

THE House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT) FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76 HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd April, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.10 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P., (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E. (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P. (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A. (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A. LL.B. Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. A. MORRISON and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minutes of Friday, 16th March, 1973, are before you for confirmation. There being no objections these Minutes are confirmed.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to lay the following

The Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1973.

The Judges (Salaries) Order, 1973.

The Judges (Conditions of Service and Allowances) (Amendment) Regulations, 1973.

The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1973.

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1973.

and on behalf of the Minister of Finance a Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for eleven months ended 28th February, 1973.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following

Statements showing Money Order Transactions through the Crown Agents for Overseas Governments and administrations, for the months of October and November, 1972.

Statements showing sums advanced to the Postmaster General for the Payment of Money Orders for the period October/November, 1972.

The twenty-first Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Natural Gas Corporation for the year 1st April, 1971 to 31st March, 1972.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following

Report of the Barbados Community College for the year 1st September 1971 to 31st August, 1972.

Statement of Accounts of the Barbados Community College for the Financial year 1971-72.

Report of the Ministry of Education for the period of 1st September 1970 to 31st August, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions

Resolution to approve the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1973.

Resolution to vary the Schedule to the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act 1971 to increase the annual salary and duty allowance payable to the Governor-General.

I may mention that I have written His Honour the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition to have permission to deal with these two matters along with others which I will make mention of later, in all their stages today.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$3,629,828 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 1, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I am also seeking permission to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy 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 Husbands and Oxnards Plantations, St. James, in connection with the development in the Cave Hill area.

Also, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, 1971. Again, Sir, I am asking permission to deal with this Bill in all its stages today, the necessary procedure having been adopted with the Speaker and the Leader of the Opposition.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following question

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that, under Chapter 111 Section 24(6) of the Constitution of

Barbados, Parliament is empowered to make provision with respect to the practice and procedure of the High Court and the Court of Appeal to enable these Courts the more effectively to exercise the jurisdiction conferred upon them by the Constitution for the enforcement of the fundamental rights and freedoms of the individual as enshrined in the Constitution?

2. Is the Minister aware that although the provisions of the Constitution came into operation since the 30th day of November, 1966, Parliament has not yet made any provision with respect to the practice and procedure of the abovementioned Courts in relation to the enforcement of the aforesaid fundamental rights and freedoms?

3. Is the Minister also aware that there are likewise no rules of court dealing specifically with the aforesaid practice and procedure in relation to the enforcement of the aforesaid fundamental rights and freedoms?

4. Will the Minister state whether this omission has been deliberate, due to an oversight or neglect? If it has been due to none of these causes, will the Minister explain why no provision has been made by Parliament and why no rules of Court have been made?

5. Does the Minister consider it necessary that such provision be made? If he does not, why not? If he does, will the Minister state when it is proposed to make such provision?

6. Will the Minister see to it that the necessary legislation is brought before Parliament before the year's end?

7. Alternatively, will the Minister see to it that the necessary rules of court are made and brought into force as soon as possible?

BILLS .READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, 1971, be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to state the Oral Reply to

Parliamentary Question No. 66 asked by the member for St. Thomas is ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance and temporary Minister of External Affairs I wish to state that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 74 asked by the member for St. Joseph is ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that replies to Parliamentary Question No. 77 asked by the member for St. Joseph and Parliamentary Question No. 80 asked by the member for St. Lucy are ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question No. 81 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the first Order of the Day. It is to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the implementation by Barbados of the agreement between certain Caribbean territories for the establishment of a Council of Legal Education.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, at the inaugural meeting of the Council of Legal Education which was held in Barbados on the 20th and 21st September, 1971, it was agreed that judicial status should be given to the Council of Legal Education and legal effect to the agreement establishing the Council at domestic level. To this end, a Draft Model Bill was circulated, and the Chairman of Legal Education in his covering letter stated:

"(a) It seems clear that the agreement must be set out as a Schedule to the legislation; and

(b) The statute should refer expressly to those parts of the agreement which must be given effect at the level of domestic law."

At the meeting held on the 21st September, 1972, the Government agreed that legislation based on the Model Bill should be enacted so as to give effect to the agreement at as early a date as possible. The Draft Bill attached as an appendix entitled the Council of Legal Education Act, 1973, now being submitted for approval, was based on the Model Bill to carry out the recommendations of the Chairman of the Council of Legal Education.

Section 2 of the Bill provides for the inclusion of the text of the agreement, as amended, by the supplementary agreement as a Schedule to the Bill.

Section 3 enacts that paragraph 2 of Article 1, Articles 5 and 6 and paragraph 6 of Article 9 of the agreement shall have the force of law in Barbados.

The Bill also provides for giving effect to future agreements by means of an Order by the Minister responsible for the subject of the Council of Legal Education.

The position, Sir, as I mentioned just now when I was giving a little background information, is that the Cabinet at its meeting held on the 12th February, 1970, considered this entire matter in so far as Barbados becoming a party to the agreement for the establishment of the West Indian Council of Legal Education which would be responsible for the professional training for those students who had completed their LL.B. degree in the Faculty of Law at the University of the West Indies. The agreement was signed on the 17th March, 1971, on behalf of this Government by the Attorney-General and the

Instrument of ratification signed on the 25th August, 1971, by the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, has been deposited with the Commonwealth Caribbean Regional Secretariat. The Governments of the Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago as well as the University of the West Indies and the University of Guyana have subscribed to the agreement and it is currently in effect.

In so far as the financial arrangements are concerned, Sir, an amount was included in the Estimates to give effect to Barbados' commitment to the setting up of the Establishment and also the recurrent cost of this Council of Legal Education. The recurrent cost is \$1,864,055, an annual contribution of \$641,352, and the capital cost is \$1,211,674 payable in two equal instalments. Barbados' share of the cost on the basis of the rate of contribution of 7.7% is \$49,961 annually for recurrent expenditure, and the sum of \$94,370 for capital expenditure to be provided over the first two years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this matter was considered on more than one occasion by- the Cabinet, and on the 11th March, 1971, it was concluded that Barbados should become a party to the agreement for the establishment of this Council of Legal Education, subject to certain amendments to the terms of the agreement. The Cabinet also concluded that the then Attorney-General, Senator the Hon. F. G. Smith, Q.C., should sign the agreement on behalf of the Government during his visit to Guyana between the 14th and 18th March, 1971, with the following proviso:

"Barbados interprets Clauses 1 and 2 of Article 10 of the agreement to mean that the agreement is subject to ratification, or acceptance, and comes into force upon deposit of the Instrument of ratification or acceptance on behalf of the University of the West Indies, the University of Guyana, and on behalf of Barbados, Guyana, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago."

Barbados' paper was signed subject to deposit of letters of ratification. The Attorney-General at the time, now Minister of Communications and Works, reported to the Cabinet at a meeting on the 22nd March, 1971, that he had signed the agreement during his visit to Guyana. The Instrument of ratification was subsequently signed by the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and forwarded to the Caribbean Regional Secretariat on the 24th August, 1971.

As I have said, Sir, this agreement, as amended, is now in effect, and Barbados has made provision for its contribution in this year's Estimates. I have just given you what the commitments are likely to be, both recurrent and capital. If there are any further questions on which hon. members need some background information, the Hon. Minister of Education, who was the appropriate Minister at one time, apart from the Prime Minister, of course, and also the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, who was the Attorney-General at the time, can fill in any gaps which I may have left out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the passing of this Bill, Barbados would have fully subscribed to the system of Legal Education which has been decided on for persons qualifying in the legal profession in

the West Indies. Of course, on this side of the House, we welcome the establishment of this system of legal education, and we will wholeheartedly and readily vote for this Bill which gives effect to the agreement to establish the Council of Legal Education.

Let us say, Sir, that we believe that all professions and not only the legal profession should be regulated and controlled, but also that there should be established proper standards of training. We think that in relation to the legal profession the right course has been taken. Speaking for myself there is only one note of regret which I have to state, and it is that it has been found necessary, because of the political situation in the Caribbean, to establish two law schools; one in Trinidad and Tobago, and one in Jamaica.

I believe I have heard the Director of Legal Education, the former Mr. Justice Fraser, say that this political reality has forced upon the Caribbean countries a, perhaps, more expensive organisational structure than one would wish. Unfortunately, we have to live with these realities, but I trust that in the years to come, when we have had the experience of seeing the institutions function, we can convince the other Caribbean territories that, perhaps, adequate arrangements could have been made in Barbados and Barbados alone where the Faculty is for the professional training. 12.30 p.m

I think we have to foot our share of the bill. We have agreed to the system and we have gone along with the majority vote on this matter. We recognise that we now have to provide three libraries instead of two, various lecturers who will be supplementary as well as complementary to one another, but I trust that the young citizens of the West Indies for whom we are providing this education will recognise that they have a duty not only to qualify brilliantly in their subjects, but also to give some of their time back to the community which will be paying by and large for this system •

There is not very much more we can say about the Bill. It merely gives juridical status to the Council and we hope the Council will function quickly and efficiently, and that the first graduates who come out of Cave Hill in June will find that their transition into the professional law school will be as smooth as possible.

Again a note of regret. I would have hoped that the Organisation of Commonwealth Caribbean Bar Association would have been

represented on the Council itself. This matter has been fully argued and talked out, but it is a fact that the legal profession as well as the representatives of the Government on the legal side and the Judges are on the Council of Legal Education. It is to be hoped that in due course they will establish professional standards which will be implemented by all of the individual territories. One of the first tasks will no doubt be to set rules of etiquette governing the profession as a whole, and I think that under this umbrella of what I like to refer to as functional federalism, we may yet in due course assimilate close enough to the other territories of the Caribbean.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

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

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item stands in my name, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Offences Against the Person Act, 1868.

As the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Offences against the Person Act, 1868 (Act 1868-5) in order to introduce into the Law of Barbados the doctrine of diminished responsibility. That doctrine permits a person accused of murder to raise the defence that he was at the time suffering from an abnormality of mind which substantially reduced his responsibility but does not provide a defence to persons who are merely hot-tempered or kill in a sudden access of rage or jealousy. The onus of

showing that such an abnormality exists would be placed on the defence and a person who established this defence to the satisfaction of the jury would be liable to be convicted of manslaughter only.

Provision is also made that in trials for murder in which the issue of provocation is raised, the nature as distinct from the degree of provocation should be immaterial and the jury would be enabled to take into account everything both done and said according to the effect which it would have on a reasonable man.

Now this is merely an attempt on our part to bring the laws of Barbados in these matters in respect of murder, manslaughter etc, in line with the British practice and the Act which I think was passed in England in 1957. I speak subject to correction by some of the practising lawyers on the other side or on this side who may be more au fait as to the correct date, but the fact is that this is an attempt on our part to bring our law in line and more up to date in accordance with the practice in England today in so far as these matters are concerned.

Now this Bill seeks to amend the law relating to homicide by introducing the doctrine of diminished responsibility and widening the concept of provocation. 12.40 p.m

Murder may be defined as the intentional, deliberate and un-provoked killing of another without lawful excuse or justification. An example of lawful excuse is self-defence, and an example of lawful

justification is execution of the sentence of the Court. Every person, as you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is presumed in law to be sane and to intend the natural and probable consequences of his acts, but this presumption of sanity and intention is rebuttable by evidence to the contrary. The question as to what the accused intended involves the state of mind at the time when he committed the act. As the common law now stands insanity is a defence to a charge of murder, but the test of insanity as was laid down in 1843 and what has become known as the M'Naughten Law is whether it was clearly proved that at the time of the committing of the act, the party accused was labouring under such a defect of reason from disease of the mind as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing, or if he did know it, that he did not know what he was doing was wrong.

Where insanity has been raised, section 51 of the Mental Health Act 1951 (1951-25) applies, and this provides that where a person who would

otherwise have been convicted of murder is acquitted on grounds of such insanity the court shall order the person acquitted to be detained in custody in such place as the court appoints until Her Majesty's pleasure is known, and thereupon the Governor-General who is vested with that power, acting for Her Majesty, may give such order for the safe custody of such person during Her Majesty's pleasure as the Governor-General thinks fit.

Apart from insanity, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which satisfies the test as laid down above, drunkenness and provocation are recognised in common law as capable of affecting the mental responsibility of the accused for his acts, but in the case of drunkenness and provocation, murder is reduced to manslaughter. The test of drunkenness is that it must render the accused so stupid and befuddled with drink as to impair his powers to judge between right and wrong and to measure the consequences of his actions. In the case of drunkenness and provocation, however, Sir, while drunkenness and provocation can so reduce the crime of murder to that of manslaughter, on the other hand, where the accused was suffering from a defect or abnormality of mind whether due to inherent causes or reduced by injury or disease, or by arrested or retarded development, and such defect or abnormality of mind without substantially impairing his mental responsibility for the killing, yet fall short of the test of insanity as stated above. Such state of mind would provide in our law as it now stands no answer to a charge of murder. It would not reduce the offence to manslaughter. The test of insanity is of a very high standard and is reached only in very extreme cases.

The amendments proposed in section 3A of the Bill here is therefore to provide that if the accused was suffering from such abnormality of mind as substantially impairs his mental responsibility for the killing he would be convicted not of murder but of manslaughter. This will assist lawyers who are not so bright, Sir, the lawyers who are not that gifted will have this to assist them to find some form defence in the case of murder, so this is coming to the assistance of practitioners. With all due respect, I am not referring to anyone here, counsel on the other side, hon. members who are bright, I am speaking in a general way of the average lawyer not the eminent ones, but the ones who really have to practise at the court will have now a ready-made defence in cases of murder, but of course it will have to be borne out, proved and backed up by medical evidence, and it is not a question of excusing people who commit murder but it is

really giving them a very fair trial, and probably invoking some of the provisions before the jury as such for their consideration which normally are considered by the Judge and by the appeal Judges and

the Privy Council if it goes that far. So these are principles in my view which are already in force but not which are exercised by the jury as such but all these considerations are already in operation. This is putting it squarely on the jury for them to consider and regard as a good defence.

I suppose the legal luminaries will elaborate on this, but I think that lawyers generally will welcome this piece of legislation in that it provides a good defence in very difficult and extremely hard cases. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we on this side have very little to say, only that this Bill is long overdue. Now that the Government has seen fit to begin to update the laws of Barbados I wish they would also look at the aspect of manslaughter caused by vehicles and amend the laws whereby a charge can be brought for causing death by dangerous driving rather than the usual manslaughter charges which are now made. It is all good and well for the Leader of the House in introducing this Bill to speak about a ready-made defence for lawyers. First of all, there are no more lawyers, as far as I know there are attorneys-at-law.

The second point is that I hope that the Public Service Commission will now take active steps to look at the situation which exists at the Mental Hospital, because every practitioner will tell you that in recent years, or from the time I have been practising in Barbados, it is one of the most difficult things to get a doctor from the Mental Hospital to examine an accused and to come to Court to give evidence which in the opinion of everybody else, is evidence which satisfies the court and not to bring an acquittal or a conviction.

We have had problems asking the Director of Public Prosecutions to summon doctors from the hospital, and unless you do that, you cannot get them. There is some ridiculous situation in which I understand doctors are complaining that they are never paid to do this job, and some of them have gone so far as to charge elaborate fees. One doctor said he would charge \$1.00 on principle, but I hope that in bringing in this Bill, the Government will understand that this Bill will

not be workable unless you have the assistance of those persons trained in the medical field, otherwise, it will be useless because you are putting a heavier burden on the jury who would not be guided by professional advice or who would not be able to hear expert evidence, although they are not supposed to accept it, but they have the right to listen to it and make up their minds much more easily than if they are left in the dark.

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.50 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution to grant the sum of three million, six hundred and twenty-nine thousand, eight hundred and twenty-eight dollars from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-1974 Part I - Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1973-74 No. 1 which form the Schedule to this Resolution be the next Order of the Day. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 1

A Resolution for the sum of \$3,629,828 was called.

Dr. The Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks to provide amounts of \$1,041,746 and \$2,583,082 to meet increased payments in respect of Welfare Grants and Old Age Pensions with effect from 1st April, 1973. We are proposing to increase Old Age Pensions from the current rate to \$8.00 per week, and the Welfare Grants as follows

a child under 16 years of age \$2.50 per week; minimum rate for an able-bodied adult \$1.50 per week;

maximum rate for an able-bodied adult \$2.50 per week;

minimum rate for disabled person \$5.00 per week;

maximum rate for disabled person \$8.00 per week.

I move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I must commend the Government for bringing this Resolution before this House. It should be drawn to the attention of the public that, since the Democratic Labour Party has been given the mandate to run the affairs of this Country, the Old Age Pensioners have received a reasonable number of increases from time to time.

If I remember well, Sir, the amount which each old age pensioner received when the D.L.P. came to power was \$2.40 per week. I think that in the case of welfare grants the amount was also very small. Today we are here to deal with an increase of 60%, and it proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that this Government has been doing its utmost for old age pensioners. When we consider that when this Government came to power they were only receiving \$2.40, and today the amount which we are here to approve is \$8.00 I have no doubt that even our detractors will congratulate us for this reasonable increase.

Sir, you will agree with me that every member of this Honourable House of Assembly would be very happy if we could have given them a bigger increase, but when we consider the resources of this Country and take into consideration the amenities which this Government has to give the people and also the amount which has to be allocated to every Ministry annually, I am sure that you will agree with me that we have done our utmost for these old people.

Mr. Chairman, I am also happy to know that the means test has been increased over 100%. This means that certain people who were not eligible for pensions under the old Act will now qualify for pensions. 1 p.m.

Sir, while we have been told that with the increase of this means test the numbers will increase by about 10 per cent, it is my opinion, speaking from experience, that we may be called upon to pay more than has been recommended to us, that is, the 10% increase. This, Sir, will help certain people who are

placed in certain categories to receive old age pension, and I have no doubt that these people will be happy to hear of the passing of this Resolution.

Now, Sir, when it comes to the welfare grants, it is known that we have certain paupers. Regardless of what we do, we have to look after certain poor people, and in every country you find these poor people, and therefore I am very pleased to know that the Government has also found it possible to increase these grants, and especially for children.

Those of us who worked in the former Local Government Council know that there are several parents who go overseas, and in many cases, do not remember their children who have been left in this Island. Consequently, it is the duty of the Government to take care of these children. In many cases some of them are sent to the Homes, but we are not here to encourage children to be sent to Homes, and if their relatives can assist in maintaining them the Government should be commended for the increases which have been recommended to us here today. A few weeks ago when we were dealing with the Supplementary Resolution for old age pensioners, I reminded this Honourable House of a Resolution which was passed approximately eleven years ago and this Resolution requested that these old age pensions should be paid by cheques or some other method, and that they should not be called upon to go up to the various post offices for their pensions. I have often seen many of them become ill and had to receive first-aid treatment. Mr. Chairman, in some cases some of them have to travel three or four miles and there may not be transportation for them. Imagine seeing an old person of 75 years of age walking three or four miles after getting up in the morning at about 5 o'clock, or 6 o'clock, so that he can be first in the queue. I can therefore only appeal to the Government to do something to alleviate this hardship.

Since this Resolution was passed, people have been receiving their pensions from the Provident Fund and there are 6,000 to 7,000 people who are being paid their amounts by cheque. Now the time has come when we must think about these people and try to help them by finding some new method so that they can be paid at home. It is true, Sir, that with the payment at home it can be done bi-weekly or monthly. We are not supposed to continue with the method of paying them weekly. I am sure you will agree with me, Sir, that in case of heavy rains some of them get wet and become ill just to get the few pennies. I think the time has come when some improvement should be brought about in the payment of old age pensioners. To think of additional centres in my opinion is nonsensical, because regardless of where you place these centres, the people will have to travel to receive their pensions I can only appeal to my Government, and especially to the civil servants who have to deal with all aspects of this matter to get down to business. In my opinion it can be done and I do not see how it is such a colossal task for civil servants to organise some new system whereby these people can be paid at their homes. I am therefore appealing to Government to do all that it possibly can to use their influence and see that this change comes about. Again I would like to give this Resolution my wholehearted support.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. member for St. Philip South and the one point which he has made with which I totally agree is that of finding it possible to make payment to these old age pensioners directly at home. 1.10 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, we are concerned here today with what I consider more perhaps than at any other time strictly the human element of things. You will find that provision has been made in your welfare grants for a child under 16 years of age to receive \$2.50 per week. The minimum that an able-bodied adult is to

receive is \$1.50, and the maximum is \$2.50. In other words, an able-bodied adult in these terms is the equivalent of a child under 16 years of age, because they both get the same \$2.50. In respect of the disabled person, undoubtedly there are provisions for increases, but nevertheless, what we do not have before us, and which I believe the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us here and now, is how many persons are presently receiving this money, that is, how many under 16 years of age, how many in each group (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e), and with the increase how many you expect to pay in each group in the new setup. The Minister should have it so detailed, that I ought to be able to hear from him how many people from the parish of St. Peter are receiving the disability allowance of \$8.00, how many children under 16 years of age are going to be receiving \$2.50 per week, because it is all right for us to vote money and say how this money must be spent, there should be some means of checking regularly.

I have said repeatedly that some of the things which some of these poor mothers particularly are subjected to by some of these Welfare Officers are things we do not like to have to face up to, but a thorough investigation might reveal that there are some of these Welfare Officers who when we look on the circumstances of these poor people and might well be the fathers of the second child in each family, and I mean it when I say so. The complaints of all these mothers cannot just all be concoctions. We see very well what provisions are made here. I think one thing that should concern us is what provision is made for those persons who can get jobs but would not work. What are we going to do about that? Are they going to get welfare grants? If you journey from the 19-mile stone in St. Lucy to Seawell Airport in Christ Church you will see along the main highways on every bridge or on every curb wall around a quarter to nine or 9 o'clock on mornings groups of young men making themselves pretty happy, it would appear to me, at that early hour of the morning, but are we going to make provision for that type of person who can get a job and will not look for one? Very often some of them ask for \$1.00, but if you tell them you can give them a job around your home and pay them more than that dollar they abuse you. What are you going to do with that type of situation? We certainly want to see that assistance is given to all those persons who are not able to work.

In the case of those mothers who have their children of these tender ages we would like to see something more than \$2.50 given to each child, because we know today that with the inflationary spiral, the high cost of living, with the prices of everything going up momentarily that \$2.50 per week means nothing to a mother having to look after a child and to make every provision for it. When the mother has to be looking after this child she cannot go out and look for work, and when she gets only \$2.50 for the child, what is her position then? When she gets an able-bodied pay which is equivalent to \$2.50, exactly what are you really providing for her? What I want to say is that I am thankful for small mercies, but I am not one of those people who are going to come here today and make it to appear as if we are doing all this for these people, because looking at the high cost of living, the conditions under which some of these people live, this is not really doing anything. There was a time I heard the hon. member for St. Philip South speak of the day when they got \$2.40 per week as old age pension, but in the day when they got \$2.40 rice was being sold at so many pints for the bit and that when they got \$2.40 those old people could send the \$2.40 to somebody's shop and they would have got so much groceries for the money that the shopkeeper would have made quite a large profit on that \$2.40, and he would then give them a piece of salt beef on the top of the basket and give the little children some broken biscuits.

What we are saying is we are glad to see in respect of the old age pensioners that Government has decided to give them an increase of \$3.00, but when we look to see that in the Public Service, we do not have it before us, but there is a rumour - and we do not dismiss it - that Ministers are going to get a very

good increase, this, Mr. Chairman, bears no relation percentage wise to what is really taking place. 1.20 p.m

What we would say is that we remember hearing the Prime Minister say how those who were in the higher brackets would have to mark time until others catch up with them. These old age pensioners have already done their gallop and

they cannot even trot at this stage. Some of these old people are still depending upon others for support and so on. One thing that has to be taken into consideration with respect to the raising of the means test, and it is that with the new land tax situation, if one of these old age pensioners finds that the little plot of land which he or she occupies or owns has a site value of, say, \$780, it means, according to this new means test, that he or she cannot get old age pension. He or she will not be able to get the \$8.00 per week. Site value means income.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

No. Do not fool the people.

Mr. HINDS:

I am not fooling anybody with anything, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. We have in this House the Senior Welfare Officer, and he has informed me that that statement is not authentic.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to repeat what I have said, with your permission. If an old age pensioner owns a plot of land that has a site value of \$780, in the light of the new eligibility test for old age pensioners, he will not be eligible for old age pension. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Philip South does not know about what I am talking, but shouting out is cheap. (Asides.) The same thing applies to the Hon. Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

As far as I am concerned, I am listening directly to what you are saying on this Resolution and to no other remarks. I think you should carry on with the Resolution and ignore any remarks whatsoever.

Mr. HINDS:

I cannot ignore the heckling, Sir. If they heckle me now, they will heckle you later, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will deal with them.

Mr. HINDS:

I am sure that the Minister will tell us how many old age pensioners they are now making provision

for? How many they are now paying the \$5.00 to? If they give us those figures, we believe that we can make our own additions for 10%, although we do not accept that it is going to be only 10%. We believe that there should be a figure entirely different from this.

Mr. Chairman, you will find that much is going to be said about increasing the old age pensioners' allotment to \$8.00. You will find that the Income Tax Commissioner makes provision for those persons who have one of these old people living under the same roof. If an old person is living with you under the same roof, I think you can make a claim for \$200, but if the person is not living under the same roof you can claim only \$120. You will find that when one gives a careful study to taxation, one will find that everything is interwoven. Old age pensions, the welfare grants and income tax are involved. You will agree that, if an old person is not living under the same roof as the person who is making a contribution to his support, it would cost that person more than if the old person had been living with him under the same roof. By sharing the same services and facilities in the home, the person would have to contribute less to the old person. This trend would have to be put in reverse for it to have any real meaning. (Asides.)

Mr. Chairman, they are shouting for time, so I will wind up. I am sure the Minister will have his figures to let us know exactly how he has arrived at the amount for which he is asking. Surely he is going to tell us about the old age pensioners in St. Peter and in St. Philip as well as in St. George. I want to know how many people are going to be paid at \$8.00 a week, how many people they estimate will be paid at the \$1.50 and \$2.50 a week and so on. We should be grateful for this type of information.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that you, like all members in here, would never expect me to allow a resolution of this nature to go by without making a very small contribution to it. I think if there is one person in Parliament who has always advocated and fought for an increase in the amount paid to old age pensioners from 1956 when I came here, posterity will surely reveal that it is me.

Only a few months ago you will recall, Mr. Chairman, that I had a battle with Mr. Speaker, I was almost asked to leave the Chamber, and I would have gladly done so, because I am still convinced that I was batting on a good wicket when Mr. Speaker did not allow a resolution which I had brought before Parliament asking Parliament to increase the old age pensions from \$5.00 a week to a minimum of \$15.00 a week. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker at that time did not see it fit for me to have this Resolution discussed in Parliament, and I can only conclude that, since Government has now seen it fit to bring this Resolution before the House, it was merely to prevent me from getting the glory or the credit for bringing the Resolution.

However, there is no doubt in my mind that, although both sides of the House would welcome an increase in the old age pensions in this country, we on this side cannot, and I am confident that when the Minister, if I know him well enough, has to reply, could not possibly agree that an increase from \$5.00 to \$8.00 per week is an adequate amount on which an old age pensioner can exist in this Country with the high cost of living with which we are now faced.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how the Government arrived at this \$8.00 per week. I believe that this was an amount arrived at for the purpose of fooling people that the Government is increasing Old Age Pensions, since the salaries of the Governor-General and the civil servants are going to be increased. Day after day you can hear of the Secretary of the Trade Union having a battle with the merchants and

employers in Bridgetown in order to get better wages for the workers to enable them to cope with the spiralling cost of living. For the Government therefore, to come before this Committee and ask this side, though we have to support it in principle, for what I consider to be a measly additional \$3.00 a week is merely to meet what one can consider will be the increase in rentals for house spots with which they will be faced, since some of the landlords are now jacking up the rents because of the recent Land Tax Act.

Mr. Chairman, you are a grocer, apart from your public duties, and you are well aware of the fact that many of these people cannot exist on \$5.00 a week. I do not consider the additional \$3.00 as an amount that is adequate for old age pensioners. I am neither an economist nor an actuary, and I am unable to arrive at a figure where I would know percentage-wise how much it would cost the Government to give the people a bigger increase. It is my honest opinion that \$5.00 a week was too low to give an old age pensioner, and I feel that the minimum given to them should be \$15.00 a week.

Now, Government can find money to spend on things which I do not consider as priorities. I was not in my place, but I have been told that we are going to have some sort of coast guards with 40-ft vessels sailing up and down in an effort to stop people from bringing in animals and to stop contraband. I am certain that the money which will be spent on the purchase and maintenance of these coast guards could be used for the purpose of increasing old age pensions to an adequate sum on which to live. 1.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, you are aware of the fact that these people have made a contribution to this Country. They have given so much and in return they get so little, and can be safely considered as the forgotten of the Country. They have wrestled through the hard rugged days, and now that we are seeing a better way of life, they are still overlooked. My view is that the Minister should look into this increase of \$3 per week. I am aware of the fact that with the coming into being of national insurance you would in fifteen or twenty years not have people drawing old age pension because they would be drawing national insurance; but when you have reached the age of 68 and have to wait another ten or fifteen years before you can draw national insurance, those people must go through very terrible days.

I am not going to speak much longer on this because Government knows my feeling on this, and I have made what contribution I have to make very brief, but I would like Government to look into the possibility of increasing the old age pension a little more. I do not feel that an additional \$3 a week is adequate, and I sincerely hope that the Minister when he replies will give some idea of how they arrived at the additional \$3 in comparison with the present cost of living.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see that the old age pension has been increased. I know that the hon. member for St. James, like all of us, would like to see a larger increase, but you have to think in terms of your economy and in terms of other things. I would like to see the means test more liberally looked upon. I have said already, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe in the means test for old age pensions. I think it is copying the English system and I do not think we have to do that. I know that people will say that if you remove the means test that everybody will qualify, but you already have an age limit and everybody cannot qualify, because you can only qualify when you reach the age of 68 years. If there are some people who will go and draw the old age pension though they are in better circumstances, those are going to be marginal, and you cannot legislate for marginal people.

Mr. Chairman, what I do not like now is the indignity some old age pensioners have to suffer, because

when the inspectors go to their house, some of them have to hide the television set under the bed. I am a serious man. The Government cannot have a television station and then tell people they cannot have a television; so I do not regard having a television set or a radio as something to disqualify a person. I do not agree with it because they are simple means of enlightenment and enjoyment, and that is why I hope we will begin to abolish the means test," and work a system in which you will know the number who are drawing old age pension and regulate it to that figure, and if there are those who are well off and go and draw old age pension, you will have to live with that. You should abolish the means test and wash out the foolishness of carrying on an administration. I am a practical man. You set up an administration all over the Island to pay out a meagre amount. In my way of looking at it, it is top heavy, unwieldy and cumbersome apart from naming a few people. Some people will draw old age pension now whom you may feel can do without drawing it. You should remove the means test and fix the amount.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to talk like people in Barbados without being able to identify. Nobody in this House can tell me what are the numbers of people who are over the ages of sixty-five that would qualify if you remove the means test. Sixty-eight is high for Barbados and in any case the span between 68 and dying could not be much more than 12 years, because the average age of living in Barbados is not 80, and you are bound to know that between 68 and death you only have the question of paying somebody for twelve years. It costs the Government more to pay pensioners than to pay old age pensioners, and if you are drawing from the Government I do not believe you can draw old age pension too, and those persons are disqualified. The time has come when the Government should examine the abolition of the means test and fix the rate so that 'whoever comes in the dragnet are in, and those who are out remain outside. 1.40 p.m.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, in replying I would like to state that in my initial remarks I did not say much. My reason for so doing was based on the fact that about two weeks ago we heard arguments for and arguments against the increase in old age pensions and I did not see the necessity for rehashing the arguments and counter-arguments again, but unfortunately I see that some of them have been repeated. I believe that each member is in favour of an increase in old age pensions; how much this increase should or will be has to be determined by the ability of the economy of the country as a whole to service this increase. When one takes into consideration all the attending circumstances bearing upon the economy at the present time, one will have to agree, even if reluctantly, that the increase at this stage is a reasonable one, and while one may not want to say that it is here for all time and maybe next year one will have to look at it again, one has to accept at the moment that the economy of Barbados support this, and it cannot support an old age pension of \$15 per week. An old age pension of \$15 per week as advocated in some areas would mean looking for \$13 million per year, and the question is, would the people of Barbados at this stage want to suffer increased taxation to raise this amount of money.

As regards the means test, I would like to point out that my Ministry is re-examining the whole issue. It is very to come in this Chamber and make statements and feel that automatically they can be applied. The mechanics and the effects of all these things have to be worked out fully, because if you do not do that you are not running the Government properly, and we are trying to run the Government and have succeeded so far. There are 17,56 people over the age of 65 in Barbados, and for the benefit of those people who are interested in numbers, there are 13,867 people drawing old age pensions. The other figures as regards a breakdown of disabled people and people of various ages I can give because I have the file here. Looking at the face of it I would tend to agree with the hon. member for St. Michael West

that there may be a case for the abolition of the means test, because if you have 13,867 people now drawing old age pensions and the total number of people over the age of 65 is over 17,000, one sees that there is not such a big difference between those who are drawing and those who are likely to draw if everybody over the age of 65 given the opportunity draws an old age pension. Again, I say all of this has to be worked out and one cannot come here in an ad hoc manner and agree to anything being said, we have to work out the mechanics of these things.

For the benefit of those hon. members who have been asking for figures, I would like to point out that there is a total of \$1,568 disabled people in the whole island broken down as follows: St. Michael 487, Christ Church 161, St. George 64, St. John 101, St. Philip 310, St. Andrew 101, St. James 83, St. Joseph 78, St. Lucy 64, St. Peter 93, and St. Thomas 26. As regards the people who drew national assistance last year, the total number was 5,657 broken down as follows St. Michael 2,686, Christ Church 371, St. George 137, St. John 169, St. Philip 585, St. Andrew 269, St. James 423, St. Joseph 196, St. Lucy 319, St. Peter 367 and St. Thomas 137. If we have to break down the number of children and parents who receive national assistance I think this is too tedious and I have no intention of reading them out here. I have the figures which are broken down by mother/guardian with one child, mother/guardian with two children and up to a maximum of nine children, and then again broken down by parish, so I would like to assure hon. members that we looked into the details of the people drawing national assistance and the disabled people who come and seek assistance. We just do not vote money just for the purpose of giving anybody money.

I know a lot can be said about the cost of living, and as I said, I am not prepared to rehash all the arguments of two weeks ago, but I would like to stress that while it is laudable to come in here and say for the people's benefit that you are interested in the elderly citizens in the Country, all of this again has to be related to what the economy of Barbados can support, and I am certain that if anybody makes an analysis of the economy of Barbados at this stage he will have to agree that the economy of Barbados cannot support this laudable figure of \$15 per week or more, as some of us would like.

When we look at the other aspects of old age pensioners, again the Ministry of Health and Welfare is reviewing the whole structure of paying these people their money. We do not need to be impressed by anyone, because both the Parliamentary Secretary and myself have paid visits all over Barbados and have witnessed the conditions and the problems suffered by many of these people. Only last Sunday I was in one of the parishes looking at the problems of some of these people, and I am certain that this estimate of an increase of 10% is very conservative, because on my evidence alone the number of people who deserve to get and should be getting national assistance or old age pension far exceeds the 13,000 we are now thinking about. There are by far many more people in Barbados right now who are in need of assistance one way or the other but for reasons best known to themselves are not coming forward to ask for it, so I do not need to be convinced, neither does the Ministry need to be convinced of this.

We are also looking at the question of making free transportation available to some of these people, but here again it is not a question of just taking up something and applying it, one has to look into the cost efficiency of these things, because whenever you are finished, you have to look for the money and you also have to look at the effects it will have on other sections of the economy. When we think in terms of paying by cheque we are not only looking at the question of paying by cheque we are looking at the question of paying by other means, actually being able to go and pay the people directly in their homes. All the various methods of paying pensioners in Barbados are at the moment being investigated

by the Ministry of Health and Welfare, and when we are satisfied and we have a good method, we will take this method up for the concurrence of Cabinet and we will implement a method which will go a far way in relieving a lot of the problems which each and every one of us should know if we do not already know, that these people have, Without any more ado, Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the Addendum sets out, the Order entitled the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1973, should be laid in Parliament, and the Order seeks to give effect to the salary revision approved by the Cabinet for the Director of Public Prosecutions with effect from 1st April, 1973. 1.50 p.m

The important part of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1973, shall have effect and shall be deemed always to have had effect as if -

(a) in Schedule A, the word "A" were substituted for the words "\$16,200" appearing in the column headed "Code Number" opposite to the office "Director of Public Prosecutions" under Head 5 LEGAL; and

(b) in Schedule B, the words "\$22,680" were inserted in the second, third and fourth columns opposite the Code

Number "A" appearing in the first column of that Schedule.

This is merely to revise the salary of the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Order to carry this into effect has been duly signed by the Minister of Finance, the Minister responsible for Establishments, and the Resolution has been circulated. This is really in keeping with the increases in salaries, and this is the proposed salary for the Director of Public Prosecutions to put him in line with the Judges of the Supreme Court.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO VARY THE SCHEDULE TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
(CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) ACT, 1971**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next item on the Order Paper is a Resolution to vary the schedule to the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, 1971. It is to increase the annual salary and duty allowance payable to the Governor-General. It is a Resolution in accordance with section 3(2) of the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, 1971, that the Schedule to that Act be varied by increasing the annual salary and duty allowance payable to the Governor-General from \$26,400 and \$12,000 to \$36,000 and \$18,000 respectively. Again, Sir, this is just in keeping with the general salaries revision, and the Governor-General's salary is being increased proportionately.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is a Bill to amend the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act 1971-35 to make provision for the holder of the office of Governor-General to receive at his option a reduced pension and gratuity.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 44

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Order No. 44 be suspended in order to permit me to proceed with the Bill I have just mentioned.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the objects and reasons set out, the Bill will amend the Governor-General (Conditions of Service) Act, 1971-35 to make provision for the holder of the office of Governor-General to receive at his option a reduced pension and gratuity. This is bringing the salary of the Governor-General into line with that of the Ministers and Parliamentary members, so that he will have an opportunity to opt for a reduced pension and a gratuity. I do not think this needs very much explaining. 2 p.m.

It is a provision which should have applied to the Prime Minister and to the Governor-General, but I do not know how it was omitted. It is a fact too that it was omitted when we were considering the pension rights of parliamentary members and Ministers, and we are now regularising that. I think that is all I need say at this stage.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that this is the year of salary increases and bringing people in line with each other for the purpose of meeting the every day cost of living, or what the Prime Minister referred to as the better way of living.

I want to sound this note now because I believe I am going to be out of the Island for cricket. I have sat in this Chamber and heard about increases for the police, civil servants

and everybody else, and there is no doubt in my mind that there is going to be an increase for members of Parliament, and I want to jump the

gun now so that if I am not here nobody would feel that I am not part and parcel of this exercise.

I am looking forward to a handsome increase. I want to make that very clear because there are a few hypocrites around the Country and whenever there is an increase for members of Parliament, there is a public outcry. If you increase the salary of a parliamentarian by 25 cents you would hear every person in this Country meeting you and saying "man you are drawing all the money and you aren't giving me any." Let me make it clear that I have a public duty to perform, and I have to do it in a manner with which I am satisfied. Anybody can get on a public platform and read what I have said. I will never be a hypocrite. I am not going to come in here and sit down and vote for something, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and let it be against my conscience, and this is not in reference to any members on this side, because I would have to attack the other side first.

There are people in the organisation of both political parties who will come around with you at election time and assist you to win a seat to run the Government or form the Opposition, and as soon as you climb up the steps you are a different man. I want to be very honest because I am not going to be here to make this contribution, and I am not going to be one to vote against it and be the first to run down to the Treasury. I am serious about this. I am not one of those persons who will play they are not interested in it and then go and draw it. I have heard people say that we only come here on Tuesday. Whenever I go to a harvest anywhere in Barbados it costs me at least \$20 or \$25, and if I go to four in a

month, that is \$100. That is nothing to do with other things with which I am confronted day after day. The whole of Thursday is devoted to the people of Barbados, and you can see people from 9 o'clock until 5 o'clock in my office. I do not have to publicise this like our lady member on the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It is now 2 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, fifteen minutes have not gone yet.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before you suspend the sitting, I am wondering if we could suspend the appropriate Standing Order in__order to accommodate the hon. member and also to try and finish this matter in fifteen minutes or whatever time the hon. member may feel.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am entitled to half an hour so the hon. member does not have to accommodate me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House realises it is 2 p.m. and automatically this House would be suspended. If the hon. member cannot finish in ten minutes, then the Standing Order would have to be suspended.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER NO. 6

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to move that Standing Order No. 6 be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you are going to upgrade the people in relation to the standard of living, you must have your increases in pay. I am not prepared to be any Victor Vaughn or to walk about like "Gear Box"; I must be able to carry myself well so as to make my constituents and the people of Barbados proud of me, and so that I can make them feel that I want them to look and eat like me.

I once heard Prime Minister Forbes Burnham of Guyana say something at his Congress which I always attend, and it is that there is a joker called Nixon who is President of the United States of America and costs the United States Government \$10 million to keep in office, but as soon as he goes and buys a little nay-nay car for \$3,000 or \$4,000 there is a public outcry. He is the same Prime Minister who is equal to the President of the United States of America. This is the trouble you get with people and I am speaking quite frankly and honestly. I am not covering up for anybody.

Hansard will reveal that when I first came into Parliament I put a case against the raising of salaries for members of Parliament in 1966 because I did not understand what was going on. I did not know. I was sincere and honest about it, as I am about anything I say on the floor of this House. I thought this was a job which should be done voluntarily. I felt I should be able to go out there and offer something to those who could not help themselves. I did not understand the real work in it. I heard the Prime Minister once say when he was on the other side that he went somewhere and had a flat tyre, and I told him that if I met him a night changing a flat tyre

I would take out a bull pistle and give him a lash, because no Prime Minister of any country should be by the side of the road changing a flat tyre any night.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we had the English Town Crier here and the Leader of the Opposition asked me to come to Parliament because he had to go out with the Town Crier to entertain him. He had his duties to perform, and I feel that if the Prime Minister of a country is well paid, his Ministers are well paid, the Speaker and the Clerks of Parliament are well paid and the Leader of the Opposition is well paid, then we as back benchers should be well paid too. This is my honest opinion. I know what it cost me to go through an election. I know what I suffered after the election. Buying a boat is all right, but to maintain that boat is a serious thing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am putting a case because I know you are going to hear around the street corners that we are getting a piece more change. So many of them do not understand that I have to make a contribution each month towards my pension and they approach me and tell me they hear I am getting a pension for nothing. All this nonsense you hear simply because you have a half-baked paper known as the Advocate - the piece of thing the Government had is no longer in existence - which does not know what to put and is not prepared to give the people the facts about it.

As I said, Sir, I have taken the opportunity to speak on this Bill so that I can express my views because I am leaving the Island to go and watch cricket and the matter may come up when I am not here, and I want every one to understand quite clearly where I stand, and whenever Hansard is read back by some of the political puppets I can stand manly on my feet and defend it, because I have made a contribution to this Country and I have another five years after this session to do so further, come what may.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was

read a third time and passed.

DOCUMENT LAID

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to lay a document.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. minister of Health is asking leave to lay a document, and unless there is any objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

Dr. the Hon. R E CADDLE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the National Assistance (Amendment) Regulations 1973. 2.10 p.m

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn till Tuesday, 17th April, at 12 o'clock noon.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

In rising to second the motion, I just want to draw certain matters to the attention of the House. For some time now I have completed my review of the recommendations made by the Debates Committee on the salaries and remuneration of the staff of Parliament, and it is my understanding that a meeting of the Debates Committee was summoned for yesterday, and as is customary, that meeting was abortive.

I should like to make my position clear, that I have completed my part of the exercise as Minister of Finance and I have agreed with virtually all of the recommendations. Copies have been circulated, I understand, and I have also been informed that Your Honour was present yesterday. From time to time I read in the daily newspaper that the Public Accounts Committee could not function because the Government members do not turn up, but this is untrue because whereas it is true that there are, I believe, four Government members on the Public Accounts Committee, invariably at least three of them turn up and it only takes one member of the Opposition to constitute a quorum.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

How can there be a point of order in the middle of a speech from an Hon. Minister? You can only be on a point of order if I am not entitled to make a statement on the motion for the adjournment, but not to say that you do not agree with what I am saying, because I would be wasting my time in here. Do not let

us have this nonsense going on nowadays.

I am making a simple statement on the motion for adjournment as a Minister of Government and Minister of Finance. The Debates Committee made recommendations about the salaries for the staff of Parliament, they have been considered by me from an Establishment and financial point of view, sent back to the Debates Committee, copies have been circulated and as is customary, the public ought to know that both on the Public Accounts side and the Debates Committee which should run the business of Parliament, members do not turn up to the meetings, so if members of the staff do not have their salary increases brought before Parliament so that they can draw their money it is because members do not do their duty for which the hon. member for St. James claims that they should be paid more money. Attending meetings of the Debates Committee is part of the duty of a member of Parliament if he is appointed to the Committee, and if he does not intend to serve on that or the Public Accounts Committee then he should resign and say that he finds it impossible to carry out his duties as a member of the Committee, but once you are on a Committee I respectfully submit that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to attend that Committee. That is all I want to say, Sir, and this is my method of getting it on the record that I have completed my part of the exercise.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, speaking briefly on the adjournment to the same points as those made by the Prime Minister, and speaking also as a member of the Debates Committee and as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee I cannot let those remarks go unchallenged. The Public Accounts Committee is undoubtedly well supported by the Government members of whom you are one, Sir, except on such occasions as the Housing Authority has been on the agenda when no Government member has ever turned up. As far as the Debates Committee is concerned, the hon. member for St. Peter or I make it our business or if possible both of us, and at least one of us, to be present and the hon. member for St. Peter was present yesterday. In fact, Sir, I am on holiday this week but I made myself available to the Debates Committee, gave instructions that I should be telephoned if needed for a quorum. Due to some accident I did not receive the papers, it is not the fault of any hon. member, it is because of disorder in my office that I had not actually seen the papers, I should not say I did not receive them and therefore I did not go, but I believe that the attendance record of the Opposition at the Debates Committee will stand comparison with anybody's except that of course of the Leader of the House who is an indefatigable attender at all Committee meetings with which I am familiar and of which he and I have been members together, so I would just like the record kept quite clear. The Opposition attended yesterday's Debates Committee meeting, what was needed was more Government members, and I believe one other Senator might have been needed too because I believe the quorum includes two Senators. No Government Senator except Senator Goddard, according to my information, appeared yesterday, so I would like to get this on the record too, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I must also challenge the Hon. Prime Minister's statement. I am a member of the Public Accounts Committee from this Session, and since I have been a member at no time has there been a quorum and I believe I missed one meeting because I was out of the Island. At no time has any of the Government members supported the Public Accounts Committee with such numbers as would form a quorum so I do not want it to go on record as the Prime Minister said that one member of the Opposition can make a quorum and that we do not turn up. He should check the records and see how many times the members of his Party have been absent from meetings when they are called.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, on this adjournment so many members want to have the record straight, and I do not need anything from any member, if I cannot attend a meeting of any Committee I am not going to make any apology to anybody. I have passed the stage of making any apologies, I am not employed when I come in the House of Assembly, I am a member of the House now and I want to make it clear that when the Leader of the Opposition made that stupid statement that no member of the Government Party.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, I object to the use of the word "stupid". I submit it is unparliamentary.

Mr. WALCOTT:

You cannot tell me it is unparliamentary to say a member makes a stupid statement. I have not called him stupid yet, I said he made a stupid statement, and I am going to prove that it is a stupid statement because an intelligent person should not make a statement like the one the hon. member made to the effect that only when the Housing Authority matter came up on the agenda that none of the members of the Government Party attended the meetings. The hon. member knows that he told me that I have been supporting the Committee of which he is the Chairman and that the only member who has been tardy in turning up is the member for Christ Church West, a member of his Party, so how could the hon. member get up and make that statement. What about the Housing Authority could prevent me from turning up at a meeting, when he knows that I said in the House of Assembly when the Minister of Housing made a statement that I said I did not agree with the Minister saying he did not have any interest in the matter. I say it is a stupid statement to make because if the hon. member is an intelligent man and he makes a statement like that he knows it is a stupid statement. 2.20 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of explanation, Sir. In reply to that stupid speech of the hon. member who has just sat down, I should just like to explain what I have said and outline the stupidities in what he has said. I am talking about the very stupid statements which he has made in the House. (Asides.) I am explaining, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Will you please get to the point.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I am speaking on a point of explanation. The hon. member has only been a member of the Public Accounts Committee for a short time, and it is in fact untrue to say that he has never apologised, because the hon. member always shows the Committee that greatest courtesy if he cannot attend a meeting - I mean the hon. member for St. Michael West - and explains himself. He has been a member only for a short time. He explained that it was not possible for him to attend the meeting on the last occasion when the Housing Authority matter was on the agenda, and he was not a member on the earlier occasions in the last Parliament when the Housing Authority issue was on the agenda and no Government member turned up.

Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South East is saying that he turned up on those abortive occasions, but he is mistaken. If he checks the record he will find that the occasions when he turned up were not those abortive occasions. The hon. members for St. Michael West, St. Michael South East and

St. Joseph have all turned up to make a quorum when there has been no quorum They have all turned up at different times, but not on any of the occasions when the Housing Authority issue was on the agenda.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I first have to apologise to the House for having started this debate. I just wanted to get it on the record, but there are certain things I must draw to the attention of the House. I will bring in a record of the attendances at meetings that are abortive and are non-abortive. That is the first thing I will promise to do. The member for St. Thomas was not Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee in the last Session, as far as I can remember. I just want to say that it is nothing new that Committees do not come off.

It has not started with this Parliament. I came in here in 1951, and I found that many people, who had been in Parliament for years did not turn up to Committee meetings, including the Leader of the Opposition, the Premier and everybody else. I made a suggestion then, which was followed for a short time that Committee meetings should take place on the day on which Parliament is summoned for its regular meetings. If Parliament is summoned for twelve o'clock, then there is no reason why a Committee could not be called for eleven o'clock.

Now, we are on the point of adjournment today, some six or seven hours before _we normally adjourn; there is a quorum here for the Debates Committee, and there is no reason why the Clerk could not ask the members of the Debates Committee to remain after lunch for half an hour to deal with certain matters. I strongly urge that all Committee meetings of the House should take place on the date on which the House meets.

As a matter of fact, I have known Committee meetings to take place when the House was actually in Session here, and Committee meetings were going on inside one of the inner Chambers of the House. There is no reason why it could not be done during the tea interval, or during a luncheon interval, or at a time like that, but it is clearly inconvenient for members to be asked to come at 2.30 on a Wednesday afternoon, or on a Monday afternoon, at three o'clock to attend a meeting of the Committee and we have to be practical.

I only raised the matter in order to clear this up, and to clear my side of the record in so

far as the salaries of the members of the staff are concerned - not that any of them vote in my constituency, and even if they voted in my constituency I would not have to worry about that either.

ADJOURNMENT

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 17th April, 1973 at twelve noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the sitting accordingly. 2.25 p.m

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17th April, 1973.

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

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relation); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. MOTTLEY entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr, Speaker, I am commanded to lay -

- (a) The Customs Duties (Full Gospel Christian Church of Barbados) Notice, 1973.
- (b) The Customs Duties (Elkay Travel Requisites Industries Limited) Order, 1973.
- (c) The Customs Duties (S.T.S. Limited) Order, 1973.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following paper

Fifteenth Annual Report of the Housing Authority for the year 1st April, 1970 to 31st march, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

- (a) Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1973".

(b) Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Officer) Order 1973".

(c) Resolution to fix the rates of salary and allowances applicable to the posts of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and Executive Personal Secretary with effect from 1st April 1973.

(d) Resolution to grant the sum of \$25,460 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 2, which form the First Schedule to the Resolution.

Also

(a) A Bill to amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act, 1969.

(b) A Bill to repeal the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970 and to make provision for revised Salaries and Allowances of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

(c) A Bill to repeal the Senate and House of Assembly (Members' Remuneration and Allowances) Act 1970 and to make provision for revised allowances of members of the Senate and revised salaries and allowances of members of the House of Assembly.

REPORT OF THE DEBATES COMMITTEE ON THE MATTER OF THE SALARIES REVISION FOR THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to lay the Report of the Debates Committee on the matter of the salaries revision for the staff of Parliament. As Your Honour will recall, this matter did engage the attention of not only the Debates Committee, but of a Sub-Committee of which Your Honour was the Chairman on the numerous occasions when we met. The matter was considered, and representation was given for the staff of Parliament by the Barbados Workers Union. The recommendations have met with the approval of the Cabinet and the Minister of Finance; the Debates Committee has adopted the Report of the Sub-Committee, and we are now in a position to lay the Report before the House.

I take it that copies of the Report have been circulated to members of Parliament, and I am merely asking, at this stage, that the Report be laid. I propose that we may have a short suspension in order that these matters which are being laid now may be pursued and studied. There will be a suspension of the sitting for a short time to enable members to peruse not only the Report, but to have things settled in their mind, I know that they will need a little time to study the Report.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act, 1969, be now read

a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.15 p.m.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to repeal the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970, and to make provision for revised Salaries and Allowances of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, was read a first time.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to repeal the Senate and House of Assembly (Members' Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970, and to make provision for revised allowances of members of the Senate and revised salaries and allowances of members of the of of Assembly, was read a first time.

REPLIES TO ORAL QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 67, asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, is ready.

Also, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 83, asked by the hon. member for St. George North is ready.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, this point if I may crave the indulgence of the House, since we are on Replies to Parliamentary Questions, I should like to state that I noticed that at the last.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid I cannot entertain the hon. member. The hon. member is out of order. There must be some other way in which to raise the matter.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr, Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 71, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 79, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy, is ready.

Also, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 86, asked by the hon. member for St. George North, is ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 43, 44 and 49 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House has asked for Standing Order No. 16 to be suspended, and this is the very thing I wanted to raise just now when you said I was out of order. Last week, questions came down marked with an asterisk for oral answers and then you suspended the Standing Order dealing with Questions and they were printed. This is an infringement of members' rights and I would like you to rule before we go further, because if we have to comply with the tiding Orders and put an asterisk against questions for oral answer, then it is an infringement for those answers to be printed before they are asked by hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not see it as an infringement because when Question Time is reached later and the hon. member who has asked the question is in his place, the question is answered in the normal way. If the unfortunate incident occurs in which the hon. member is not in his seat, then the Reply gets laid and the Oral Answer is not given. It cannot be an infringement on the hon. member's rights.

Mr. BOLDEN and Hon. C. E. TALMA rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time. The hon. member for St. Joseph caught my eye first.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, that is presuming something which will not be, because everybody was in his seat on the last occasion and the House was adjourned before we reached that point. If you move that Standing Order No. 16 be suspended, then there is no Question Time, and we cannot reach the point which Your Honour made.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have already made a ruling and I do not propose to have it questioned. I think it is the normal practice subject to the understanding between both sides that when Standing Orders are suspended, the rights of the minority are expressly and impliedly preserved, and one would hope that this understanding prevails and therefore that Question Time would be taken in its appropriate place. I see no difficulty whatsoever.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member could not be more correct. The hon. member for St. Joseph is to some extent on good ground and is anxious to have his questions answered in the normal way. They have not

been bypassed and will be answered at some convenient time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That is not correct and the hon. member is misleading the House. The answers have been printed and the questions removed from the Order Paper; so how can the hon. member say they will be answered at a convenient time? Questions Nos. 74 and 77 have been printed and removed from the Order Paper. The Standing Orders specifically say what must be done, and there is no question of the rights of the minority being upheld when you move that the Standing Orders be suspended.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to set the records straight. The question of the printing is not the Government's fault. Last week I came in and told the House that the Replies to two questions were ready. The Government is not responsible for running the House. We have a Clerk of the House. We do not have to hide from answering questions, and we have come prepared today if they are on the Order Paper and if the Opposition wants the answers, to give them orally, but I am telling you how it came about. The Clerk who is not present asked the Minister of Education and myself for the Replies and said he would print them - I do not know under what Rule - and I gave them to him; so the hon. member for St. Joseph is perfectly right in saying that if they are off the Order Paper it makes it extremely difficult for them to be answered, but the Government itself has come prepared to answer the questions orally if so required, and if there is some method of getting them on the Order Paper we are prepared to give them. Do not blame us, it is the Clerk who asked for them to be printed. The Government does not print the Order Paper.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am also.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid the hon. member has lost his right to speak. The hon. member can only speak once in the House and he has risen twice on points of order. If this is a new speech, then it is disallowed.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, what is the point of having Standing Orders if this is the way the House is going to be run? We did not reach Question Time last time and now I am being told that I have lost my right to speak when you claimed freedom for members in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point or order. Will the hon. member kindly take his seat?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of privilege, the questions have been removed from the Order Paper, so what are the rights of members? This is what I would like to hear.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of privilege either.

Mr. BOLDEN:

We never reached Question Time last week. 12.25 p.m

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the point which the hon. member for St. Joseph was endeavouring to make was that on the last occasion when the House sat Question Time was not reached and the questions of which notice was given for some reason or other were not laid on the table of the House, and therefore they ought not to have been printed and should still remain on the Order Paper because the only way they could be printed is if they were laid on the table of the House. The questions should still remain on the Order Paper, and I would ask that as a right Questions Nos. 74 and 77 should be replaced on the Order Paper. I think this is correct procedure.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I would like to support that. It was not convenient last time we met for the questions to be dealt with and therefore they are still pending.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I regard that as being an oversight on the part of the Clerk and I now direct that Questions 74 and 77 for Oral Reply be restored to the Order Paper. I believe that with leave of the House they can be dealt with today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that all the measures of which notice was given here today be dealt with.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Permit me please to put the question that the Standing Orders be suspended for today's sitting.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking previously and I gave way. We have no objection to the Standing Orders being suspended but we would like from the Leader of the House the customary assurance that now that Standing Order 16 is suspended that at some appropriate time to be agreed upon that we will have Question Time and also that we will have Private Members' Time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the circumstances and in view of the fact that there are questions outstanding from the last sitting we will readily agree to that.

The question that the several Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting and that Private Members' Business will be done was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is only one Item on the present Order Paper which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance. It is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Husbands and Oxonards Plantations, St. James. Before we deal with this, I beg to move that the various measures of which notice has been given here today be dealt with in all their stages at a later stage of today's sitting. I may add, Sir, that Your Honour is aware of the matters we

are dealing with and that the Leader of the Opposition is also aware of the various facts of the matters.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, when you come in Parliament and get five documents pushed into your hand which you have to study you cannot always hear what the Leader of the House is saying while you are looking at them

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member can rise on a point of information.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Again I will accommodate the hon. member. I simply made a motion to deal with the various measures of which notice was given here today in all their stages in order to expedite matters generally and not to cause any delay or inconvenience to anyone, including the staff of Parliament and members generally, and to enable this sitting to adjourn for four or five weeks to which all hon. members should be looking forward. These matters could not have been circulated any earlier and I intend to suspend this sitting for an hour, if necessary, to give members an opportunity to study all the papers. This is a motion to deal with all these measures of which we have given notice at a later stage of today's sitting.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this is the second time since my election to this Chamber that we have had a salary increase for members of Parliament Ministers, etc., and on the last occasion I wondered - and today again I wonder - why these things are never circulated beforehand, but we have to come here and be given a number of documents and are given an hour or so to study them 12.35 p.m

I would have thought that something as important as this, on which hon. members are called upon to vote, would have been circulated beforehand so that members would have had an opportunity to study the matter and discuss it properly when we come here to take part in the debate. These documents were not circulated; the Bills have not be circulated or gazetted and certain documents are never circulated beforehand to give the public an opportunity to is that increases the Ministers, the Members of the Government and Parliamentarians are getting. Although, on this occasion, we are not objecting to deal with these matters today, we would hope that in future such documents would be circulated beforehand so that we would have adequate time to discuss them, and the members of the public would be in a position to know exactly what is happening. In the case of Bills, the Standing Orders state that they should be gazetted. The Minister has suggested that the House should be suspended for an hour, but we on this side would like an assurance that the suspension will be taken for one hour and a half instead of one hour in order to give us an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I can see no emergency in dealing with the question of parliamentary salaries. I cannot see any reason why a Government that says it is running the country's business properly and has 18 seats should come into the House; produce Bills of this nature at the last moment, and ask to suspend the House for an hour in order to come back and discuss certain matters. This is very unsatisfactory. It is a very bad way of doing the people's business, and it is worse and compounded because we are in here to

vote ourselves increases in salaries today. I consider the excuse.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I want to draw to the hon. member's attention and to the attention of the Chamber generally that the facts involved in all of these Bills.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. The hon. member has a right of reply.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, as a member of this Parliament, in my view measures of this nature should be properly circulated. I do not believe that any exchange of letters between two parties, or any two parliamentarians, regardless of whether it is the Leader of the Government Business and the Leader of the Opposition, is enough when one is dealing with parliamentary salaries. Surely, we should be able to discuss the matter properly with our constituents. To come here and say today that the only excuse for this is that the House wants to give a 4-week vacation to the Clerks of Parliament is not satisfactory. The Government is using this method on each occasion with certain measures coming because this House. The Government has come here today and we are expected to calculate, for instance, the Prime Minister's pension on his retirement. It looks as though it will be in the region of \$75,000 to \$100,000. We are expected to calculate that within an hour, and we must be satisfied to make a contribution to the debate.

Let us get it straight. Whatever discussions that went on did not relate to any Minister or Prime Minister's salary, or any change in the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act. It is an insult to a member of Parliament to bring him here after an adjournment that has gone on for, at least, two weeks; push a bundle of papers in his hand and expect him to make a worthwhile contribution to a debate of this nature and also expect every one of us to vote for the matter as it stands. Mr, Speaker, I deprecate this attitude. I think that the House is entitled to have the benefit of a member's considered opinion on matters of this nature, and that members should have a proper opportunity in order to form opinions and come here with ideas. Unless we are all prepared to run the country's business properly, then we may as well pack up and go home.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be frightened out of making my statements regardless of whoever follows me, or whatever conversations certain people may have had. As far as I am concerned, I consider this type of thing very unsatisfactory, and it is a bad way of doing the people's business.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Christ Church is no different from members of the Opposition in the past. Any increase for members of Parliament or Ministers is always a political matter. I will have to deal with him when the Bill is being dealt with. When he gets up and fulminates about things being done in an unsatisfactory manner, he is doing exactly what the Press will be doing when this Bill is passed. We will be told that we are raiding the Treasury; we are breaking the Treasury, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I saw in the newspaper yesterday that a Company with \$2 million trading assets was offering a job to a Manager at \$30,000 to \$35,000. Every person in this Country has had a 30%, 40%, or

50% raise in salary. We have come to Parliament with a Bill not even to compensate Ministers for the work they do in running a country with a \$184 million budget. At once the hon. member starts out making political capital that it is unsatisfactory; he talks about the pension the Prime Minister is to get and the gratuity he is to get. How did he know it was \$35,000, if he did not calculate it? He is very quick on the calculation, although he says that you cannot calculate it in a minute, and he is able to mention a figure of \$35,000.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing unsatisfactory about this matter. He is merely following the typical Barbadian pattern that politicians are the lowest form of animal life; you only go in for politics when you cannot find anything else to do, and you cannot earn a living anywhere. He is starting out now for the Press to follow in either "Topic For Today", or "Editorial For Tomorrow". He is the mouth-piece for the Press, and that is all he is doing.

The question that the House do now deal with the several papers which have been laid today in all of their stages was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The first Item on the Order Paper - under Government Business stands in the name of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Husbands and Oxnards Plantations, St. James, in connection with the development in the Cave Hill Area.

RESOLUTION RE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HUSBANDS AND OXNARDS PLANTATIONS ST. JAMES, IN CONNECTION WITH DEVELOPMENT IN THE CAVE HILL AREA

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, when the Government acquired Husbands and Oxnards Plantations at one stage, and other plantations in the Cave Hill Area several years ago, it was known at that time that there were several enclaves, but it was not known who had possession of the land furthermore who had the ownership. From time to time the owners of these enclaves have come to light, and they have approached Government on the question of the acquisition of their properties which, in fact, had been vested by an Act of Parliament in the Urban Development Corporation.

This Resolution is similar to one which was passed some time last year in this House. In this case this Resolution seeks to acquire a 1/4 acre of land which is surrounded by lands now in the ownership of the Urban Development Corporation. The owner of the property cannot give a clear title to the land and, therefore, it is intended to use the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act for the purpose of acquiring its proper title. 12.45 p.m.

I beg to move that this Resolution do v pass.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is hardly any objection that might be offered, and what might be offered Government certainly has its numbers with which to support its claim and it will be proceeded with, but I think I am right in saying that the former U.D.C. has disposed of some of its lands in this Cave Hill area to a lot of private persons, and I am sure the Minister will have something to tell us on this score. If it is a case where they found themselves being able to dispose of it at one end and now find the necessity to acquire at another end, surely there would be some explanation in this respect when it is borne in mind as undoubtedly the Minister would know that what must worry some of us is the type of persons that have been selected as purchasers of the lots that have been sold. The Minister cannot deny that it has been a select few who have been chosen for the acquiring of these lots and with this policy what are we to expect? Why has this been employed in the conduct of the affairs of a public institution? We would certainly like to hear what the Minister has to say. We can call names of quite a number of these people. but we feel we are not here to try to embarrass anybody, because we believe that if the former U.D.C. did not hold its flag up as it ought to have done and had offered its goods publicly and had shown to the public that it in truth and in fact intended to have the public to pry into the sale of its goods, we would have had an entirely different situation; but it is bad policy in our view to have acted in the way that we have seen in the cases to which I referred in respect of this Cave Hill area.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the acquisition of land in connection with the development in the Cave Hill area. Now what I want to speak about here today, Mr. Speaker, relates to the kind of development which we see going on in these development areas. It would seem to me that generally speaking there does not seem to be any kind of regulation as to the manner in which these developments should take place. I am thinking particularly in terms of an area where there might be fifty or one hundred houses as against the Cave Hill area where there are hundreds of houses, and the unplanned nature of some of these developments would lead one to believe that enough planning did not go into them. I would like the Minister to know that I feel that some regulations should be laid down to clearly set out the manner in which developments should place, that is, if you have an area where you are going to have a lot of people, then some provision should be made for recreational facilities. For example, some provision should be made for community centres, and playing fields so that if you are building up a community, the facilities which one would expect to find in a modern community would be found in these development areas. I have no doubt that in the Cave Hill area this will probably be the case, and now that we are looking at this, we could have a genuine look and guidelines laid down as to what should happen in future developments, because I think this is of extreme importance.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to reply to some of the points raised by the hon. members. Perhaps I can reply to the member who spoke last, first. In the first place the hon. member is probably not aware of the Cave Hill Master Plan which was laid in Parliament some time back in 1965. This plan sets out the development of the Cave Hill area, and there is no absence of areas for recreation in that area. There are plans for schools, for open spaces, for parks and parkways, for playing fields, for churches, for a commercial centre as well as plans for other areas for individual shops. In other words, the total needs of the community are planned for in that Cave Hill area. In other areas for which I have responsibility - I

cannot talk about something for which another Minister had responsibility which was the former Housing Authority and is now the National Housing Corporation - wherever we are putting up a substantial development, there are also plans for these facilities. As a matter of fact, it is only a question of days now before our shopping area in Silver Hill is complete, and this will be the first shopping area in any of our housing estates catering to the needs of the low income groups. That is the reply in relation to the points raised by the member for St. Lucy dealing with matters for which I have responsibility. I believe that the Town and Country Planning insists that wherever there are substantial developments, areas should be left open in future for this kind of development. In other words, areas are not to be built on. This is something that began probably four or so years ago.

As regards the question raised by the hon. member for St. Peter, I am not so sure what the hon. member is after. I can merely state that as far as I am aware, and I have no responsibility for the sale of property, there have been no selected people as regards the purchase of land in the area owned by the former Urban Development Corporation as he appears to indicate. The Urban Development Corporation

sold land to hundreds of people. They sold land to a developer who developed the Paradise Heights area, then there were 128 different lots in Wanstead Terrace that were developed and sold to individual owners including the Government of Barbados, and the Government owns about 12 or so houses in the Urban Development area. It then sold approximately 31 acres of land to the Commonwealth Development Corporation which the Urban Development Corporation still controls and controls the selling price of these houses. 12.55 p.m.

For the Commonwealth Development Corporation to develop houses and sell to individuals they do not have to refer to the Urban Development Corporation, it is entirely a matter for C.D.C. to determine who should be the purchasers of their properties; all that U.D.C. has been controlling is the purchase price of the properties, and how much money C.D.C. is allowed to make in profits; that is all that U.D.C. sees after. As to whom the individual purchasers are, is entirely a matter for C.D.C. and I do not know that they are selective as to whom they should sell their lands. I am not aware of that.

I want to make this point. It became necessary for U.D.C. to sell to developers large areas of land. They sold land to a Barbadian now living in Jamaica and they sold land to C.D.C, but they had spent a lot of money putting in roads, water, gas and electricity. The U.D.C. was not set up with any capital sum. they were told to develop the Wanstead area and no money was passed by this or any former Government for putting funds into the U.D.C. to carry out any of its functions under the Development Act. Therefore, it became necessary to sell land to those people who were interested and who approached the U.D.C. to buy land, develop it and assist those people. This Resolution is not intended as such to be any additional acquisition because we do not want to acquire any additional amount of land. This land was supposed to have been vested by an Act of Parliament in the U.D.C. and the reason for that Act of Parliament was for the purpose of vesting this property rather than with the normal conveyancing, so for this reason it was done, because the Solicitors found that there was absolute confusion for vesting property. This Resolution is now intended to cure the defect in that Act of Parliament to give the ownership to the Government that the Government can now vest all property in the National Housing Corporation as it is now known.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the assurances given and in accordance with the request made by the acting Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until 2.30 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On resumption

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed. On the suspension of the sitting, Government Business was the Order of the Day and to that it now reverts.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

REPORT OF THE DEBATES COMMITTEE ON THE MATTER OF THE SALARIES REVISION FOR THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of the Debates Committee on the matter of the salaries revision for the staff of Parliament be now adopted. The Report was circulated; the Sub-Committee's Report has received the blessing of the entire Debates Committee, which includes the representatives of the Opposition and the Other Place, and the Government is willing to support the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee with one or two very slight amendments.

I beg to move that the Report be now adopted.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION RE THE FIXING OF RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES APPLICABLE TO THE POSTS ON THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to give notice of a Resolution to

fix the rates of salary and allowances applicab. to the posts on the staff of Parliament with effect from the 1st April, 1973. I am asking for leave to have this matter put on the Order Paper. This is a Supplementary Order Paper, but I could not have given notice of it until the Report had been adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER Are you asking for leave to have it dealt with today, or to have it put on the Order Paper for the next sitting of the House?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I should like it to be dealt with today, Sir. Copies of the Report have been circulated and the Report has been adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution in connection with the revised salary and allowances for the staff of Parliament with effect from the 1st April, 1973, be the next Order of the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out

"Consequent on the adoption by the House of Assembly of a report of the Debates Committee of Parliament on the matter of a salaries revision for the staff of Parliament with effect from 1st April 1973, this Resolution seeks approval, in accordance with sections 5, 6, 7 and 9 of the Parliament (Debates and Establishment) Act 1970 (1970-30), of the revised rates of salaries proposed in the Debates Committee's report, as well as the rates of allowances proposed for the Clerk of Parliament.

The title of the post of Deputy Marshal has been expanded to "Parliamentary Attendant and Deputy Marshal" to take account of the duties other than those of Deputy Marshal required of this officer,

The new post of Technical Officer/Office Assistant has been provided. It will replace the former ad hoc arrangements for the operation of all the mechanical apparatus of Parliament, including the amplifying equipment. The officer will also perform duties of general office assistant of Parliament."

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need say any more. These recommendations are set out in the Schedule; the decisions which have been reached by the Debates Committee have the support of the Government; this matter is long overdue, and in keeping with the cost of living, the salaries have been revised in order that the staff of Parliament are given the same consideration as other members of the public service who have been dealt with long ago. Members of the Opposition are also members of the Debates Committee, and they are fully apprised of what we have done. (Asides.) If we are not going to deal with this matter today, then a certain measure of inconvenience and hardship will be experienced by the Clerk and the

staff of Parliament.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE REVISED RATES OF SALARY AND ALLOWANCES FOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRIME MINISTER AND EXECUTIVE PERSONAL SECRETARY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is a Resolution to revise the rates of salary and allowances of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Executive Personal Secretary (formerly called "Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary"). This is the next Resolution I propose dealing with, Sir. This Resolution seeks to give effect from 1st April, 1973, to the rates of salary and allowances applicable to the posts set out in the Schedule shall be as specified opposite thereto, and that the said salary and allowances be payable out of the Consolidated Fund.

In connection with these two posts, the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Executive Personal Secretary (formerly called "Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary"), the Addendum sets out that:

"Consequent on the general revision of salaries and other emoluments of Government employees with effect from 1st April 1973, it is proposed that the emoluments attached to the non-pensionable post of Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister which was last fixed by Resolution No. 47/1970 at \$11,520 per annum in the case of salary and \$1,440 per annum in the case of Travelling Allowance should be revised also with effect from 1st April, 1973 to \$16,440 per annum in the case of salary and to \$2,400 per annum in the case of Travelling Allowance.

2. It has been used that the title of the non-pensionabl post of Secretary to the Personal Assistant and the Parliamentary Secretary" should be charged to that of "Executive Personal Secretary" and that the emoluments of that post, at present equivalent to the former Civil Service grading of Z.12-8 (\$6,720 x 240 -7,200 x .300 - 8,100) should be revised with effect from 1st April, 1973 in keeping with the revised emoluments of the Same grade Z.12-8, namely:-

In 1973-74:

\$8,400 x 300 - 9,300 x 360 -10,020

In 1974-75:

\$8,784 x 312 - 9,720 x 384 -10,488

In 1975-76

and thereafter: \$9,192 x 324 - 9,840 x 384 - 10,608"

It is felt that in revising the salary of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister and the Executive Personal Secretary, we will be doing something in keeping with the present scales in the Government departments.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 2.40 p.m

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item with which I propose to deal is a Bill which as the Objects and Reasons set out, would repeal the Senate and House of Assembly (Members' Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970, (Act 1970-13) and make provision for revised allowances of members of the Senate and revised salaries and allowances of members of the House of Assembly.

At the very outset I may mention that the Cabinet through me, since I had done some informal negotiating before, officially wrote the Leader of the Opposition requesting suggestions or recommendations from the Leader of the Opposition and his group in connection with the revision of salaries of members of the House and allowances to members of the Senate, and of course the salary of the Leader of the Opposition himself, but unfortunately we did not receive much assistance from that source. The Leader of the Opposition, presumably, after consultation with his colleagues, replied in these terms; I will make it a document of the House because I do not like to misquote any one.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, since the hon. member has already misquoted himself, may I suggest that he make both his letter and my letter documents of the House and read them out. I am happy to have mine read out, but let his be made a document of the House also.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will give the Hon. Leader of the Opposition an opportunity of reading mine and I will read his. I think that is fair enough. The letter reads as follows -

"2nd April, 1973

Hon. C. E. Talma, M.P.,

Leader of the House of Assembly,

Cabinet Office,
Government Headquarters,
Bay Street,

ST. MICHAEL

Ref. M.P. 4457 vol. IV Dear Minister,

In submitting my recommendations on salary revision for members of Parliament except for Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries I am bound, and am happy to be bound, by the policy of the Barbados Labour policy as expressed in the Party's Manifesto for the 1971 Elections to the effect that such a revision should take place only after an outside body has examined the matter and that Members and Ministers alike should not decide on their own pay increases. Also I think that Members' new salaries cannot logically be fixed without new Ministerial emoluments being officially made known at least to private Members of Parliament.

I therefore recommend that a small Commission preferably headed by a judicial officer or the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, and including a representative of the Establishments department of the Public Service and a person with a knowledge of the higher range of salaries in the commercial sector Bridgetown, be appointed to investigate the matter and report at an early opportunity.

Yours sincerely,

J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Leader of the Opposition."

That is the sort of assistance that I received in reply to my letter to the Leader of the Opposition asking him and his group to make proposals for increases of salaries for members of Parliament except Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. When we received such an irresponsible answer, to say the least, the Government then had to fall back on its own resources and what was done in fixing the salaries of the public service, from the Governor General, the Chief Justice, the Judges and the Director of Public Prosecutions right down through the entire service. We were told that we should consult somebody in the commercial sector; these are people who feel that we have no right to be in here and should not be paid for our duties. We could not accept this outrageous suggestion from the Leader of the Opposition, and that letter was treated with the contempt it deserved, totally ignored as being absurd, repugnant, irrelevant and silly on the face of it and like that it was not worth the paper on which it was written.

We had to turn around and revise the salaries and we have done our best. Although on the grounds of interim payment there is probably something to be said later on when we get to that, yet I think that despite the policy which has been enunciated and which has been governing this Country for all these years when the principle of paying members was accepted, when a salary of \$80 or \$100 a month was given in the first instance, that was the biggest insult ever done to any member of this House. I happened to be here then. You are either going to pay or you are not going to pay, but you cannot insult a member

of the House of Assembly by giving him \$80 or \$100 a month. 2.50 p.m.

This was what used to be the case, but today we do things on a more equitable and fair basis and we are not insulting anyone, we are not digging a hole in the taxpayers' pockets and paying salaries which are out of proportion for the amount of work done. On that basis these salaries have been fixed and I think that the Minister of Finance and the Cabinet have done a fairly good job and that we have been fair and equitable in so far as our colleagues on the other side are concerned. We are on equal footing in here whether Prime Minister, Minister or else, are all elected by the people and will all be removed in the same way. In fixing the salaries we have to be fair and equitable to all, and I think this is a fair assessment considering the duties we have to perform. Some may think that we meet once a week, but there are committees and other things which have to be done outside the meetings of the House, and I must say that some members of the Opposition, including the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for St. Peter, are always here when committees meet, so it is no raid on the taxpayers' money as such, it is paying members who represent the people of Barbados on a better basis than ever before.

We are running the country, we are not making laws for ourselves and not paying taxes, when we come here and say that members should get fair and equitable salaries and certain rights, those are things to which we are all entitled. In my own constituency, if I get another \$2,000, my people in Christ Church will be happy for me. That is all I have to say, I have no excuse, I have not come here for money because I have served in here for many years for nothing, but now money is here please let me have mine. I have held my seat for 26 years and will probably hold it for another five or ten despite what traps are set for me. With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in a spirit of what the hon. member who has just sat down would no doubt call irresponsibility to deal with this issue of the salaries of members of Parliament. While it is true that some of what the hon. member said, for example, that he served for years in here without pay, I believe it is four years without pay and 22 years with pay, because as he spoke I was reminded of the opening line of the National Anthem of Rumania which goes like this "Awake, awake from thy lethargic sleep" but we have found the hon. member sleeping in here during the six years I have been in here. The first occasion upon which we have seen the hon. member playing the role of Rommel which he has so often described himself as being the better perfection than the original field marshal, the only time we have seen him playing the role is when he is talking about increased emoluments which have at long last reached the level which he thinks appropriate in the circumstances. I want the Leader of the House to know that the same people who wanted to set traps for him wanted to set traps for me and for the Opposition in this same matter of members' salaries.

I have a copy of a letter from the Leader of the House in which he suggested that I consult with hon. members on this side, but I did indeed consult with hon. members on the side opposite, private members of the House as the hon. member for St. Michael West will tell you, I consulted with him and I specifically told him that I was consulting with him because I could not consider him bound by the Barbados Labour Party's policy as set out in its Manifesto. As far as that is concerned I am sure that my colleagues will be happy to have our clean and spotless linen shaken out in public because it does not

need to be washed. It was the hon. member for Bridgetown who I remember moved a motion some time ago at our Party Executive pointing out that this was policy and directing that this be the attitude to be taken by the parliamentary Labour Party in here when the question of a rise in salaries came up. The letter which has been made a document of the House says that I am bound, and I am happy to be bound. That is some of the background.

The question of the salaries themselves. As was carefully set out, but within the proper framework of the necessity for members of Parliament to be paid properly, in the speech of the hon. member for St James at the last sitting of the House, some rise in the emoluments of all members of Parliament here and in the Other Place, private members and Ministers, Speaker, Chairman and other members was necessary and inevitable in view of the general rise in public emoluments and indeed in private emoluments throughout Barbados as a result of the uncontrolled rise in the cost of living which this Government has permitted to take place over the last few years. It is obvious that inflation has to be met by some increase in salaries and wages, but members of Parliament have been left to the end, and it was at no stage anticipated - and I do not believe that any member of the public could imagine that there would not be some rise in the salaries of members of Parliament - but it is obvious from what has been going around and papers which have been laid on the table of the House that a very magnificent rise in salary for the Prime Minister for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries was contemplated by the Government. It is also obvious to all, and is made that much more obvious by the defensive nature of the speech of the Leader of the House, that we all in here know perfectly well that the public in Barbados as in almost every other

country in the world

3.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is out of order. We have a

Bill dealing with the Prime Minister's salary, and we have not yet reached that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that he is only referring to it en passant.

Mr. ADAMS:

Of course, I am only referring to it en passant, Sir. Was it Disraeli who spoke of Gladstone being so inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity that he failed to notice what else was going on? Perhaps the Leader of the House is so impressed by his speech that he is not paying proper attention to.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let us get on. Carry on.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to everyone concerned that the public of Barbados do not like to see increases in salary for members of Parliament, and there is a great temptation on the part of all

Oppositions to go along with them blindly, to oppose the increases, and there is a great temptation of Governments to try to embroil the Opposition in accepting the increases in return for giving them substantial increases, too. That is what I refer to when I speak of the trap, because the Minister's letter to me was nothing more than an attempt to get the Opposition to put down on paper some figure which would preclude the Opposition from saying that the rises in salary had been introduced by the Government, and, if the rises were too high, from saying that there were too high.

Let it be clearly understood that the rises in salary have been introduced by the Government, and anybody who is opposed to them must look at the door of the Government. Do not look at us. My signature or the signature of hon. members on this side will never go down on documents which this Government is seeking to use to drag us along in the wake of an unpopular-policy unless, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we believed in the unpopular policy and we believed that a bipartisan approach was necessary for the good of Barbados. I do not think that these increases are all necessary for the good of Barbados. They are for the good of the Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Members, Speaker, Chairman and others. I do not regard this as a matter in which a bipartisan policy is necessarily a good one. In any event, our Party did not agree with such a policy. We agreed to point out to the Government that our Manifesto bound us in a certain respect, and I have no apologies to make to anybody for suggesting that one of Her Majesty's Judges, or the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, was a person suitable to sit and hear evidence, if necessary, from members of Parliament as to their expenses and as to amount of time demanded of them in the discharge of their services, and report back to Parliament, for Parliament is, after all, the final arbiter and the Act must pass through Parliament itself.

Mr. Speaker, for the Leader of the House to term such a suggestion as irresponsible, to me only shows that when a question of salary or emoluments comes about the Leader of the House loses the balance of his judgement which he has exercised so well in 22 years that has allowed him to be a Minister in so many different Governments and under so many different conditions here in this House. I am perfectly sure that if he is serious in characterising the suggestion that a Judge, or the Chairman of the Public Service Commission,.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have not been a Minister for 22 years. I have been in here for a period of 26 years, but I have not been a Minister for 22 years.

Mr, SPEAKER:

No point of order!

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was a member of the West Indian National Congress, the Congress Labour Party, the Barbados Progressive League, the Barbados Labour Party and the Democratic Labour Party. He has sat in here under five different titles.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker. I have sat in here as an independent member for Christ Church. That is how I sat in here for almost all of the period I have been in here, except during the last 10 years. At one time I ran with the Barbados Labour Party where I was expected to lose in St. James, and then I walked in independently in Christ Church. Do not make me open up.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is a matter of personal explanation, and it is accepted.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get involved with the hon. member, but there are one or two persons with a knowledge of Barbados' political history greater than the hon. member's recollection, apart from the documentary evidence, Sir but never mind that. We are now talking about parliamentary salaries. I am glad that it is not we who have had to expose what our suggestions were. I say here quite clearly that I have every faith and every belief that any of Her Majesty's Judges, assisted by a properly chosen Commission, would have made apt, or suggestions, regarding members' of Parliament salaries which would very adequately have satisfied the Members in here, but from the word go the suggestion was doomed.

Mr. Speaker, one Minister said to me: "Man, you are making a joke. Do you want us to subject our salaries to the Public Service Commission?" I said, "what are you afraid of? Do you believe that the Commission would not appreciate your responsibilities and the size of the department you are running?" The Minister went away saying that it was a joke. I am hearing the same fear expressed today from the Leader of the House. If there is any merit in the Leader of the House's argument, he should submit it, not only to his own majority and to us on this side upon whose vote the salary depends, but he should submit the matter to independent persons. There will always be dissatisfaction in Barbados about the size of Parliamentary Members' salary as long as we are seen or thought to be selfish.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Sir. Independent members outside of Parliament in the commercial sector who know how to arrange salaries for the big people in business and commerce? Do you mean the merchants and planters who were in here years ago?

Mr. SPEAKER:

To rise on a point of order is to question the Standing Orders and to say that they are being breached. This is the second time you have done that, and it is not necessary.

Mr. ADAMS:

There are planters on that side, too, Sir. In the days of the merchants and planters no salaries were paid. When the salaries were passed by the House of Assembly, it was written in the Advocate at the time that they were railroaded through the House of Assembly and aero planed out of the Council. I can well remember the phrase in 1948, even if its writer may not recall it over the passage of years. The question of merchants and planters is irrelevant, Sir. This is a different Barbados now. The very merchants and planters may be the ones to tell you to have some more money. I repeat that if the argument has merit, then it cannot only be addressed in here, but it must be addressed to an audience that can appreciate its merit. It is time that we wake up and take stock of the situation. We cannot go on constantly pursuing an unpopular policy which appears to be to your financial benefit and expect to get the credit from the public which the Members of Parliament deserve.

Now, Sir, I believe this whole business of consulting with the Opposition was a sham. It is well known - it must be seven weeks I think -before that letter was sent to me from the Leader of the House that a

committee sat. I do not know who the personnel of the committee are, but two separate Ministers, one of them the Leader of the House himself indicated to me some of the salaries which were going to be recommended. (Asides.) I hear a well-informed voice on my left, Sir. Certainly the salary for Members of Parliament which I was told the hon. members would get would be \$600 a month and \$400 tax-free duty allowance I see it mentioned here. 3.10 p.m.

How then am I to regard the letter which comes to me and calls for recommendations as other than a trap, a sham and a hypocrisy when what I heard seven weeks ago turns out today in the House to be what is put before the House? That letter was nothing more than an attempt to involve the Opposition in a financial transaction which hon. members may later on when the other Bills come before the House have occasion to characterize in its true terms. I heard that this is supposed to be on an equitable and fair basis. Well, I do not know if it is fair that Parliamentary Secretaries who were getting \$1,050 a month at a time when ordinary members were getting \$650 will now go to \$1,950 a month, a great deal of it duty free when members have only gone to \$1,000. In the salary of the Deputy Clerks of Parliament which has just been passed I observe that they, although they attend Parliament the same once a week and do not have constituency expenses and who by the terms of their employment are part-time officers, are perilously close to members of Parliament, although they do not have the \$50 wedding presents, the putting of their hands in their pocket for a bank note every Saturday afternoon that you drive through your constituency, and do not have the ladies who canvass for you coming and saying that Court Bros. are levying on the furniture and they need \$38.19 to pay the writserver. It never seems to me to be an exact amount. If you go around the private schools in Bridgetown, you will see letters there - I do not know from how many members on this side - but certainly from Tom Adams, "Dear So-and-So, I enclose a cheque for the school fees for such and such a person for two terms as her mother says she cannot afford to keep her at school any longer and I would not like to see the girl leave school before taking the examination." All that members of Parliament have to face. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: So the salary is too low?) I want the public to know that I am not saying they are too low or too high. I would say that the hon. member for St. Michael West selected this exact figure. I neither agreed or disagreed; I am just letting the public know that members of Parliament are expected to spend a good deal of money not in directions which break any election controversy law or anything else, but they are expected, as the people would put it, to help those who helped them.

I think that political brains should be applied to the problem of reducing members of Parliament expenditure. I think it would be a good thing if perhaps election expenses were chargeable upon public funds in the way that one or two modern and dynamic countries are now beginning to approach the matter, and that you prevent members from spending money at election time, and get people out of the habit of thinking that a member of Parliament's pocket is available; but there must always be that habit as long as members are seen to fix their own salaries, because it will always be felt that they cannot be spending so much otherwise they would vote themselves more money. The hon. member for Christ Church East has said that if they gave him \$2,000 more he would spend it on his constituents. That is an encouragement...

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, again I am being misquoted. I said that if I got \$2,000 more on my salary the good electors of Christ Church generally whom I have represented for many long years, not only the people of Christ Church East, would be very happy in that I would be in a better position to accommodate them not only at election time, but apart from election time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That was a point of elucidation.

Mr. ADAMS:

I appreciate the careful way he has put it, although I see by the unreceptive face of the Minister of Tourism that he has no wish like the hon. member to spend cent one or accommodate person one in Christ Church North Central. However, such a statement even though made in levity and taken with amusement by the House is an encouragement to all our constituents to believe that our pockets are available for public relief. That is the point I was making, and as long as we are seen to act irresponsibly - for what does irresponsibility mean; it means control by no one, responsible only to yourself - as long as we make ourselves responsible only to ourselves, the public will act with the same irresponsibility towards us.

This is a small place and members of Parliament are easily available to their constituents, and that is a good thing. We ourselves are creating some of the dangers of which complain.

Now, Sir, \$1,000 a month for ordinary members of Parliament I do not think is excessive. I cannot say it is too high or too low. I certainly cannot think it is too high in all the circumstances, but what I am going to say is that the Government is very clever in invoking the rule against anticipation, but this has always been done to prevent members when discussing their own salaries from being able to discuss at the same time the emoluments of Ministers. Let me show you what has happened. The Leader of the House has twice given me very short notice - once certainly - of what was intended because I got the letter from him saying what members' salaries were to be in my office where I chance to be at about midday on Saturday, but never at any stage has the Minister officially sent to the Opposition any indication of what Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries' salaries were going to be. Did he have something to hide? Did he want the six of us and our colleagues in the Senate and the other members of our parliamentary party to sit down and discuss in a vacuum the passage of these Bills? He wants to hide from the public until the last possible moment what Ministers are going to get.

It is an open secret, again I have heard this for six or seven weeks, that the Ministers were to get \$2,800 a month or whatever it is. I have made it known to my colleagues at different times, but what we were quite unprepared for was the Prime Minister's housing allowance, but that is another matter altogether. We are aware of this, but never at any stage have we been so officially informed as would allow us to make meaningful recommendations or say anything meaningful either to the Cabinet or to the commission which I suggested, for we are always perfectly ready to speak to a commission and make recommendations, but you cannot make these recommendations unless you have an overall picture of what the salaries are going to be. Never at any moment although I have asked often enough has anybody told me what the salary of Mr. Speaker was to be I saw it and became aware of it for the first time today. Again I am not going to say it is excessive. Your Honour has a dignified position to keep up. I think that the former Speaker and the late Leader of the Opposition were mistaken at the last salaries revision when they accepted very ungenerous salaries indeed and abandoned their entertainment allowances. I believe that both of them at the time were taking too restrictive a view of the traditions which they had to uphold, but it is not the amount, because \$1,750 a month overall for Speaker, \$550 of it tax free, I do not believe is an unreasonable sum of money to pay, because although Mr. Speaker is theoretically a part-time officer, in fact he is constitutionally just as full-time as a Minister. He continues

after the House dies which I would have thought was one of the characteristics that divided full-time from part-time.

Mr. Speaker, the real point is that all of this was concealed from the Opposition in this attempt which the Government has been making to get through the salaries increases with the least possible public opprobrium. Sir, there is bound to be some public opprobrium. Maybe the public of Barbados will appreciate the gratuity for the Prime Minister and the salary. After all the House of Commons voted the Duke of Wellington £100,000 and a house. That was 157 years ago I believe, and £100,000 and a house to be named No. 1 London was a substantial gift in those days and he has not even Prime Minister yet at that stage. 3.20 p.m.

Let us not think that Barbados is the only place where politicians occasionally have to grant these sums of money and more sums of money to persons who have served the State well, but Barbados is small and in the 25 years that members have been paid no effort has ever been made to go openly, sincerely and honestly to the people to try to put this matter over and try to gain public acceptance of the fact that it gets a Government in these days only as good as it pays for, because you cannot today attract people into the pursuit of politics, as politics has a lot of personal heartbreak and memories as all hon. members in the House know. I wonder sometimes if you get more heartbreak in Government or in Opposition, but when I look at some of the hon. members opposite, including the member for St. Michael South and the member for St. Michael North Central, I wonder if they are really finding it worthwhile when I see the problems that arise from being in Parliament. To persuade people to take up those positions, there has to be a definite balance between the exercise of power, the possible openings in other capacities and so on, but we are not necessarily the best persons to balance them.

I keep on and on hearing from people that when they are working for \$1,050 a month and they have to act as Ministers, the Assistant Secretaries are getting \$1,100 and they do not respect them. I will never subscribe to any theory that a man cannot work for you as a civil servant unless you get more money than he. This may not be very relevant to this part of the Bill but I am tired of hearing it and I would invite everybody who thinks that the only way they can command respect from a public servant is to work for more money than the public servant to have a little more examination of self. In Canada I am sure that salaries paid to the politicians in most cases are less than salaries paid to public servants, and indeed the Prime Minister is among those who receive less money than civil servants. In the United Kingdom a Permanent Secretary's salary I believe is some thousand pounds a year more than the Minister. I am not as up to date as I could be and never have I heard any person in a British political context address an argument to anybody that a Permanent Secretary would not do what he wants unless he is working for more money. It is a totally fallacious argument and its fallacy is well exposed in those countries where the quality of a person who is going to reach the top of a Civil Service Department is such that to keep him there you have to pay him a very handsome salary because there are persons outside who will pay more. We will find that ourselves in the public service of Barbados sooner or later.

I am not advocating raising the salaries any more, but if you want to get away from the idea of an army of occupation, if you want to get away from these continual complaints that civil servants cannot do their work, you will want to attract to the Service at the earliest possible stages persons of the higher academic and intellectual qualifications, and you will only attract them if you are paying them salaries that they cannot get on the outside.

Mr. Speaker no doubt this speech will be characterised as further irresponsible, but at least I thank goodness that it is the public who will judge whether Government or Opposition have been more responsible in the attitude they have taken to this particular rise in salaries.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill I would like the public to know that with the exception of a few disgruntled employers who prefer to have several months of confrontation with the Barbados Workers' Union when they have to give their employees an increase of salary, there is always jubilation and happiness when the employees of the private sector and employees of the Government receive increased salaries. Throughout the island there is an atmosphere of peace and tranquility, but when the cost of living goes up and legislators who have to maintain their families are given increases everyone takes time off to discuss, criticise and in many cases belittle legislators. Even certain employees, who we sit in here to give increases to from time to time, some of them are the people who join with the public to pull down the image of legislators. This island has a population of 240,000 people and it only carries 24 members in the House of Assembly; you will therefore see the responsibility which a legislator has when he is elected to this ancient and hon. House of Assembly. Government is the biggest business in any country and the remuneration which legislators receive cannot be compared with the payment which others receive who are employed in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, politicians or legislators have their families to maintain, and in some cases you will find that a certain section of the community would prefer them after serving the community to go and beg their bread from their constituents and ask for donations to assist them to maintain themselves and their families. 3.30 p.m.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the Advocate which was published on the 5th April, 1973, and this is what the editorial says:

"INCREASED PENSIONS VERY NECESSARY"

Sir, this can be made a document of the House. I quote:

"The raise in line with trends over the years, the pension was \$1.20 in 1951; \$1.80 in 1956, and it was later raised to \$3.00. On December 1, 1969, it was put up to \$5.00 at the same time that the Government pensioners were given a cost-of-living allowance of \$25.00 a month. A year after This is the point I want to make now, Sir.

"...A year after the members of Parliament had voted themselves pensions for their service to the nation."

Sir, I would like the writer of that article to know that we, as legislators, contribute 5% of our salary monthly towards a Pensions Fund and, therefore, in saying that we got in here and voted ourselves pensions when we contribute monthly towards a Pensions Fund, in my opinion, is misleading the public.

He continues:

"By all means the Parliamentarian must be paid for the service to the country and its people, but he must never lose sight of the fact that the people elected him to be their representative not to get rich and fat at public expense."

I want to say that, like the member Christ Church East, I have served this country since 1930 as a vestryman. Subsequently, I have served as a councillor and, as you know Sir, I have served in the Council from its inception until it was dissolved. As you know, Sir, those offices were honorary ones. Now, I want to tell the writer of this article that we are only elected here for five years. If he thinks that politicians are becoming fat, he or any member of the community who attains the age of 21 and can read and write can take part in the next elections and become a member of this House, if the people elect him. It is not good enough for him to sit in his office and criticise politicians.

Now, when he is employed at the Advocate there are various benefits which he will derive: severance pay, gratuity, and so on. If he thinks that he can sit in his office and try to belittle legislators by saying that people come in here to become fat and rich, then he is making a reckless mis-statement. It is not such an easy matter for politicians to become rich. If he thinks that we are gaining so much from being legislators, he has the opportunity of running at the next Elections.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the members of the public and the community know the responsibility which legislators have to carry on their shoulders? Speaking for myself, and I will include you, too, Sir, because you are my colleague and you represent St. Philip. On mornings before six o'clock I will get a number of my constituents calling at my home for me to do something for them. On evenings as soon as I reach my home, and before I can get a meal, you will find people there asking me to do something for them. Proper representation does not mean coming to this House and attending a meeting once a week, and especially when you are domiciled in your constituency, it becomes a colossal task to look after the interests of the people. In many cases, Sir, you have to make a sacrifice of your family in order to deal with all the problems of your constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we must let the people know that legislators must be paid well for their services. After we have served the public, what is left for us to do? Must we then walk around and beg our constituents for assistance? That is the mentality and the mind of the person who wrote this editorial on the 5th April. Regardless of his colour, I say that he is a wicked, vicious and malicious person who is trying to mislead the public. Mr. Speaker, I have no apologies to make for what is before the House, and I give this Bill my wholehearted support.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that, unlike the members on the Government side who have spoken on this Bill, it has been impossible for anyone on this side to have prepared a speech in reply, or even in support, because the time in which this Bill has been presented to this House has been characterised by the shortness of the notice given to me and many other members on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I do not mind if the adjectives of irresponsibility, viciousness, political! capital or whatever adjective may be chosen are levied against any speech that I make in this House on this subject. 3.40 p.m.

Let me say right away that I consider as a representative of a constituency that members of the House

are entitled to adequate notice of the terms of a Bill which is coming before the House, and I go further and say that when legislators are being judges in their own cause they should not only do right if they think it is right but they should let the people have an opportunity to see that what they sure doing happens to be right. Now I cannot for one moment in this House in conscience support a Bill for a raise of salary for any hon. member of this House including myself in circumstances where it has been brought into this House at short notice and without giving the public an opportunity to see and giving me as a member representing a constituency an opportunity to decide. I believe that basically, if the Government is asking for bi-partisan approach to matters, they must carve out quite clearly the areas on which they want this bi-partisan approach. It is only in instances where the Government believes there is political capital to be made that they are going to urge a bi-partisan approach and that there should be no argument about this. It is only in these areas where they believe they may be a reaction from the public that the Government is going to say that they want to tell the public that legislators must be paid, but when it comes to the political hustings, when it comes to election campaigns, the merits and demerits of these Bills are never heard about. I heard only a couple of weeks ago a speech made in here when we got up in support of another motion putting forward our party's point of view in which the reply came from a member that this was not in our Manifesto. I have not seen anywhere in this Government's Manifesto anything at all concerning this Bill for a raise in parliamentary salary. I feel therefore that if it is coming now we must be given an adequate opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. Speaker, when I look at the proposals that are put forward for members, I notice for yourself Mr. Speaker perhaps the lowest increase of all, 37.15% and 60% in the duty allowance; for the Deputy Speaker 47.37%, 60% in duty allowance; for the Chairman of Committees 60% for salary and 60% in duty allowance; for the Leader of the Opposition 50% in salary and 60% in duty allowance, and like yourself the entertainment allowance is for the first time duty free. For the members of the House of Assembly there is a 50% increase in salary and 60% increase in duty allowance. Let me make it quite clear. The negotiations that took place with the civil service like the negotiations that took place with the Union were characterised and welcomed in by statements from the Prime Minister that this Country could not afford increases in the nature of what some of the civil servants were asking for, and indeed were told that it is only after the third year that there will be a 40% increase to the civil service as a whole.

I want to make this absolutely clear. In the Budget Speech for last year the Prime Minister said that civil servants were demanding salaries for some public officers higher than those currently paid to Ministers of Government, increases in pensions from 30% to 50% without any explanation as to the manner in which these increases can be justified. The militant and churlish Opposition leadership of the Secondary Teachers' Union has staked its own claims on the earnings of the taxpayers still entrenched in the belief that they can go further than holding up the nations's children to ransom but that they can blackmail the whole community and even overthrow the Government.

One of the things that characterise this policy and I have only come here lately and have not given the years of service of the hon. member for St. Philip-South or indeed the Leader of the Government, and I commend them for their public service, is that when people's own interests are at stake they shun behind a lot of pejorative adjectives the necessity to attack people because they have their own point of view and they characterise them as going into the hands of planters and merchants, and viciousness, all of this terribly unnecessary when the Government knows that the point we have been making.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member for Christ Church West, but the mention about merchants in Bridgetown relates to me, because I said that these are not the days when planters and merchants are in here. I was not referring to them I was just speaking generally. They made

laws for themselves and did not want to be paid. What I said did not relate to the hon. member at all or anybody representing planters or merchants.

Mr. FORDE:

I take the hon. member's point. I know he would never talk about planters and merchants in here because in these days there are planters and merchants and business people. The point I am making about this is that it is unnecessary to look at the position of this measure in that type of light in order to justify or to refute the salaries or the arguments in favour of an increase in salaries or the principle in going about an increase in salaries.

When we voted a while ago unanimously for increases in salaries of officers of the House, we did so on the basis after negotiations between their representatives on the Workers' Union and the representatives representing this House. When we voted for increases of salaries for civil servants.....

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we voted for increases of salaries for civil servants and teachers, we did so on the basis also of negotiations with them. Now I believe that if the merit of the case for an increase in salaries for members of Parliament and Ministers is beyond approach, no member in this House should be spared of having an independent authority to pass judgment on raises in salaries for themselves. Now that principle is being laughed through the door, but it is recognised that in places like New Zealand you have a remuneration authority. In other Parliaments in the world today people are moving to the position where they recognise and accept this principle where, all the evidence is given to the country at large, where independent bodies look at it, and in some instances they are probably given salaries that the members may not give themselves, higher sometimes or lower; but the point is that the public gets an opportunity to pass judgment on the situation properly and to come to its own findings on the situation. I believe it is the correct principle; I do not mind who disagrees with me. I am not going to be frightened out of saying something, and it is one that I would commend to this Country any time because it is a good principle to let somebody outside who is independent enough have a look at, ferret out the facts and come to a conclusion and then we can come to Parliament with it. You might not finally accept it, but there is no doubt that we are here being judges in our own cause.

I want to move on to another position. I always being told that members of Parliament work hard, that they have to put their hands in their pockets, which is true and I am not denying it, in order to give to constituents sometimes, that some Ministers give up lucrative professions while others continue in their outside occupations part-time or as investors. I am not blaming them. If members of Parliament are going to be continually asking the country for increases in salary, and if Ministers want because of their status and the duties and responsibilities they have to be properly paid so that they do not lose anything by it, then there are other standards that the country demands. 3.50 p.m.

Those standards must be laid down in a proper integrity commission and a proper law dealing with the

whole matter as far as I am concerned of a disclosure of assets. I do not believe it is my duty to come into this House and whitewash any matter, but I have never seen a declaration of, assets by any member of Parliament. Certainly you can do this with secrecy. I want to know that Ministers and members of Parliament are not put in the position that certain indirect pressures can be put on them and when their judgments are being brought to bear on matters they are not looking over their shoulders, but to get to this situation we would need two things: proper laws and regulations as well as increases. I have never heard the Government with a policy on that yet, that is in our Manifesto. I do not mind what speech was made that this party was rejected because the Government got 18, but I got elected on the basis of that and I will talk it in here. I got elected in Christ Church West on the basis of that, and I say we need in here independent principles laid down for having a disclosure of assets.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I would like the hon. and learned member for Christ Church West to enunciate in detail on what principles he got in in Christ Church West.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That has nothing to do with the debate, the hon. member may continue.

Mr. FORDE:

I am quite willing to disclose my assets and I will not be hiding behind companies set up in the Cayman Islands or Nassua, and every time I buy an aeroplane or a plantation I do not have to hide and fool the public, anybody can take me as I am straight from the collar, like it or lump it, and I tell the public that too. All I want to know is whether the other persons are willing to do this too. I believe that a matter of principle the House and the Country should move to this position of which we are talking. We have not come in here simply to vote ourselves salaries willy nilly and say we consider them to be fair and equitable and that is the end of the matter, nor am I going to be party to out-of-the-House negotiations where for the last few weeks I have been hearing in the corridors of the House what X and Y are going to get, I do not believe that that is the way to conduct business, and as a result I have not participated in it. Do not tell me you must go along with this or that, I am not that type of person, if I believe that a principle is right I will say so. I want to make it clear that the increases we are voting percentage wise in the first year is higher than the increase given to the higher echelons of the Service in particular, and if we are stating a proper incomes and wages policy we must set the example.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I consider it to be hypocritical to say that you can live on \$600 a month and then come in and vote yourself or absent yourself from the House and let your colleagues vote you the money and when election time comes you get up and say you were not there when it was voted. I do not believe in that at all and that is why I say every member should come and face the music and say what he wants to say about it. Certainly he has his country and his constituents to answer to. I say I am going to vote against the Bill regardless of how I am characterised as a matter of principle. I do not know about the others and I am not going to get up and tell the public afterwards that I was not here when the matter was being debated in this Chamber or that I was absent from any discussions on increases in salary or pensions, I am very much here.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I think this is an indirect attack on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance who is Chairman of the Cabinet, and his presence here is not strictly essential in that none of these

arrangements could be agreed on unless he had approved them. He is not hiding himself, he does not have to be here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point made.

Mr. FORD!:

I am very glad to hear that the Prime Minister approved of this because I would not want it said afterwards that he did not approve. I remember him making a statement to draw the Leader of the Opposition into what he described as falling for the hook.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, it is not a question of falling for any hook, it is understood that the Prime Minister agreed with it but that the Cabinet and himself agreed with it, so what is the object of his presence now? All the members want the increases whether that are in Opposition or in Government.

Mr. FORDE:

You speak for yourself. Let me say that having heard that I will read again from the Budget. "The first proposal which I intend to implement is a policy on incomes of persons who draw salaries and wages out of the public treasury. I said earlier this year, on the first day of May to be more precise, that persons in the higher brackets including the Prime Minister, other Ministers, members of Parliament and others who cannot be deemed to be main wage earners, cannot expect that I will widen the gap between them or us and those wage or salary earners who are finding it difficult to make ends meet." If you are giving the public service a low percentage increase you should do the same for yourself.

When the other Bill comes up I will be making my other remarks on it, but I would like members to know that duty free allowances mean what they say, a duty free allowance is not taxable and in actual fact if you look at its true import the salaries that we are voting ourselves have a much higher content, because part of the duty free allowance happens to be tax free, so when we are comparing salaries compare them on their true import and impact and not otherwise. I have never argued that certainly Ministers of Government who are full time people and others should be asked to serve the Country to the extent that they give up everything they have, that has never been my argument, I am not even asking them as a Parliament if they do not want to do so nor to make the sacrifices that were once made before by the Leader of the House, I am not saying that. I believe that we should set up proper machinery to look at salaries. I believe that when we are debating our own salaries we should not do it in this rush manner either and thirdly, I do not believe that we should widen the gap between ourselves and the others by voting for ourselves increases that seem to me by and large to be much higher percentage wise than the increases given to some of the Civil Servants. I do not think we can do that with a proper conscience. That is my contribution on this.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. I share the view of the hon. member for Christ Church West that for any Bill coming to Parliament longer notice should be given, and the Government itself does not feel, except in exceptional circumstances, that we should ask to do any matter in one day's sitting if it can be avoided. That is a clear principle which the Government accepts, and the Government only asks for leave to do matters in cases where it has not been able to give greater notice of the particular

measure. It is not a question of using numbers, it is a question of the Government trying before the Budget speech of the Hon. Minister of Finance to get the decks clear as far as possible. 4.00 p.m.

I gather that very shortly the Minister of Finance is hoping to introduce his Budget. This is the 17th April, and we are just trying to clear the decks. That is why you have been given short notice, but the Government does not like this type of legislation. This is not to avoid debate, because the Government can answer any question that is raised on this matter.

With regard to the question of an independent tribunal, that is nonsense and it is ridiculous. We sit in here and decide the salary of every single person in this community that draws money from the Treasury. The Opposition and the Government decide that on the basis of job description and work load. To tell me that I am not capable of saying what the work of members of Parliament is, rightly or wrongly, but I am capable of saying what Permanent Secretaries should get, what the judges should get, what the Governor-General should get and so on. Why did the member for Christ Church West sit down in here and allow the Governor-General's salary to pass without debate at that figure, and then tell me that he is not capable of saying what his own parliamentarians deserve?

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of explanation, Sir. The hon. member for Christ Church West was not in this House when the Governor-General's Bill was passed without debate. You can look at the record and see the position.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Now, you get the Governor-General, the Chief Justice, the Judges, the Director of Public Prosecutions, and we are saying in here that \$X is what they are worth. Are you going to tell me that as responsible politicians, having gone in for politics, we are not in a position to say what members of Parliament are worth? That is really ridiculous in the extreme. We are now asked to rely on Judges, whose salary is being fixed by us, to tell us what salaries we should get, or to rely on the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, who is appointed by the Prime Minister after consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, along with a civil servant from the Establishment, to tell us what salaries we should get! Now a civil servant who is working under a Minister must tell the Minister what salary he should get! Have you ever heard anything as foolish as that?

Mr, Speaker, in any case, whatever is decided by them the Parliament will have to pass the Bill. An independent Commission cannot pass a Bill. Is the hon. member going to tell me that when the Bill comes before Parliament that our hands will be so tied that we would not be able to amend it, or to increase the salaries in it? Who is running the Country? Is it the independent commission or the Government? We are judges in our own cause, because we have to pass the legislation to give us the money. If we do not accept the Commission's report, whether the Chairman is a judge or he is the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, we are the final arbiters. Under the Constitution the people who must pass the laws must always be judges in our own cause. Do not tell me anything about a commission. In any case, the commission will not be independent in the sense. (Asides.) I am talking from a judicial point of view.

Now, if Judges asked for \$40,000 and they only get \$20,000, a man could say: "I have a chance to sit on this commission. They only gave me \$22,000, and I will give them \$10,000." If the Chairman of the Public Service Commission wants \$300,000 a year or \$200 per meeting and the Government says that it

would be prepared to give him \$100 per meeting instead of \$200, then you would expect him to be independent and impartial in dealing with us!

Mr. Speaker, there are only two points in this debate. Do not make political capital out of this. Do not cause any disaffection in the community. The people must know that anybody who can persuade a majority of electors in any constituency to vote for him; any person who can form a party and get the majority of seats at the elections can get the salary that we are now getting. We are not giving ourselves a salary in perpetuity. In 1976 when the elections come, all of the people in the Gallery can run, get seats and come and draw the money. The Opposition will never tell you that when they get in they will reduce the salary of parliamentarians. They will not cut down but they will go up. I have my views on these two points. Are members entitled to an increase? The consensus seems to be yes. Every single person in the Country has got an increase; the Statutory Boards have had an increase and so on. The answer, undoubtedly, is yes.

Now, is the increase reasonable or not? That is the only debate on this question. I gather from the Leader of the Opposition- I am sorry he is not in his seat- that he is not prepared to comment until the public say that the increase is too high. I have my own views, but there is

nobody in this House who would tell anybody that \$600 a month would be too high for a parliamentarian in 1973. It might be too low, but it cannot be too high.

Apart from the 50% to which the member for Christ Church West has referred-he has a mentality like the people in Town. He wants the Union to come and fight to get \$40.00 a week for somebody. He wants the people in Bridgetown who...

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member wants to refer to my mentality, I will tell him that it is a bit higher than he will ever conceive. I do not have that sort of mentality, if that is the way he operates.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am only referring to his political mentality. I am not talking about his judicial mentality. I am saying that he is young in politics, and I do not blame him. Perhaps he sees a case where he can make some political capital out of it. There is nobody in this House, or in this entire Country, who can tell me that in 1973 \$600 a month for a parliamentarian is too much.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, they will not go and tell the people the truth. They will get on the platform and say that we are raiding the Treasury and so on. Now, a Permanent Secretary has no constituency; he has no obligations to anybody; he gets a house allowance of \$200 a month, an entertainment allowance of \$2,106-as far as I can see he gets \$4,320 tax-free. When a Permanent Secretary travels on Government business he also gets a travelling allowance; he can borrow money to buy a car, up to a certain amount; he can get a travelling Allowance, but you do not hear in this House that a Permanent Secretary who has no political obligations, who does not have to give anything to a Church fair, harvest, and so on, is getting too much. He is getting \$4,320 tax-free, and his housing allowance is pensionable, too. Why do you not tell the people the truth?

A politician has to go to funerals; carry sick people to town; assist people, and all he is getting is \$400,

whereas a Permanent Secretary, who can go home the moment the Minister leaves the office and drink a rum and ginger, or a whisky and soda, can take things easy. He has nothing to do, but he can get \$4,320 a year tax-free. The member for St. Thomas mentioned the question of paying to repair toilet bowls, paying school fees and so on, and yet you are going to tell me that \$400 a month is too much for a parliamentarian! Let us start telling the people the truth.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason why the 50% is on here is that the members of Parliament will not be getting the 5% increase every year like civil servants. The Permanent Secretaries are getting \$18,000 a year. A Minister must get more than \$18,000. Do you think I am going to work for less than my Permanent Secretary? I would apply for his job, because it is money I want. That is what I am looking for. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition tells me that, as a Minister, I get per month what he can make in a day. He is not a better lawyer than I am, As a matter of fact, in many ways he is worse. He can make in one day what I make in one month as a Minister! It must also be noted that the Permanent Secretary is getting 5% over the three-year period, which Ministers and parliamentarians are not going to get. 4.10 p.m

When the cost of living has gone up, it is the Minister; if a bus breaks down, it is the Minister; if there is no water in the pipes, it is the Minister; when unemployment is high, it is the Minister; when there is inflation, it is the Minister; everything that happens in this Country, it is the Minister; and are you going to grudge the Minister getting more than a Permanent Secretary who is sitting down in a nice air-conditioned office and getting a 5% increase up to 1976? Are you going to tell the people that to pay a Minister \$24,000 is too much? It is time, as I said, that we stop making political capital out of payments. The people of this Country have over the years from the planter days got the idea that as soon as you are in trouble they can run to you. I will tell you the truth now. Between last night and this morning I had a woman in my constituency who wants me to pay her passage to America because she said she can get a job with somebody; and this morning at 7 o'clock a man rang me and told me he saw a house in Jessamy Lane and asked whether I would buy it and hold the receipt. Do you think a Permanent Secretary gets that foolishness? As soon as it comes to members of the House, you hear they are breaking the Treasury, they want power. A Minister or member of Parliament has a wife and children to feed, school fees to pay, car to run and live to a certain standard; but people feel he has gone into politics because there is no other profession.

What the people in this Country must know is that politics is the only thing you do not have to do a degree for, so they qualify right away. Everybody in Barbados is a politician because you do not have to do a refresher course, and it is the only profession in which I have been engaged in which my integrity, my honesty, my desire to serve, my altruism are no guarantees for my success. If in 1976 the Leader of the Opposition comes with a big lie, I might lose my seat. Honesty won't help me; all the service I put in would not help me; interest in the people would not help me; my socialist convictions would not help me. This is the profession you have gone into. A good lawyer like the hon. member for Christ Church West reaches the top; a good farmer like the hon. member for St. Joseph makes his money paying the mortgage he lends out, easy. A good printer like the member for St. Peter is cool breeze, he must succeed. The member for Bridgetown with what he inherited plus what he earns is easy. The Leader of the Opposition with what he inherited plus being a good lawyer is easy. The member for St. James is scratching, fighting, battling.

When you seriously look at the political scene in Barbados there are only two questions I would like to

ask the hon. member for Christ Church West. Making allowances for the lateness of the debate, and it is not late in the sense that for a long time in the year was the question of increases for Ministers and members, how can we honestly tell people if we are sincere in our protestations that \$600 is too much? Do not look at the percentage because we are not getting 5% each year like the Civil Servants. Every year the civil servants and certain workers in Government are getting a 5% increase in addition to the ordinary increment, but members of the House are not getting it; so 60% is nothing. I agree that the \$400 is tax free, but so is the civil servants' entertainment allowance and housing allowance, and so is it pensionable. He has not got the obligation. You are fortunate that you represent a constituency just around the corner from you, but when the member for St. Peter has to drive down from St. James, the member for St. Joseph has to go over from St. Philip when the member for St. Thomas has to go from Christ Church, they do not get travelling like a civil servant; it has to come out of the \$400. You must tell the people of this Country that it is high time that they expect their legislators not to work for chicken feed while people in this community who are less influential, less important can earn money and live.

I saw as I mentioned earlier a job advertised for \$30,000 to \$35,000 with a company of \$2 million trading assets and I carried it and showed the Prime Minister and said they would have to start him at the top, why don't you apply for it? \$35,000 is more than he is getting, plus the other "perks". If he is manager they are going to give him a house, a big Daimler and everything. There are only two points in this debate leaving off the political peripheral argument, and they are, a) members entitled to an increase, and is \$600 as a salary too much, when you consider that the average civil servant who may get 30% now is going to get 5% in each year? Judging from the Opposition, I may feel it is too little, but is \$600 and \$400 a month tax free which in certain countries is equivalent to constituency allowance too much? Each member should have an office in his constituency and should be able to hire a secretary to take the complaints in his constituency; so when you look at the \$400, the only reason why people do not get better representation is because of the niggardly way in which we try to pay parliamentarians. The hon. member for St. Philip and the hon. member for St. Peter should each have an office and be able to employ a secretary, but can \$400 a month do that? Yet you hear the member for Christ Church West from his position of affluence, from his position of generosity and philanthropy tell you that we must appoint a judge. The point is whether you appoint a judge or the chairman of a commission. Has what the Government brought to this House too much? Is it a raid on the Treasury? Is it an unreasonable burden on the taxpayers or is it in the circumstances a reasonable amount?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I make my final submission to you that this figure certainly cannot be characterised as unreasonable or too high, and there may be sound arguments to justify why it might be too low.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understood that earlier in the debate the Leader of the Opposition made some remarks about me in this matter. (A VOICE That is not true.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Order. Please allow the hon. member to develop his point and I will rule accordingly.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I am sure you will not have much chance to rule when I am finished with him because these water-

washed crooks that come around this place I have to deal with very roughly. I do not call any of the members of the House of Assembly at home or anywhere else because I am not in politics looking for anybody's favour. I have said in here already that the members on the front bench do not perform any favours for me. Far from that I have now come from a meeting and I told the workers to tell the Minister of Health or the Prime Minister tomorrow that if they do not get more money for work they have to do, they will put down their tools.

Now, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition called me up at my home one night. He is not accustomed to calling me because we are not that kind of calling friends, and I was surprised when my wife told me that he wanted me. He said that the Leader of the House had written him a letter about salaries, and I told him I was a member of the party and asked why he called me. He said that the letter referred to members other than Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, and as I was a member other than a Minister he felt it applied to me too. (Mr. BOLDEN: What time was that?) I did not put down any time. He Asked what was my idea about salaries and I told him this was a difficult matter. I understand that he said today that the figure in this Bill is the figure that I mentioned to him. 4.20 p.m.

This is a difficult matter. I understand that he said today that the figure is a figure I mentioned to him; he probably knew the figure, because I do not even have any talk with any of the members of my party about money. I came in here without money, when members were not getting any money; and I am very scrupulous about talking money with members of the House, so when the hon. member said I mentioned a figure to him I do not know anything about that, because I do not even draw the money from the House of Assembly, it is paid into an account at the bank. I do not regard that as money. At my stage of life that does not mean anything to me, I am not one of those half-cent politicians who have to account for money at home. My Secretary works for more than \$600 a month, so you would understand my position. You have these as instances to show that there is not anything I was talking about in so far as the hon. member is concerned, but he wanted to get some views about this. I told the Prime Minister, as far as the members are concerned, that I regard \$600 a month as not enough for members of the House; that has nothing to do with me, because whatever they pay me Government is getting back more than half.

I had to fight this matter from the beginning. When I first came to the House members were getting \$80 a month, so it is not a question of money. I want to make it clear that if salaries were not paid the people who sit in the House of Assembly could not be in the House today. The character of the House of Assembly has changed as a result of certain members, because it means now that people who can afford to come here now would not be able to come here without salaries being paid. I want to make it clear that I am not the kind of man who is looking for friends, so if the Leader of the Opposition made any statement that I said

something to him I want to make it clear that he called me up and as a matter of good manners I spoke with him, but the Leader of the Opposition and some other members of the Opposition felt that in 1966 when I was defeated in St. Peter that was the end of my life. I regard a seat in the House of Assembly as a medium through which you can do some sort of good but not the only medium where you can do good. If that were so, the Island would be a very sad place indeed because there are only 24 members in here and it would mean that it would take 24 people alone to do anything for the community. I am not a man who is gifted with the art of insulting people and for that reason I had a discussion with the hon. member but I do not want the hon. member to get here today and give any impression that we had a

conversation. I think the hon. member Was somewhat in a quandary as to what his position was going to be because he spoke about what his party's National Executive had decided about salaries, but that is his business and I told him the Leader of the House would have to talk to me about it because I am a member of his party.

I do not agree with these allowances. It is not fair to the Speaker of the House to give him the same allowance as the Leader of the Opposition. I do not care who the Speaker is, you have to demand certain things, the office of Speaker deserves more than that of the Leader of the Opposition, and I make no bones about it. You cannot be giving the Leader of the Opposition the same amount as an entertainment allowance as you give the Speaker. On what basis and analysis should the Leader of the Opposition and the Speaker of the House receive \$1,800 as entertainment allowance? Do you believe in privilege and class? Is it done on the basis "that the Leader of the Opposition is who he is and the Speaker is who he is? On what basis is the post of Leader of the Opposition equivalent to that of the office of Speaker? How can they be equal in office? Are you going to give the Opposition an allowance that would equate with the Prime Minister's because by that comparison the Leader of the Opposition is the person to take over? I do not agree with it on the basis that this was done by some people who do not understand looking at things but understand looking at people. I am satisfied in my mind that if someone else was Speaker the allowances would be different. I do not want to say anything more than that, but you cannot give the Leader of the Opposition \$1,800 a year as entertainment allowance and the Speaker of the House the same amount and say it is fair.

They talk about the \$600 they intend to give to members, but if the members who operate on the basis that this is good enough are satisfied, I am not. Take the Ministers for instance, some Ministers have an idea that all that matters is to be a Minister in Parliament, but you are not born a Minister you are made a Minister, and you have to be a member of Parliament first. There is a peculiar concept that when you are a Minister you are more than human, but we are all equal in here. A ministerial position is a position of choice, not preference, nobody can make me a Minister, I would have to decide to become a Minister, I am not one of those people who feel that the only contribution you can make in public life is to become a Minister. Six hundred dollars a month in a day and age like today is no money, so if the hon. member for Christ Church West feels it is a lot that is a matter for him, but from what I have seen given in the court as judgement in these days it shows that \$600 a month is no money because when you can get a \$30,000 judgement in a place like Barbados it means that the value of money has gone up.

I agree with the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works that the time has come when people must look at Parliament with more respect. We are still lucky in Barbados that the assassins have not struck as yet but we should not believe that we are immune from such. Those of us who have been in public life for any length of time would know about the threatening letters we have received, the problems we have had to undergo, and when you talk in terms of \$600 a month it does not compensate for the many duties we have to perform. I dispute ,this nonsense about a percentage basis. You cannot pay a parliamentarian every time you raise the salaries of carpenters and those people, the negotiations for them will have to be gone into at different and on more occasions than you should think of raising parliamentary salaries. 4.30 p.m.

Do you want to make nonsense of the ministerial and parliamentary system? Every time you increase a man who is getting 80 cents an hour or \$1.25 per hour, are you going to be running behind him with an increase in your salary? I think that you should look at this matter in the context of money and what

\$600 can do today. This has nothing to do with what the Hon. Minister has said. We know a lot of people. All of us have to carry notes from the banks to our offices that we cannot carry home, because if your family see these notes they would want to know how we can find money to back the notes and we cannot find money to do certain things at home.

For instance, I was told that if I do not find money to take to the bank the end of this month \$960.00 will go through the eddoes. You do not get an income tax deduction for such things. A man came to me the other day to borrow \$2,000. When I told him that I would carry him to the bank, he got annoyed. He did not want to tell the bank what he wanted to do with the money, and he said that I did not want to help him. He felt that he has been my friend for several years and I must get this \$2,000 for him. The man feels that as a parliamentarian you must back notes and so on. I asked him if he would tell the bank manager what he wanted to do with the money. He scratched his head and said: "Since you want to know my business, do not worry with the money." The consolation I have is that he got vex with me, and I have not signed any note. If he had remained pleased and I had signed the note, I would have had to hope that he remained pleased with me until the money was paid back to the bank.

Mr. Speaker, from tomorrow morning people will be coming to borrow more money. Nowadays, people do not ask you for a quarter any more. You will be asked to give a \$1.00 or \$5.00 if you can afford it. I am talking about begging and not borrowing. Yesterday I was in the constituency of the Hon. Minister for Education. A woman approached me and said that she belonged to the Union. I told her to go and look for the Minister of Education, but I hope that she will be able to sell the Minister some tickets for her dance.

Now, I agree with the Minister that you will have parliamentary expenses. I would like to have an office in my constituency. To rent a decent office and to employ somebody to work there and run it with a certain amount of efficiency, you will spend almost all of the money you receive as a parliamentarian. These are some of the things that will be required of parliamentarians today. A Minister cannot be a Minister of the Government and every afternoon he is going to every dance and going into somebody's cellar and so on. He has to put up a Parliamentary office. Some Ministers use Government Offices where people go to see them. The nation as a whole can do that, but I am talking about your constituency in particular.

The hon. member said that it does not require degrees to become a politician. If you are a serious politician, you must have some sort of a library unless you are one of these ignorant politicians who come here merely with an Order Paper in his hand. What about the books you buy? What kind of library do you have?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, Sir. What I was pointing out is that are not voting ourselves anything that is in perpetuity, and since it does not require any formal training, the same taxpayers who grumble can come here and draw the salaries if they can get people to vote for them. It does require training, but what I am saying is that since, prima facie, it does not require special training, and since we are not voting ourselves any money for all time, we have no vested or permanent interest, and the people who grumble now can have a chance to draw the salaries, too.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I was not making any reference to what the hon. member had said on that matter. I was only making the point that a parliamentarian is required to keep up to date if he wants to keep abreast with what is taking place in the world. He has to keep a library and he has to buy books and read them in order to keep abreast of what is going on. These are parliamentary expenses, but we do not receive anything for them. In the circumstances, I find that these are modest salaries being paid to parliamentarians. I think the mistake we have made is to compare our salary with that of a Permanent Secretary.

Now, I have written something about the European Caribbean Community. It seems to me that it takes the Permanent Secretaries to make the Ministers understand what is the true relationship of a Minister as a Minister and it has no relationship to a Permanent Secretary. If you had no Permanent Secretaries the Ministers would still remain Ministers, and a parliamentarian would still be a parliamentarian. The trouble is that too many parliamentarians like to say on the platform, when they are trying to ridicule each other, that Frank Walcott has a big car now and he is going to buy another big one. They do not realise that he will buy them as long as they are comfortable and are being sold in Barbados. All they will have to do is to bomb them when they see them. That is the sort of cheap remarks you will get from politicians, and when they return to Parliament they cannot allow the people to believe that they want these things.

Now, a lot has been said about the Prime Minister having a house. Some people give the public the wrong impression and the Ministers are now coming face to face with these things. Yesterday the hon. member said that the Prime Minister would be getting \$35,000, but there are many people in Barbados who are working for more than that. I know that some people are afraid to pay taxes and they will not work for money. My idea about it is that as long as I am doing a job you will have to pay me; the income Tax Department can take what they like out of it, and I will get what is mine. I am nothing to do with what the Income Tax Department get, but I am something to do with what is mine. The Department cannot get more than I will get. If I am going to be a Rockefeller, I know that I will be a millionaire and I could not pay \$1 million in taxes and remain poor. I do not mind that. You must pay me adequately for the work I have to do so that I will not have to worry any person about anything.

I am very serious about this matter, and I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not here. This \$600.00 a month that is offered to certain members of the House is still, in my opinion, small and parsimonious. I know the argument that was used. It was said that this represented 50% of what the amount used to be before, but we cannot talk in terms of 50%. When they refer to a parliamentarian as a part-time worker that is *infra dig*. 4.40 p.m

When you are in Parliament, you are there for five years, and therefore your whole life is in Parliament. This is the analysis I have made. Even in the House as it is constituted now, you have nine Ministers three Parliamentary Secretaries, the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees making a total of fifteen members of my party who are officers of the House, and the only other parliamentarians of my party are the hon. member for St. Lucy, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central and myself. We are not part-time because we are not unemployed. I thank Christ that I am a part-timer because I do not want to be unemployed to come in here for anybody to say "poor fellow! You know you have to help Frank because he not making anything outside, so let us raise it a little privvy more so that he can get a grog." It seems that that is the hypothesis, because they like to add on what you are working for with what they believe you are working for outside and say you are getting

more than a Minister when it is finished. There is some concept that nobody can work for more money than a Minister in Barbados, but I do not subscribe to that view; it just depends on what you are doing. I feel that a Minister has certain privileges that only a Minister can enjoy. There are certain powers and privileges that go with ministerial office and this should be so.

Now I will go further. I am not a Minister or think I will ever be, but I would like to see a better system of public life in so far as ministerial transport is concerned. Ministers have their cars, but I am just back from London where I was invited by the British Government who were host to the conference I attended, and though we do not have the same money as the British Government, we are running a country and there are certain minimum things we should have. This Government does not carry that kind of public transportation, and when the Government has something you have to be trooping about in a Minister's car, and if you tell the Minister that you do not like what he said, he may pass and not give you a lift, and you may feel more concerned driving in his car than if you had a car that belonged to the State which he also used, so that when he is not a Minister he has to leave it too like anybody else. You should have this so that when there are public functions here people can be driven with the dignity that a host country should have, and not this idea of a Minister having to stretch out himself or be squeezed up because he may have to send back home for his wife, or you cannot sit down too hard in the back seat. It is time that the Government has its Ministers operating like how Ministers operate in Africa. There is one thing I would say Africa can teach us, and it is that without any pomp they put motor cars at Ministers' disposal for the use of the State. We have this idea that this is something that is too lavish. It is not; you are performing a duty for the State. You can have your own Motor car and drive it where you like, but so far as the State is concerned, its duties should be performed with the dignity that they demand and without any qualm of conscience.

Now the whole exercise of money being paid to parliamentarians is infinitesimal in its context. You cannot begin to compare the salaries you pay to parliamentarians in the same way you pay salaries to an ordinary career person. Parliamentary life is not a career. In this context it is very phlegmatic because you are here today and out tomorrow. The very life of this Assembly will show the life of members is not more than three or four sessions. You cannot say you are coming in here for twenty-five or thirty years and say it is going to be a life's work. I think the time has come when hon. members should pay this some attention, because a debate like this should not be one in which you look upon it, where somebody is trying to get money out of the Treasury. We are clear in our minds that \$600 a month is a foreman's pay today. A good foreman gets more than \$120 a week; so do not let us get the idea that we are lavish. We are expected to perform certain tasks in the community and I think we should be properly rewarded. I can afford to say that because I look out for reward for everybody. I have told the workers that when they see Ministers' salaries have been increased they will be able to have a little more courage, and they will realise that they have to do something about those people who have to clean the streets, and therefore it is a matter of principle.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think there can be any quarrelling by the members of the Opposition. I do not believe that the hon. member for Christ Church West feels that parliamentary salaries are too high. I believe he was making a quip from a statement made by the Prime Minister and you can come back and say he has changed. He said last May Day that he was not going any higher than the fellows below here, but he has raised the Permanent Secretaries too, and it so happens that whenever these fellows come off, they do better than the people below who get the same five percent on \$1.20 as those who get \$1,800, but 5% on \$1,800 is different from 5% on \$1.20. Even with us in the Union we cannot

complain sometimes because you would be complaining all the time. I hope the Opposition does not feel that this is something they have to envy. I do not envy the Ministers for their salaries. I feel that the allowances given to the Speaker is less than it should be, without begrudging the Leader of the Opposition the allowances he has been paid. I do not think that the salary of the Leader of the Opposition is anything to write home about if he is going to do his work, but I think the Speaker's allowance could have been increased.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to say that one can categorise this era as the era of short notice legislation, and my reason for saying that is that quite recently the Government has been coming to the House and giving notice of Bills and Resolutions and asking for them to be done in all their stages, which makes it highly impossible for members of the Opposition and part-time legislators, and I use that term having had my ears close to the ground and heard that the Cabinet had decided on the salaries of other members because they termed them part-time legislators. It is quite clear that the Government regards these members who are not Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries as part-time legislators because they have failed to give us adequate notice and I cannot see how anybody can really contribute meaningfully to a debate this afternoon when all these papers have come to us in the first half an hour of coming to Parliament and we are asked to do them in all their stages this evening, and the Minister of Communications and Works is making the excuse that you have to get through them in time for the Budget Speech. That is no excuse whatsoever. There is a good son why these Bills have been brought in this method at this late stage. Despite what the Leader of the House has got to say about his communicating with the Leader of the Opposition and he did not contribute anything, look at the Bills we have to deal with today and you will see something. 4.50 p.m.

You will see on careful notice that the Deputy Clerks of Parliament who by the very nature of their employment are deemed to be part-time are getting a higher salary than the part-time legislators as the Cabinet chooses to refer to them. As the hon. member for St. Michael West said, they must have decided to check on what the hon. member for St. Michael West, the hon. member for St. Lucy, some other hon. member and those on this side are working for in their other jobs before they could decide what to add to that as a reasonable salary because they are only part-time. If you had time to study the Bills which were brought down today you would see that they were done in such a hasty manner that there is really and truly no relationship between what is being done when you look at the various sections of the community. I am not going to say that we are not getting enough or that we are getting too much, what I am commenting on is the question of this short notice legislation which is constantly coming before the House of Assembly, because it is not doing the Country any good.

Another point. If you are talking about being just and equitable, how can you say that the Deputy Clerks of Parliament and all the other persons in Parliament who come in here one day a week are entitled to interim payment and part-time legislators are not entitled to it? I think if you are going to do anything, give less money, but you must bring it to the House in time that people can see. Sometimes at 7 o'clock at night a policeman comes and gets you out of bed to give you papers for the next morning; is there something so secretive about these that they could not even have been sent out yesterday afternoon? The Prime Minister said in this House that if the Opposition were doing their job they would get together and decide what they were going to do in Parliament. He said that his party has got to meet before they come to Parliament and decide what they have to do, but how can you expect us to meet when we are never told what is going on but are handed papers in Parliament and a Minister gets up

after moving that certain Standing Orders be set aside and expects us to do justice to any bit of legislation which is brought before us. There was an excuse at one time that Bills had to be printed before they were brought into the House, but now they cyclostyle them and still bring them in late. How can you expect the Opposition - or as you term them "part-time legislators" - to contribute anything worthwhile to the debates in this House any longer? It is time the Government stops this foolishness, this is no question of budget time or anything having to be done in a hurry, week after week this is being done. When the Cemeteries Bill came down the excuse was that if it was not passed that day the work would have to be stopped and the workmen would not get paid, so it was done in all its stages in one day. When the Midwives' Bill came, it was that the time would have passed for registration so it had to be done on that day; with the Land Tax Bill it was that no money would have been collected because the bills had not yet been sent out. The Government does this over and over again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. member but I do not understand what he is saying, the proposals with regard to salaries were communicated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The principle for paying was dealt with long ago but the amounts were communicated to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the House has lost the trend of what is going on, he does not understand what is going on. How can he say it was communicated to the Leader of the Opposition when the Leader of the Opposition said clearly he did not know until 12 o'clock on Saturday? Take for instance the Debates Committee. I heard the Prime Minister three weeks ago saying that he had done his work on this and the first time I knew what was in this paper was today. What is the excuse for holding this one for three weeks? I have heard in the corridors of this House what the Prime Minister was going to get, and Mr. Deputy Speaker, I told you before you knew what you were going to get. That was long before I heard that a letter had gone to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of explanation, I have never until today known of the salaries of the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, and the Chairman.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I knew, and this is why I say there is a basic reason why these documents are constantly being brought to the House late.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The hon. member for St. Michael West said you do not increase the salaries of Parliamentarians by 50%, he said you look at the value of money to see what it can do. I agree with him 100% because I see when you calculate here the Ministers are getting a 42.86% increase. I heard that one Minister in Government says he intends to hold down the cost of living and he refuses to increase the farmers' take for their produce by more than 11%, how can he now be justified in receiving a 42.86% increase? It is bad management if he sits down in Cabinet and knows the cost of living has risen so high, due to his inexpertise in handling the matter of trade and food, and accept a 42.86% increase on his salary. Is it not

time that the Government look around and either move the Minister of Trade or let us get a rational levelling up of salaries to suit the cost of living. This is why I say there is reason for these documents coming late, and when I go outside and tell the farmer that the Minister of Trade is getting a 42.86% increase I want him to tell me why the farmer cannot get a 30% increase on the sale of his produce.

I am not going to say they are too high or too low, I want the Government to understand that the Prime Minister came in here and quarrelled about the Debates Committee not meeting, the Public Accounts Committee not meeting, and then he said that when you are elected to Parliament your duties involve sitting on these committees, and no Minister of Government can sit down at Cabinet and term other members of Parliament as part-time legislators. If we are part-time legislators you will not be able to get any committees to meet except when we feel like coming, and I want to make that clear. It is my contribution to the debate that the Government must understand that Government is not only made up of Ministers, it is made up of Government and Opposition and we are all involved in this. I agree with the member for St. Michael West, he is not the only one who has the experience of people coming to him, in the last three or four weeks with the crisis in agriculture. My telephone was ringing from 5 o'clock in the morning till about 1.00 or 2.00 the next morning.

If I am a part-time legislator I will have the right to do what the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works used to do, have a number ex-directory that only your friends can call you.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of explanation, that was when I was in the Other Place.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Minister of Trade has a number that is ex-directory and he would like to know how I found it because I used to call him up, and I will start to call him at midnight too. 5.00 p.m

If he is a full-time Minister and he has a telephone number which is ex-directory to enable him to perform part-time services, then I think it is time that everybody should perform part-time services too. I want those members who like to go back to the Cabinet, or to call up the Minister, and tell him that Bolden said so and so will repeat clearly what I have said. I am no part-time member of Parliament, and I am doing a full-time job. I do not want anybody to categorise me as a part-time member of this House. That is all I have to say.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is safe to say that it is an insult to hon. members who have been elected here for a 5-year period, to refer to them as part-time, moreso when it comes to the question of salaries revision and matters related thereto. I believe that if the Minister of Finance is spoken to in the terms that he should be spoken to, he will understand and appreciate the feelings of hon. members on this side of the House for having fallen into that lapse, or whatever it is, that has cause him to feel that way about hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a bit on both sides of the House on this question of salaries revision with respect to the emoluments of Ministers, the Prime Minister and others, but I am more concerned with the pittance that seems to be dropping from the tables of the others and is left for those of us who could not fall within the ministerial ranks, of the ranks of Parliamentary Secretaries or to fill the other

offices. It is known that there are not enough offices for all of us to fill at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say that 40%, 50%, or 100% is too much for one person or not enough for another person, because that does not fall within my ambit. As a member of Parliament I must say that since I was elected to this Honourable House, my work load has increased more than 600%, 700%, 800% or 900%. As I go on from day to day, and the more I try to serve the people the more I find the work load increasing. If you do good to one person, whether he is from St. Andrew, St. Lucy or St. Joseph, he will spread the good news and more persons will come to see you day in and day out. night in and night out, so your work load must increase Sir, it is in terms such as these that one will have to try and assess whether or not my coming Parliament one day a week, four days a month, or 52 times a year must be considered as the yardstick of my service to the Country, or whether or not one will not have to gauge my work-load by the numbers who travel the length and breadth of this Island to find me. After I have had to put in a hard day's work at my office, I have to see more people every day than some doctors and, perhaps, some of the lawyers have to attend to in their various offices. I see people in my office each day, and when I go home at night I find people from my constituency and from other constituencies waiting in motor cars to see me. What can I do, Mr. Speaker? Can I turn those people away by telling them that I cannot see them? I cannot do that.

Mr. Speaker, there are all sorts of demands - not requests - made upon every elected member of this House. It is not every hon. member who can succeed in hiding from his constituents. I do not intend to hide from mine. I have never hidden from my constituents, and I do not intend doing so. With regard to what the Minister of Communications and Works has said, I feel that I should be paid well enough that I should have a secretary to relieve me of some of the requests that are made on me personally in the course of each day of my life. This is a common affair, Mr. Speaker.

When I am taking my wife and son to church on a Sunday morning, people stop me in the road about something or other. I have to stop; I cannot pass them and say that I am too busy to see them. I politely ask them to give me enough time to take my wife and son to church, and I will see them at a later hour. A man who is working at DaCosta & Musson Ltd. would not be stopped by those people to ask for a lift, but when you are an elected member the people seem to think that the car you are driving is their car. I have attended functions and found people who hired a motor car to attend the functions, and, the amount they saw that I was present, they decided to let the car that they had hired go because they knew that I would have to take them home when the functions were over. That is the sort of demand that is made upon an hon. member in these days. As the hon. member for St. Michael South West has said, as from tomorrow the number of demands will increase. Requests are made of hon. members to back notes at banks for their constituents and for others and to accept all sorts of responsibilities. Some people have money for debt collectors; they run to hon. members asking them to help them to pay the money; hon. members then have to get in touch with the debt collectors and ask them to give the people a chance that they will accept responsibility for the payment of the money. You try to do something to help people and all of those things will pile up. Sometime when you back a note the person does not pay, and at the end of the month when you think you have \$X in the bank you will find that you are \$X minus so much. When these people do not pay, the banks will make deductions from any money left in the accounts of hon. members.

This matter must be given careful consideration, Mr. Speaker. I do not know how hon. members live in relationship to their constituents. I know how I get along with my constituents. I feel that I can say

boldly and I have the feeling that I am the father of the nation. People from every single parish in this Island and from every constituency just turn up at my office and at my home with certain things that are remotely connected with me and seeking all sorts of advice and so on. I cannot turn these people away. I have to provide them with some form of entertainment; give them some sort of satisfaction; go out of my way to help them and so on.

I think it was the Hon. Leader of the Opposition who mentioned the question of school fees. I do not want to come before Parliament to say all that we have to do for people from time to time. The question of school fees is one thing, but you have to provide some of the children with clothing, you have to give them books, and you have to become father and mother to some of them because you are a member of Parliament. 5.10 p.m.

There is one thing I have got to say, Sir. We are here to decide whether or not members of Parliament should be given some sort of token payment for the services they render to the people. I know what services I render. I know that the measure of my responsibility to the people has increased so tremendously that I am sure the people of St. Peter have a confidence in me that I would not attempt in any manner to do anything that would earn their displeasure whether it is a matter of payment for myself or for any other member of the public service with whom we may have to deal. What has been worrying us, however, and from what we have seen going on from both sides of the House, is what are we going to tell our constituents. That to my mind is not the point at issue. You have to ask yourself whether you are doing something that is wrong or something that is right. If you know you are doing something that is wrong, you cannot return to your constituents because you cannot find a feasible excuse to put before them; but if an hon. member realises as we must do that there was the day when we had the vestrymen and local government councillors and aldermen that people could turn to, he must know that they no longer exist, and people come to you, Mr. Speaker, and to me. We have got to accept all this responsibility. There was the time when they would walk to certain people in the districts, the school masters and the like for what advice they wanted; they seldom do this today. They go to the house of the politician. They rent a car or get a lift to wherever they can be found for whatever it is, whether it is a case of death, sickness, or whatever it might be; so a member of Parliament is first in the life of these people.

Sir, I turned up late for a wedding and the bride wept beside her husband. I merely make mention of these things to show the measure of responsibility, how more attached you are to your constituents, and as a result there must be related expenses. The Minister of Communications and Works made mention of various church festivals where because you are an elected member and because you are Speaker of the House of Assembly, somebody comes up and pushes a \$5.00 ticket in your hand for a function which you know you are not going to attend; but because you are Speaker you have got to give that money which you intended to use for your home or something of the sort. My home has got to take last place on an occasion such as this and you have got to be a nice fellow and spend \$10. That is the type of thing you come up against in your parliamentary career, but all this goes to make the man of each and every one of us. This is a college of experience for us. Each and every hon. member can tell members of the public and others of what we encounter in the course of our daily lives as members of Parliament.

I have heard an hon. member from this side make mention of a wages and incomes policy and that we must set the example. I agree 100 percent, Mr. Speaker, but before you set about doing any of these things your first duty must be to make sure that every one of us who is to receive a reward for our

services is getting a basic salary or wage that can be reasonable. One of our problems has been what members made mention of earlier when it was agreed years ago to pay members of Parliament a figure which was far too meagre. In other words, parliamentarians began by selling themselves too cheaply to the public, but one has got to ask oneself about the type of service he renders and at what cost he renders this service to his own job and at the expense of his family's pleasure. All this has to be taken into consideration. 5.20 p.m.

One has got to bear in mind that at an hour of the night you are called upon to serve, and dare you say you cannot or you will not. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are some hon. members who do not and will not welcome a salary increase, but there are a lot of poor people in the parish of St. Peter and I would ask them here and now if they do not want an increase in salary to turn it over to a fund to be established for the benefit of the poor and aged of the parish of St. Peter. That is what I ask them to do. I represent people and the people of St. Peter do not expect me to come cap in hand at the end of a month begging them, they know that before I came and asked them to vote for me I was in the position to tell them I had a job and that I had provided myself with somewhere to live. In other words, I did not go seeking to represent them because there was money in it, I came to represent them accepting the responsibility which it brought. The discharge of that responsibility has made and is continuing to make certain inroads into my private life, as all hon. members who want to serve will know. There are times when your wife would be glad to have you with her but because of an engagement in the constituency, some branch meeting or some group expecting you to address them you have to deny her your company to be with your constituents because you feel if you are not present at that hour the people will feel you are not with them. All of this one has to take into consideration. Are we to do this merely for the love of it? We cannot, but this is what I want to say, and I share the view of other hon. members, whenever Bills of this nature are to be brought before the House there should be ample time for hon. members to be able to discuss them amongst themselves. The Leader of the Opposition has just come back to his place and I want to say this. I have not tried to look after my own interest and to see that after my own interest was all right to care nothing of the other members of my party, but we have heard it from the hon. member for St. Michael West and from the Leader of the House that on two occasions no thought whatsoever did the Leader of the Opposition give to any hon. member on this side. We have seen the result today, he feels himself all right and that is it.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, listening to this debate this afternoon I was somewhat surprised to hear what I would consider rather reactionary speeches by persons whom I thought to be socialists advocating the cause of socialism. From time to time during the last two or three months we have been debating measures in this use which advocated for the purpose of fleecing the status and the privilege of members of this House and trying to build around members of this House some sort of air that we are separate and apart from the other members of this community. I heard of special licence plates and these other things, and I think this is really indicative of a Government that has been in power for far too long and has lost touch with what is happening in the Country. They are not really coming to task with the issues that are facing this Country and are really concerned with the government of this Country to the benefit of themselves.

All we have heard today on the justification for the increase of salaries for the backbench members is really a foreplay of what is coming for the justification of the increase in salary for the Ministers and the Prime Minister. They are simply justifying the increase here for back benchers only for the purpose of easing a difficulty when we come to deal with the question of the salaries of the Ministers and the Prime

Minister. As I have said, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his speech indicated, the policy of the Labour Party as indicated in our Manifesto - and we on this side of the House have been fond of quoting our Manifesto in here, and today I see no reason to depart from it as a matter of principle - but I think on the last page of the Manifesto dealing with the morality of the Government we set out then that there was need for certain guidelines also for the question that in future salary increases could only come after there was an independent committee to report on salaries, because we felt at the time that it was not right to have Government merely sitting down and arbitrarily fixing salaries for themselves. What we ask of the Government is nothing strange, the member for Christ Church West indicated that this was the position in New Zealand, and even coming nearer home in the Caribbean, the Sinanan Committee in Trinidad was appointed by the Prime Minister to report and make recommendations for the salaries of Ministers and other members of Parliament. 5.30 p.m.

You must bear in mind what we advocated in September, 1971 -- not as a result of the Ashenheim Commission, or the Sinanan Commission. We advocated this long before the new Government in Jamaica appointed the Ashenheim Commission, or the Trinidad & Tobago Government appointed the Sinanan Commission some time last year. What we advocated in our Manifesto is not something which we took from Jamaica or Trinidad; it was something which we suggested and put forward

to the people of this Country as a basis on which any future salary increases would be granted.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason I find myself bound in the circumstances that, if I quote from the Manifesto on certain issues, and if I go to the people in the Country with things based on the Manifesto, I am today bound by the Manifesto. In the event that the Government rejects the principle enunciated in our Manifesto and enunciated also in the letter from the Leader of the Opposition, I find myself, in these circumstances, compelled to vote against the Bill.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. WEEKES, Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. LOWE and Mr. CRAIG - 15.

Noes: Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BOLDEN; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. FORDE - 4.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. ADAMS and Mr. HINDS - 16.

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

5.40 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS:

I beg your pardon, if it is Clause 2 I have misread the clauses. If it is Clause 2, at no stage had I intended to decline to vote. I intended my voice to be heard with the "Ayes" on Clause 2. I have made a mistake in the vote. I thought it was Clause 3 which was called.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will take the vote as "Ayes". The question has resolved itself in the affirmative with 16 hon. members voting "Aye" and 2 hon. members voting "No".

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. HOPPIN and Mr. CRAIG - 14.

Noes: Mr. HINDS; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. FORDE - 3.

ABSENTION:

Mr. ADAMS - 1.

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows-

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. CRAIG - 14.

Noes: Mr. HINDS; Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. FORDE - 3.

ABSENTION. Mr. ADAMS - 1.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. LOWE and Mr. CRAIG - 15.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 4. 5.50 p.m

Hon. C. E. TALMA. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the The Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Act, 1973.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. WALCOTT; Mr. GREAVES; Mr. LOWE and Mr. CRAIG -14.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY? Mr. HINDS and Mr. FORDE - 3.

THE MINISTERS AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES (REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES) ACT, 1973.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out this Bill will repeal

Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970 (Act 1970-10) and make provisions for revised salaries and allowances of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

The position as hon. members will recall is that the emoluments currently paid to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries were fixed with effect from 1st April, 1969 at the following rates:

Salary Duty Allowance

Prime Minister \$24,000 \$9,600

per annum

Other Ministers \$16,800 \$6,000

Parliamentary Secretaries \$ 9,000 \$3,600

The Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House was paid an additional allowance of \$1,800 per annum. The salaries and duty allowances are fixed by the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970 (1970-10) except that in the case of the Parliamentary Secretaries only the amount of \$2,400 and \$3,600 duty allowance is provided for by the Act of 1970-10. The additional amount is provided for under Other Expenditure in the Estimates. The other allowance of \$1,800 for the Leader of the House is provided for under the Senate and House of Assembly (Members Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970. The Prime Minister currently contributes \$600 per annum towards the wages of the staff at his official residence and payment of this contribution is made on the authority of the Cabinet by an appropriate notice in the Estimates under Head 17 - Prime Minister's Office, Item 14 - Culloden Farm.

The new salaries proposed are as follows:

Salary Duty

Allowance

\$ \$

Prime Minister 33,600 14,400

Other Ministers 24,000 9,600

Parliamentary Secretaries 15,600 6,000

The Prime Minister also proposes that his contribution towards the wages of the staff at his official residence, Culloden Farm, should be increased from \$600 to \$1,000 annually.

That is the position, Sir, I have given all the information I can. Members have more or less debated this Bill already when we were dealing with that for other members of Parliament. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, most of the arguments which have been made against the first Bill which was discussed in this House today can be made and indeed will be made with more force against this Bill. I remember several years ago George Orwell wrote a novel which has become a masterpiece for its clarity of thought and its sincerity of purpose. It was called Animal Farm and he pictured a kingdom where there were all animals who were all equal except that some were more equal than others. This was a socialist country he was writing about, and I think that we can characterise the situation as similar in here today, because I am more and more amazed at the fact that when people accept high office they do not make, as I have said before, a full disclosure of the total situation to the public at large. 6.00 p.m.

I have heard arguments being raised in favour of these substantial increases along the line that one has to make certain sacrifices for the constituents; that one has to guarantee certain guarantees for constituents; that one is available to people at all hours of the night and, indeed, so one is. I am not denying that for one moment, but that is the basis on which we went to the people. Surely, the short reply to this argument is that if a member does not want to give of his time and his service to the Country and to his constituents he has a freedom of choice not to stand at all to be elected to a Parliament. I do not think that that by itself is a good enough argument to justify a Bill of this nature.

As I have said before, I do not expect that constituents would wish a Minister of Government, or the Prime Minister for that matter, not to be paid for his services, but there are ways and means of going about these matters so that the principles involved could be clear to the Country and that there can be no mistaking of what we are doing when we vote ourselves various increases. I have heard the call for an independent tribunal characterised as nonsensical, as illogical, and ridiculous even, but surely one cannot be serious with that sort of argument.

Throughout the Caribbean today, certainly in Trinidad, certainly in Jamaica, certainly in some of our other Commonwealth countries like in New Zealand, the principle has been firmly established that an independent tribunal should sit between Members of Parliament and Ministers of Government to inquire into the factual situation and to report on that situation so that the public may be involved in the voting and the increases in salaries. I see nothing wrong in that.

The hon. member for the City in this House today said that this is the policy which we said, if we had been elected to the Government, we would have included as one of the ways of strengthening the morality of the Government. Now, I stand or fall on that. I believe that people who have convictions otherwise are entitled to do so. I do not subscribe that people may say during the elections one thing, and because they have lost the elections they must be cowards and be silent on their position, or look at their own narrow interest and be silent on their position if they seriously believe that it was a question of principle, nor do I believe that when one comes to a matter of this nature that one should abstain from stating one's conviction.

Since I am convinced that this is correct, I will on this measure again vote against the principle of the Bill as it stands. I also repeat the argument that I do not think it is good enough for one to come to the House with these substantial increases, push documents in our hands after the House has begun its business for the day, and then ask for a suspension for an hour and a half during which we have lunch, and then expect us to come back here and just railroad through Parliament a Bill of this nature. I do not think that is good enough at all.

Going further into the principles of the Bill, I should like to draw to the attention of this House that not only the analogy which I used from George Orwell was correct, but if you will look at the manner in which it is in future to be treated in dealing with increases, or decreases for that matter, in the salaries of the Prime Minister, the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries and those of members of Parliament, just look at Section 2(5). In this Bill that I have in my hand, the Governor-General may by order amend the Schedule by increasing or decreasing any of the salaries. But an order made under (4) may contain such supplementary provision as the Governor-General considers necessary or expedient for the purposes of this order; and shall be subject to negative resolution.

When one is dealing, however, with members' salaries it is subject to an affirmative Resolution, because in the future the Government can increase the salaries as they like; lay it on the Table of the House; believe that no member will have the conviction, or the sagacity, or the perspicacity to see the order and ask for a positive Resolution on the matter. In future, Parliament will be down-graded by this form and device which we call the Henry VIII Clauses which went out since the sixteenth century. It is very unusual today in any modern legislation to use a negative form of Resolution in many instances and, particularly, when one is dealing with increases in salaries where the Ministers fix them themselves. You can hardly have a debate unless somebody has the perspicacity to raise the question.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Sir, the hon. member referred us to Clause 2(5). Now, (5) (b) states

"shall be subject to affirmative resolution."

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Negative. On a point of order, Sir. Is the Leader of the House reading from an Act to repeal the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration and Allowances) Act, 1970 and to make provision for revised salaries and allowances of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries? I have the Bill that was circulated, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My Bill says "subject to affirmative resolution."

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Would you like to see my Bill, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not doubt you. Mr. HINDS My Bill says "negative". Mr. SPEAKER Just a moment, please.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw to the attention of the House and yourself, Sir, that the file which I am going by and which is the authority for the entire matter has the word "affirmative". I am not trying to mislead any one. If there is an error in the Bill, we will have to regularise it. It should be "affirmative" instead of "negative". I do not know how the mistake came about. At the proper time I will make the necessary amendment. 6.10 p.m.

At the appropriate time I will move the necessary amendment.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, this illustrates very much the point I was making. I am circulated with a Bill to be discussed today in which the Bill given to me says in subsection 2(5) (b) that an order should be subject to negative Resolution, and now I am told that it is a mistake. It cannot be a typographical error, but it illustrates why these Ministers should not be paid a cent more. It is absolute incompetence.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the member cannot get away with that. The ministers are not typists. I would like to know how many members on the other side have Bills with negative and not affirmative Resolution. (A VOICE All of us have negative Resolution.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order. It is most irregular. Only one member can be on his feet at a time. Are you on a point of order?

Mr. HINDS:

I am on a point of order. In the light of what has been discovered, I view this matter, and I am asking all hon. members and you, Mr. Speaker, to view this matter with all the seriousness.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the point of order? Mr. HINDS I am coming to it now.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Make it succinctly; do not make a speech. Just draw my attention to the point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

The point I am making is the fact that members of the Opposition and two backbenchers on the other side have negative Resolution and not affirmative, and I am asking that the Leader of the House postpone the matter for maybe fifteen minutes and see if he can regularise the position and see what else is wrong with the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I can only entertain it on a motion being made, not on a point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I have already given the assurance that from the file the word is "affirmative", and that word will be amended in accordance with the file. It is affirmative Resolution which the Cabinet agreed on and not negative Resolution; so it will be amended in the proper way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Christ Church West was addressing the Chair.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I hope all these interruptions will not count against my time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Oh no

Mr. FORDE:

I believe that if we are now being told that the word is "affirmative" that this House at least should get some proper investigation as to why some members of the House should be given a different Bill to debate. Sir, one of the things I admire about the hon. memembr for St. Michael West, although he and I have not seen eye to eye on certain things, is that he has the courage of his conviction. On a matter of this nature, if he felt as I do, he would come in here and talk out his views, and that is why when I see things like this it annoys me, because I have the courage of my conviction on these matters and I will say so. I am not going to hide about it regardless of whether I am right or wrong, and I do not believe I am necessarily right or wrong; but if it is " affirmative Resolution" that improves the position, but it is totally unsatisfactory to ask me to give my approval carte blanche to a measure of this nature, saying that the constituents need your assistance and that it demands so much out of you, and then you come in to debate this measure seriously. I do not believe that is right. We are not doing our duty properly.

I would like to go a little further. I like to characterize things for what they are, because I am not denying that being Prime Minister or Minister is not a position of importance in this Country, nor am I denying that they should be reasonably well remunerated, but it has always been known that people who are in public office also go there for lots of other reasons. One is the position of power which they have, privileges which they have, the opprobrium of praise which they have and doing good as well. They should not simply go there for money, but seriously I am being told that one must look at this in the context of the job load, the responsibility, the status of the person, but when I see workers in this Country, and I do not hesitate about it, paid a pittance by companies including some that I know and have been associated with, and the new ones particularly coming into the Country, I do not always hear

this sort of argument other than from the Union going down the hilt. I am calling a spade a spade when it comes to this, and I find it difficult to believe that we are doing the right thing by saying that the reasons why our salaries should be high is because the others underneath are asking for more, when we should start redressing the balances in this community from the top. If I were Prime Minister I would really have a prices and incomes policy in this Country, and I would start by controlling profits; I would start by controlling the salaries of professional people as well and come down the line, because if you are a true socialist you can tell me that. You do not come the other way and say the others are underneath pushing me up, so I must go higher. That is the argument I have been hearing to justify this. I want to see that if you are in a position of power you start from the top and level them and try to push up the balance in order to come to a reasonable level that the economy can bear. Let us look the Prime Minister's salary firmly in its face. Do not let the hon. member for St. Michael South Central come and tell me that he saw an advertisement for a job at \$35,000 and the Prime Minister is only getting \$33,600. The true salary on the basis of duty allowance without taking into account the Housing Allowance or the free house is in the nature of \$67,000 in order to give him a duty allowance that is tax free of \$14,400. Because of the tax saving position you would have had to give him a taxable income of \$67,000. Tell the Country that; and this is without looking at the position of including Culloden Farm because then you would have to add another \$18,000 which would make it \$86,000. If that is what the Prime Minister deserves, freely come out and tell the Country so and let them vote on it. If we feel that is what he deserves, why are we scared to let an independent commission look at all the facts?

Mr. Speaker, I would like this to be clear, because when we vote the officers of Parliament a pittance, we try to think we are giving them something substantial. When the school teachers in this Country slave to produce people like all of us in here, we believe when they object to wages that they are doing something wrong, and I find it is unconscionable that members of Parliament should come to characterize people as persons of affluence and all sorts of things. Let me clear my position. My father started from the bottom and I had the good fortune to be adopted, but I have never sat down on the laurels of any of my relatives in order to get anywhere. I work as hard as anybody else, but I have a conscience too, and I want to make that absolutely clear in here. I will vote against the principle of this Bill because I do not believe that the Country has had an opportunity properly to look at the full import of all this. The salary increases range from 40% for the Prime Minister. I know that the member for St. Michael South Central says that percentages do not matter, but when he gets an increase of \$9,600 per annum which is \$800 a month, even if it is 2% in the context of Barbados it is significant. It is more than a lot of people are working for. When you get a tax free raise of \$4,800, it is as much as a Corporal of Police is working for and he is on more duty call than anyone of us in here. 6.20 p.m.

When you get an increase of 42.86% for Ministers, \$7,200, that increase alone is equal to the whole of the parliamentarians' salaries without the duty allowance. Let us call a spade a spade, when you get an increase of 73.66% on the salary of a Parliamentary Secretary, \$300 a month which is equal to 150% increase, as a duty allowance tax free, let us face it, I will never want to hear this Government come back in my constituency and talk about Henry Forde being a white man's stooge or a capitalist or anything else, but now you see their true colours. No you see the position that I am being asked to come in here and vote the taxpayers' money in a prices and incomes policy of this nature where there is no true relation to any of the wages throughout the Country.

The problem with this Country is that it has no proper minimum wage legislation, but whenever you get increases in Civil Servants' salaries, those of Parliamentarians are jacked up and we keep the spiral

going without properly relating the economy. No doubt you have to come and burden people with land tax, because there is no true guide in this economy despite the inflationary effect on the prices of things from overseas. One hon. member said that in Africa they do certain things, but in Africa you also get self help, in Africa you also get a contribution, and I want to see whether some of us have the courage of our convictions sometimes to do that. I am making no bones about it, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to disclose every cent I have and every cent I earn. I do not grudge anybody for what they earn, I expect that some of us are not as well off as others and I am not trying to burden anybody by saying that their salaries should be X or Y, but I like us to be quite sure as to what we are going to do and we need standards if we are going to pay these high salaries. I will emphasise that. By any standard \$67,000 a year, which is the effective amount of duty allowance plus salary, any part of the world is a high salary, so we would expect certain standards to follow from there. I make the point over again on them I would like to say that I consider these increases substantial, I consider them as adding still further to the inflatory trend of the economy. All the increases are substantial, and I want to see if this Government has the guts at any stage to truly have a prices and incomes policy that faces squarely not with the small man who is not getting a decent wage but with all the top people like the Government members themselves. They must be in the 60% bracket now, do not make any mistake about it, do not come back and tell me you belong to the people, you are the poor man's friend and that Henry Forde is making | political speeches, get it quite clear now that all of you are in the top bracket and are making just as much money as anybody else.

When we come in here and argue about \$15.00 being too much for an old age pensioner with a means test I suppose we feel quite smart, we will all go now to our particular homes feeling quite smart that we have voted ourselves increases, but I believe that the recommendation for an independent enquiry is necessary. I believe that unless Barbados and the West Indian territories look strongly at where they are going, starting from the top and knocking off the top a little more, we are not going to get anywhere, and I anticipate that unless there is a serious increase in taxation we cannot pay this without a devaluation. There must be a serious increase in taxation, it is not now a question of the man underneath squeezing, it is the top salaries, those of the Prime Minister, Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, Permanent Secretaries,

Attorneys-at-law, Doctors if you like, and every time a carpenter gets \$1.20 a day more the bills in other respects go up. Let me tell you that that is the problem with Barbados and Bills of this nature, the problem is not getting around and telling people that they are stooges for the white man, the problem is that the sincerity is tested when it comes to people's pockets. I have seen socialists turn capitalists when it came to looking after their own money. Bernard Shaw was the one who said that you can only afford to be a socialist when you are rich, and I think, Mr. Speaker, he was referring to the situation put before us by this Bill.

Hon. F.G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, as I say again on a matter of this nature we can make a | lot of political capital. I am justifying the salaries for Ministers not on constituents, not on what your political obligations call for, I am justifying the salaries of Ministers on the basis that the Ministers are worth for the jobs they perform the amount of salary they get. I am not putting in any element of having to do this for a constituency or having to back notes at the bank, I am saying that when a Minister is paid this amount of money he deserves every penny of it, and I am not arguing any sort of half-baked socialist theories. Millionaires have been friends of the working class and people who have professions and who can earn money have a

right to what they are entitled to must You work then and live in poverty to prove that you represent the poor? Because you have a profession and you are sacrificing your time, must you consider doing it for nothing to convince the poor that you are their friend? I certainly have no intention of living in poverty to satisfy the people of this or any other country that I am their friend. When I returned from Jamaica in 1966 to this Country I made a big sacrifice. I gave up a salary of £2,500 to come to this Country as a Minister for \$1,800, and my wife gave up a salary of £2,000 to work for £1,500. That is the sacrifice I made then and it can be proven. I have no power, I am in politics because I think I can make a useful contribution to my Country, and the moment the people do not think I can they can kick me out, I do not want any power. Do you have power when your job depends on the whims and fancies of a Prime Minister? The Prime Minister can reshuffle his Cabinet, change you, kick you out, elevate you, so where is the power of a Minister? If a job which you hold gives you certain privileges and rights you are bound to exercise those privileges and rights because you undertake to do the job, so there is no power in being a Minister. I hope that none of my colleagues have come into politics for power, I have come back to this Country at great sacrifice because I think that this Country gave me birth, I have a useful contribution to make and I hope I am making it in the interest of the people.

It is all right for the member for Christ Church West to talk because he makes his money in town in the Law Courts, he has now reached the stage where he can limit incomes for professional people, but you did not hear that ten years ago or even three years ago, but it sounds politically good and he wants to limit your salary, Mr. Speaker, because he has made it. I am not sure he has inherited anything or is looking forward to inheriting anything, but he has made it so he can afford to talk. 6.30 p.m

The only justification is that the Ministers deserve every penny, if they are doing the job properly. Let us make the people understand what politics is all about. The members of the Opposition come in here every Tuesday. When the cost of living goes up, the member for Christ Church says that the Government is causing inflation. Who is the Government? When the crime rate goes up, the Government is blamed and it is said that the Government has not created enough employment opportunity. When the employment opportunity is not enough the Government is being blamed. Bringing in cheap labour, according to him, in the Country as well as low wages paid in certain places, the Government is also blamed for that. Every single thing, except the rain that falls and the stars that shine, the Government is blamed for.

Now, a Minister is trying to run a developing country; he is looking around for avenues in! order to keep thing afloat; he is trying a create a good impression in the outside world; he is trying to improve the standard of living of the people: he is trying to raise the standard of every section of the community; he is trying to provide housing for them and some people will tell the public that to give a Minister \$2,000 - not tax-free - is too much. He knows that we are in the high bracket, and he knows that we will be carrying home about \$1,400, if so much, a month. As soon as you take out your contributory pensions scheme; you pay your party a certain amount; the income tax man takes out what he wants, and the Minister will get the balance. He knows about these things, but he is not fair to the people and the public to give the impression that a figure of \$2,000 means that a Minister is carrying home the money to spend on his wife and children, A Minister does not live in the bush, He has a wife and children; he has to live at a certain standard; he suffered and gained his profession like the hon. member for the City and the hon, member for Christ Church West, but he is telling the public that the figure of \$2,000 is such a colossal sum that the Minister can live in luxury. He has just said in one breath that the Minister is in the top bracket and he is living in luxury. He knows that if you are in the top bracket that you will have to

pay 50% or 60% tax on that figure. He knows that by the time you deduct party dues; compulsory insurance pensions scheme and so on, of that salary of \$2,000 no Minister can carry home more than \$1,300 or \$1,400. The hon. member knows that.

The hon. member talks about the Prime Minister. Well, if he has a private "dig" with the Prime Minister that is another matter. I should like him to tell me how much the Prime Minister will carry home from the salary he will get. (Asides.) I am referring to his basic salary, and it is not tax-free. The Governor-General does not do half as much of the entertainment that the Prime Minister does. (Asides.) The duty-free allowance is a different matter. You must let the people in this Country understand the position. The Prime Minister of this Country entertains Prime Ministers, fellow Ministers, distinguished people, distinguished Royalty, and so on, at his house. I am telling you that this amount comes from the Prime Minister's pocket.

Are you going to tell me that you grudge the Prime Minister of this Country of this amount because two and two make an amount that you can shout about? The hon. member said that he was not here when the Governor-General's salary was passed. The Prime Minister does more entertaining than the Governor-General in this Country. This is known, and I make no apology for saying that.

Mr. FORDE:

Sir, the hon. member must understand that there are other votes, and my speech did not include the votes that are available. There is a vote of \$50,000 for entertainment, and there is another vote for "Culloden Farm".

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The vote is there, but the Prime Minister does not entertain at his house from the Hospitality Vote. The Hospitality Vote is for other purposes. Are you going to tell the people of this Country that you grudge a Prime Minister who has provided jobs for them; housing; and he has raised the standard of people to the point where they have reached today? He has carried the Budget from \$26 million in 1961 to \$184 million in 1973, and the hon. member will walk around the Country and tell the people that the Prime Minister does not deserve \$2,800 a month! What more hypocrisy can that be? (Asides) I am nothing to do with Grantley. If he was foolish enough not to get enough to live on that is his business. He was stupid. Do you think it does not hurt me when I see Cox, Ronald Mapp and Garner who made contributions to this Country walking down Broad Street without grateful people paying tribute to them? Do you want us to be in that position in 1973? They were members of your party. Does it not hurt you? You should have a provident fund for members of your party to help people like Mr. Garner, Mr. Cox and Mr. Mapp. You should tell them about that, but do not tell the people that \$5,000 is too much. (Asides)

What private commission are you talking about? Let me give you some figures. You talk about the Sinanan Commission in Trinidad & Tobago. Relate that to what we have given in terms of increases. The Trinidad & Tobago Commission raised Prime Minister Eric Williams' salary from \$1,500 a month to \$3,300 per month. Let me hear the percentage on that. Why do you not mention that to the people when you are talking about an independent commission? The same Commission recommended for Ministers of State and the Leader of the Opposition a 100 per cent increase (from \$900 to \$1,800 per month). It was backdated for a whole year, and the Trinidad Government had to pay out \$728,752 in back pay. Why do you not tell the people the truth?

Let us go on to Jamaica, and see if there is any magic in a private commission. After Jamaica and Trinidad have set the example, do you still want a commission? Mr. Speaker, it is good for them to tell the people the truth. Do you think the people in Trinidad will grudge Dr. Williams for getting \$3,300 a month? Even in England they have recommended to increase the Prime Minister's salary from £ 1,400 to £2,000. You must work out the percentages. The Lord Chancellor's salary was increased from £14,500 to £20,000. (Asides)

The same Ashenheim Commission in Jamaica recommended for the Prime Minister an increase from £6,000 (Jamaican) to £10,000 (Jamaican). Work that out in percentages. From \$12,000 (Jamaican) to \$20,000 (Jamaican). (Asides) Everything is here in the Parliamentarian, do you not read it? It reads as follows:

"The Committee set up by the Prime Minister, Mr. Michael Manley, to investigate and make recommendations to the Government in respect of parliamentary salaries, produced its report on 20th September, 1972. The committee recommended increased salaries and allowances for all Members. The following is an outline of the recommendations in the report regarding salaries (a) and tax-free entertainment allowances (b) per annum. Existing salaries and allowances are given in brackets."

The Private Members used to get \$3,600 (Jamaican), and they are now getting \$7,000 (Jamaican). That is £3,500 roughly, making allowances for devaluation. They get a tax-free allowance, and whereas they used to get £300 they are now getting £500. The Prime Minister has gone from £6,000 to £10,000, from \$28,800 to \$48,000, and then he gets \$4,000 as tax-free allowance. They did not change the tax-free allowance.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. member will have a chance to speak. (Asides)

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am trying to convert pounds into dollars because some of you do not know the conversion rate of Jamaican dollars. (Mr. MOTTLEY "Read what you have there.") It has dollars. The Prime Minister gets \$12,000 (Jamaican). A Jamaican dollar is roughly \$2.40, making allowances here and there for devaluation. Two two hundred and forties will be a pound; therefore, divide it by 2 and you will get the amount in pounds.

What I am pointing out here is that the independent commission that you talk about has increased Dr. William's salary from \$1,500 to \$3300 a month, and the Ashenheim Commission in Jamaica has increased the Prime Minister's salary from £6,000 (\$28,800 roughly) to \$48,000. The Prime Minister of Barbados has been increased from \$24,000 to \$33,000, and all of you are now saying that it is too much for a man who has just introduced the Common Market, CARIFTA, and raised the standard of the people in this Island! 6.40 p.m.

He was a foundation member. He has worked for this community, he has raised the standard of living,

he has raised old age pensions, he has introduced through his Government free secondary education, free University education, he has established the sugar workers provident fund and a million and one other social benefits for the people of this Country, and the Opposition will go around telling people that to give a Prime Minister and Ministers \$2,000 a

month is too much. I say that I earn and deserve more than this, and I make no apologies to anybody in Barbados. If you had to work for £5,000, you would probably chuck up your profession, but mine is full time and I am in the office every day, and I get blamed and accused for things of which I am innocent, and that certainly is an element of a political hazard. This idea of going into politics for power, I do not think anybody goes in it for power. You do not put your ability along the line. You do not go into politics for power; power is incidental, because when you ran the election you thought you had power, but the people did not give you. When you ran for power, it back-fired because you did not get it. I ran and I assume every member of this side ran because we thought we had a policy to offer the people. If running a country means power, then we have got it because the people have given it to us.

I am not arguing finally, Mr. Speaker, on any basis that any element of my money is to be given to the people. I do not work for them; I work for my wife and two children. I do not work for my constituents except to try by my sincerity and otherwise to improve their lot. They do not belong to my family, and if I give them something it is because I feel they have to survive, but that is purely voluntary. I do not know about other members, but I earn, deserve and merit every penny of the money which the Government is asking to vote by this Bill, and I know that any conscientious Minister who does his job honestly is not being overpaid at that figure. This socialist nonsense that you have to live in poverty or below a certain standard to convince people that you love them I am not in. Anybody who thinks I must walk around and be poor with a patch in my knee to satisfy them \ that I am with them must understand that you do not help people by giving them false impressions, and I do not intend to subscribe to 1 that theory. That is all right for the member for Christ Church West; his bread is buttered now on both sides with a little jam thrown in.

Mr. FORDE; On a point of order, the hon. member is suggesting that I am giving false impressions, and that is unfair.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time. Will the Minister of Communications and Works kindly give way?

Mr. FORDE:

The hon. member is accusing me by his statement of not being honest in my views and convictions and that is not parliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is more ideological rather than personal.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I want to say finally that as far as I am concerned, I have not got anything out of politics and that is why I am trying to build the cemetery as fast as possible, because that seems to me to be the only way I am going to own a piece of land in this Country. I have nothing in the Country. Anything I have got in

this world I got before I went into politics. All I have got is a big overdraft at the Canadian Imperial Bank. That is all politics has done for me. I want to be frank. I say I have earned it, I deserve it and I deserve more from it from a grateful people if they appreciate what you are doing for them.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak like the hon. member because I am not a Minister, and therefore I can be more objective. I do not think you look at salaries from what you do. I am going to say that even a Minister does not work, that is a matter for the Prime Minister, and if a Minister does not work, he should get rid of the Minister. Now a Minister is not an ordinary employee that you pay as a servant working for you in an ordinary manner. I do not subscribe to the conception of ministerial salaries based on the man you personally employ. I agree that a Minister's salary or salaries should be in consonance with the community in which you live, so that when you look at ministerial salaries they should bear relationship to the community and the economy. I am not going to use the word that a Minister used the other day because after a time some Ministers begin to become too hackney about the economy in which we live, because the hon. member will pull them up when it comes to the salaries of Ministers.

I am a socialist and I am not afraid to be a socialist, but it does not mean that you cannot look at money in its true perspective. I am not a socialist who looks upon \$2,000 a month for a Minister as something out of step. I consider \$2,000 as a fair salary for Ministers, but they must also get the idea that a salary of \$18 or \$20 a week for a person in the Bay Land is not the way to get the economy going, and I do not think they will ever get me to agree that the only way to get employment for the people is to pay them these small wages, because you cannot in one breath say that \$2,000 is a reasonable salary for Ministers, but in the other the only two they would get is two followed by three noughts and you think in terms of \$20 a week. I am not in favour of that. I do not subscribe to the view that something is wrong with the economy. I am not going to catch at these things. I am not going

to be caught up in this incomes and policy business in which people are catching on to highly industrial community chat where they have high wages reaching the stage where people have bank accounts and there is no question of poverty, but where you have people in your community working for \$15, \$20, \$40 a week and 15% of your total labour force cannot earn more than \$60 a week, an incomes policy in this context is a different thing. I do not subscribe to it and I do not think I will live long enough to see that become a reality. I would say that you have to increase the wages of those who are lower down.

Mr. Speaker, how a Minister works is purely a matter for the Prime Minister. I do not consider \$2,000 for a Minister as princely because there are people in Barbados who are performing tasks which are infinitely not as responsible as a Minister's job who are earning more than \$2,000 a month, but maybe the Ministers will grow accustomed to some of those people earning such salaries and feel it is all right. In Broad Street there are people doing not ministerial jobs who are earning \$2,000 a month and nobody questions their earning it. In some of these firms in the city there are a lot of built-in things, and this is true of some of the new industries. I know a man in Atlantic Shores who was being paid something like \$US2,000 a month because he is an American, and they cannot pay him in Barbadian currency. He lives in a house, and some of these houses in Atlantic Shores are built at \$80,000 and \$100,000. There are some houses at Sandy Lane in St. James where there are selling two acres of land and you cannot build a house there unless you are going to spend \$100,000, and we have people in Barbados who have these sorts of things. I am not worried about that.

Now the title of Prime Minister is an office, and I am not discussing the salary of the Prime Minister from the point of view of the person because I am not concerned with that, but for the office of Prime Minister I do not consider \$33,000 a year or \$4,000 a month too much. As the hon. member for Christ Church West says, the total salary represents an income of about \$60,000 a year, but I do not consider that salary beyond the office of Prime Minister of Barbados. 6.50 p.m

I feel that if a man is Prime Minister of a country like this with the economy it represents that it is not too much. It is true that he has his own tastes as do all hon. members, but if I were Prime Minister I would not live at Culloden Farm I would want something better, I do not want a lot of wild bush around me, I am not a bush man, but it is a matter of taste. I am sure that when my successor comes to the Barbados Workers' Union I would have set standards for him to live up to which were not set by my predecessor, but that is because I am a different man, and I do not feel that if a man is holding a job of responsibility he should not be paid a salary that is in consonance with the work he has to do. If he is not doing the job properly get rid of him, but I do not consider these salaries too high, but there is too much comparison going on. Ministers compare themselves with Permanent Secretaries, and I hope after today they will stop this kind of comparison, Ministers must have the courage to say this is what a Minister's salary

should be.

I do not want to say anything more. Personally, I do not feel that \$2,000 a month is a bad salary for a Minister in the present circumstances of Barbados. I am not looking for a ministerial position nor do I have to play up to Ministers..... (Asides) Do you not call yourself a shadow Minister? If your party were in power you would be looking for a ministerial position, and I would not expect the hon. member for Christ Church West to be less than a Minister because he will be ministerial material. You do not possess ministerial material by sitting down in a Minister's seat, you have to be ministerial material before you reach there. You do not have to be a Minister to get in some other walk of life because it is a matter of what you are, and I do not consider that \$2,000 is anything you have to jump up in the air about. Nobody in Barbados can be a millionaire or a rich man on \$2,000 a month if he is a Minister, he would have to be doing something else because the allowances they give them here only amount to the income tax they have to pay. Do you think a man can work for \$2,000 and save \$2,000 unless he does not eat? He also has to be living somewhere that is worth some sort of money to maintain it, you cannot expect him to go down in an 18'x10' and wash his face on mornings by a half door with a piece of blue soap, he has to be living in a place more akin to the kind of salary he is drawing. These are some of the natural expenses that will go with a man's living. Ministers have to purchase their own motor cars and they have to maintain them, sometimes replace them, and I think that this \$2,000 is a good salary. If they had asked for \$3,000 I would not be annoyed about it because I do not consider it would be too much for them. That is my view.

I would like to see the day when we can; discuss these things in the light that people regard

certain offices in the island, and I will say this all over the world parliamentarians are treated as parliamentarians. I was glad the Minister of Communications came back from Jamaica. 7.00 p.m

I remember some years ago the cheap Barbadians started to talk about Sir Alexander Bustamante. I

will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Alexander Bustamante set an example in leadership for West Indians at a time when the West Indians were so colonial in concept and he was one of the first Premiers who lived in a suite when he went to the United Kingdom, The former Leader of the Labour Party who was the Premier of Barbados, had the old parsimonious, meek and humble way of begging somebody to give you a drop when you are going down the road, instead of allowing the Barbados Government to give him enough money to maintain a certain standard.

The same thing happens to the Ministers nowadays. They send you overseas on business and they give you \$25 (WI) to live in London or in Geneva, and they have the Ministers doing mathematics in order to find a way to get back home. Far from living in a suite, some of our Ministers cannot get past a room. I once went to Geneva with a Minister - not this Minister here -- and the first day after the Minister arrived his allowance proved inadequate and he had to move to another hotel. Instead of remaining in the hotel with me, he had to go to a hotel with a bathroom where they had to lift him out like a baby after he had taken a bath. This is the sort of thing that Barbadians want to subject their Ministers to. They have the idea that the Prime Minister does not want to spend this kind of money, and they have to be very strict/When other people can entertain and do certain things, the concept of the Barbadians will prevent them from coming forward.

Now, the Jamaican Ministers will be enjoying life in a big suite. If anyone comes to visit you at a hotel, you would not like him or her to be sitting on your bed or in a window, and you would not be able to go in the toilet in peace. Mr. Speaker, I can speak on this matter because I am free from these things. I represent an organisation that has agreed that this sort of thing is not good enough for people who have reached a position of leadership. However, the Ministers of Barbados have to endure and like certain things. When a Minister leaves Barbados he is the same as a Minister from West Germany or a Minister from the United States. The size of his country cannot reduce his importance.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the President of Mexico made it clear that he was not meeting people from the point of view of meeting them, but from the point of view that decisions would not be made over his head without his knowing anything about them and he would have to carry on the decisions. That is why I say that the salary paid to Ministers must reflect their importance. I would agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West if we had a situation in which only Ministers would be paid, or the people at the top wanted to be paid more. Anything that you can do for the people at the bottom you should do. If you want to set a proper standard, then you should let the Ministers know that they will be given a good salary for the jobs they are doing. You will also have to let the Ministers and the public know that when we come to consider the conditions of other people we would expect them to be treated the same way.

Now, the hon. member for Christ Church West was talking today like a Minister. He wanted to know if the economy could afford it. He is saying that now because the Ministers said that the economy of the Country could not afford them to give old age pensioners more than a certain amount. The argument of the other side is that if you cannot afford to give old age pensioners more than \$5.00 , then how can you afford to give Ministers such an increase? If you were trying to break somebody politically, you could say how could you give the Ministers and increase of 42% and you can only increase the old age pensioners from \$3.00 to \$5.00 a week?

I think the Ministers have enough sense to know that if you took what is paid to them and divided it among all of the old age pensioners they could not get as much as \$1.00 a week. However, if you took

the money paid to the old age pensioners and divided it among the Ministers the Ministers would be living in clover. We are not dealing in percentages now, we are dealing in quantity. Maybe the Prime Minister and the Ministers are responsible for this way of thinking. In the past, people had the idea that the community would save a lot of money if we had cheap Ministers. It was felt that you would be able to build 18,000 more houses per annum. You would not be able to build one more house from the money you save by not paying people properly. If you pay people properly to do a job, you are sure that you will be able to retain the services of those people who will not be thinking of the misery they have to undergo.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a believer in extravagance. If the salaries proposed were extravagant, I would not have agreed with them and I would not have participated in this debate. I do not consider that these salaries are extravagant. I consider that the salaries are reasonable. I do not like what is done in Jamaica. I do not believe in changing ministerial salaries whenever you change the salaries of people in the public service. I feel that ministerial salaries should be changed on the basis that when you change them they will be substantial and you will not have to change them each time you change the salaries in the public service. That is my concept, because it is not fair to have parliamentarians having their salaries changed whenever the salary of a Permanent Secretary is changed, and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I know that members on the other side of the House know that \$2,000 is not much. The hon. member for Christ Church West is a relatively young man. Some time ago I said that in this House there should be 5 Barbados Scholars, and I see the beneficiaries to support what I have said. I said in here that the beneficiaries are the ones who will get this kind of money. The hon. member is a man who works for more than \$2,000 a month. I do not know what is his income. The hon member and I used to be friends at one time, and he told me what was his ambition in so far as being one of the leading members at the Bar is concerned. He told me that he looked forward to being the highest paid member at the Bar. I believe that the only person who is making more money at the Bar than the hon. member is his colleague Mr. Jack Dear, who is also a planter, and it would be difficult to know how much he earns. The Ministers are only getting \$24,000 a year but if they became Ministers they would not know how to divide their time.

Now, the hon. member for the City is very fortunate. When you have been born that way it is not your fault. You do not dispossess yourself because you were born that way. These are the facts of life. I do not begrudge people who have been born in these happy circumstances. I feel that some of the people who have been born in such happy circumstances can sometimes make very valuable contributions to society. Nobody has made a better contribution to the society than the Kennedys, but they were not born poor. Some of them have made more valuable contributions than some of them who have been. born poor.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is time that we should worry the Ministers or worry the people in the Country by saying that Ministers are fleecing the community. I feel that if a Minister is not doing a good job you can get rid of him by way of the ballot box.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, one would never have thought that there would have been so much argument over these salaries today. Everybody over there will agree with me, especially the back benchers who did not know what the Ministers and the Prime Minister's salaries would have been, that they have not got enough but

they cannot get up and say that. (Asides.) If you want me to call the names of the members of your party who are dissatisfied I will call them for you now. (Asides.) There are only three back benchers and you are one. You are dissatisfied and you know that \$600 is not enough for you now that you have seen what the others are getting.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I never had any conversation with the hon. member. If I were dissatisfied, you would have heard me in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. 7.10 p.m.

He knows he is one among those who are dissatisfied, and that is why I go back and say that this short notice legislation is the reason for this. If the Government had come down earlier and given everybody notice of what was going to be done, I am sure there would be more agreement than is experienced in the House today. There are other members behind there who have come outside and said that they do not feel good now that they have seen what the Ministers are getting, but none of them has got the guts to stand up and say so, (Mr. WALCOTT: I have spoken.) You have spoken but you have not said that you are dissatisfied. You said they should get \$800 at least and others are dissatisfied with the amount which they have got. My argument has always been that the Government must take Parliament as a whole and not have the Cabinet doing things behind even its own members' backs.

I agree with the hon. member who has just sat down that if you are going to treat Parliament with any respect, you have to so start differently. You cannot have two-tier or three-tier legislation. I was just saying to my colleagues that I went to Africa and as a result of the cheese-paring way they send members abroad, we have had to leave a small box there because we could not afford to bring it, but the Ministers on the outside are saying that the Speaker is entitled to his little back-pay too, but he is not getting it. I would hope that those members of Cabinet who are sitting here will go back and let the Prime Minister know that some of his members are dissatisfied simply because they have heard only by the way what the salary increases would have been, but it is only today that it has been brought home to them in full force the disparity which has been made between Ministers and members of the same party. Do not worry about us over here. As the hon. member has said, he is a lawyer; the member for St. Peter is a professional printer, the member for Bridgetown is a lawyer, but the poor farmer is the worst off. This is causing a lot of dissatisfaction, and they want the interim payment, but none of them has the guts to get up and say so. If you want me to beg for the interim payment for you, I will do it.

Mr. Speaker, this foolishness of late legislation is really disrupting the proper functioning of Parliament. You cannot have Standing Orders which limit you to certain time to speak and on top of that bring down legislation at 12.30 p.m when the House sits at noon and ask for it to be done in all its stages. I repeat, it shows the ad hoc manner in which Parliament is being run these days, and I would hope that this is a perfect example to show to Government that even its own members are not in agreement with what is going on, and I hope we never see this sort of foolishness again. As the hon. member said, if you are going to adjust parliamentary salaries, it should be done in a different way. If you did not want to bring in outsiders, you could have formed a Select Committee of the members of Parliament itself, and there could be no excuse from either side because members of the Government as well as members of the Opposition would have been part of the Committee, the measure would come

here and we would have been out of here by 1 o'clock today.

I heard the Minister of Communications and Works said that they have eighteen and they will govern, but it seems that they are governing with thirteen, because five from that side have been left outside the piling of grace. I hope they will be brought in by the time they come back down. (Asides.) Oh, you brought in somebody from my side too! Now we know. I hope the Government will agree to having a Select Committee from the House to determine matters which affect the House if it does not want to bring people from outside, but I do not believe it is right for Cabinet to sit down and make decisions where they affect the lives of everybody. You cannot ask us to do it, and I think it is unfair.

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

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMDND; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. LOWE - 12.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. FORDE - 4.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in Clause 2 (5)(b) I beg to move that the word "negative" be deleted and the word "affirmative" substituted therefor. The Clause will now read, "The Minister responsible for Finance may by Order amend the Schedule by increasing or decreasing any of the salaries or allowances specified therein - (5) an order made under subsection (4)(a) shall be subject to affirmative Resolution." 7.20 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the whole thing is different from the one circulated here because in the one with the negative resolution it states that the Governor-General may by order do certain things, while in the other one it states the Minister responsible for Finance.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, is it the procedure that we go by the copy the Clerk has rather than the one each member has?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the correct copy of the Bill on the file states that the Minister responsible for Finance may by order amend the Schedule by increasing or decreasing any of the salaries or allowances specified therein. In the next paragraph it states that an order may under subsection (4) contain such supplementary provision as the Minister considers necessary or expedient for the purposes of the order and that it shall be subject to affirmative resolution. That is what I am going by. I beg to move that clause 2 as amended stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

A Voice: Divide.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of information, there is something we must get straight. We came in here today at 12.00, we were circulated with several cyclostyled copies of papers, and the members of the Opposition found that their copies differ from what the Leader of the House is reading. Unless he can show this Committee that what he is reading has been laid in the House we cannot discuss it. If the Government is going to amend documents in their possession, but the members of the Opposition have other documents, how will the House know what has been passed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There are now four hon. members on their feet. A division has been called for on the amendment.

Mr. BOLDEN; With all due respect to you, Mr. Chairman, if you want to correct it you have to delete something and move in an amendment. Unless an amendment has been circulated you cannot move it in.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I just want to make it clear that I have read the correct one on two occasions.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, what are the amendments to subclause (4)?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The question is that clause 2 as amended stand part. That is what I said from the beginning. A division was called for and I am yet to hear the division. 7.30 p.m.

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND and Hon. F. G. SMITH - 11.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. FORDE and Mr. HINDS - 3.

Clauses 3 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; and Hon. F. G. SMITH -11.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. FORDE and Mr. HINDS -3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill, as amended, be now read the third time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P.M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH; and Mr. LOWE - 12.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. FORDE; and Mr. HINDS - 3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill, as amended, do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH; and Mr. LOWE - 12.

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. FORDE, and Mr. HINDS - 3. 7.40 p.m.

THE PENSIONS (PRIME MINISTER) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item is a Bill to amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act, 1969.

As the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Pensions (Prime Minister) Act, 1969 (Act 1969-7) in order to provide for -

(a) housing allowance payable to the Prime Minister to be included in the amount on which Prime Minister's pension is to be calculated; and

(b) the payment to a person entitled to a Prime Minister's pension, at the option of that person, of a gratuity and reduced pension instead of a pension at the rate provided for in section 4 of that Act. Section 4(1) of the Act provides that subject to the provisions of subsections (2) and (3), the rate of Prime Minister's pension payable under this Act to any person shall be two-thirds of the highest annual rate of salary paid to such person at any time as Prime Minister.

(2) If the person to whom Prime Minister's pension is payable is appointed Governor-General, the pension payable to him when he ceases to be Governor-General shall be the pension specified in subsection (1) or, if any pension payable to him as Governor-General is higher, that pension shall be payable and he shall be entitled to no other pension in respect of service in the two offices.

(3) If a person to whom Prime Minister's pension is payable is in respect of a retiring allowance payable to him under the Retiring Allowances (Legislative Service) Act, 1969, only so much of the Prime Minister's pension shall be paid to him as will, when added to his retiring allowance, amount to two-thirds of the highest annual rate of salary paid to him at any time as Prime Minister.

This is really just to enable the Prime Minister to opt as in the case of members of Parliament or Ministers, and was an omission on that occasion. Hon. members will remember that only recently when dealing with the pension for the Governor-General we regularised that in order to enable the Governor-General to opt for a gratuity and reduced pension to be paid. This is the system adopted throughout the government service, and this Bill is merely regularising the position of the Prime Minister's pension and bringing it in line with the other pensions which we have agreed on here.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I remember rather vividly listening to the Minister of Finance some two years ago in Independence Square when he stated that he was not in favour of the salary increases then offered by his Government, and he went on to make the point that while he was away the members of his party got together with the backbenchers and voted him a big increase in salary and they also voted him a pension. He went on to say that he did not agree with the Pension Bill. It was reported in the newspaper the next day that if he had been returned to Parliament he would repeal this Act. What I would like to have

before voting for or against this is the assurance from the Leader of the House that the Prime Minister knows about this. We cannot really sit down and vote the Prime Minister these things when he does not want them, because it was his clear intention as indicated in Independence Square that if he was returned to Parliament he would repeal this Act, but rather than repealing it, we find that we are now increasing it and giving him a gratuity. The one way I will readily vote for this pension is if the Leader of the House can tell me that the Prime Minister will take the pension and go home tomorrow, other than that I will oppose it.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something which would enlighten my colleague. A man is entitled to change his mind as often as a woman changes her dresses. The Prime Minister at that time was speaking in an election year, and when election year passes, everything else happens. The Prime Minister realises that time has come to an end. I am not going to play stupid. The Leader of the House said in here today that whatever is done is done at Cabinet and the Prime Minister knows about it and agrees with it; so we can assume that when the Prime Minister was talking in Independence Square he was blowing hot air and talking politics, but when it comes to dollars and cents the Prime Minister is as conscious as anybody else of what money means and what you can do with it, because I am sure that the Prime Minister was Chairman at Cabinet when these were gone through, and he would have appreciated that his pension and housing allowance was being worked out, and I am sure he is up there now waiting for the telephone to ring and be informed that everything has gone through. What worries me about this whole thing is that you come to Parliament and the Prime Minister stands up and talks about the civil servants being an army of

occupation descending upon the Treasury like the Isrealites coming down. He talks about secondary school teachers who are holding the children of this country to ransom begging for a little bit more, but all that is political talk. He went on the radio and said that he had advised the Governor-General that he had dismissed the Hon. Minister of Agriculture simply because there was money talk. All this leaves us to wonder how serious are the speeches we hear. But the Minister of Agriculture goes back into the Government. Times have changed and money is flowing, and the Hon. Prime Minister will be taken care of. I am not saying he should not be well taken care of; I am not going to be hypocritical to say that the Prime Minister must not be well taken care of, but what I want to say here, and I want Hansard to record it for posterity, is that the Prime Minister must not give the Country to understand that he is against increases for everybody including himself and then come back and sit at Cabinet, as we have been told by the Leader of the House, and approve sufficient sums to make him comfortable when he has retired from public office. 7.50 p.m.

That is the way I look at it. If you are going to make yourself comfortable, if you have served the people of this Country and the Cabinet or Parliament decides that you should be recompensed, let it be clearly said. Go out on the public platforms and tell the people exactly what you mean, but do not attack the teachers or the civil servants at the same time your Cabinet is making sure that you have a proper existence, not subsistence, after you have retired from Government office. That is what we must get straight. I am not going to say that I would like to see any Prime Minister of this Country after he has retired from office begging in Broad Street or having to go back to James Street if he is a lawyer and hustle among the young boys for a dollar, but you must not mislead the public, the same time you make provisions for yourself you should make provisions for members of your own party who are not able to stand up in here today and say they disagree with what has been given, at the same time voting for what

is given to you. The Prime Minister said in the budget speech that he wanted the members of Parliament to know there would not be any rise this year for them, but within six months of that I heard that negotiations were being made between the Union and the Government for certain civil servants and for other sectors, and then I heard about these increases. If you know you are hamstrung in such a manner that you have to give an increase, go and tell the people early, it is no good the Minister of Communications and Works coming down here foaming at the mouth telling us how much Ministers are worth and how many things they have to do, while at the same time you are saying you are entitled to so much money and the Prime Minister saying that everybody is descending on the Treasury. Let the Prime Minister come down and tell the public at large that everybody will get an increase, including himself, therefore pull your belts tighter and pay the taxes. You either want a Government and Ministers with reasonable pay or all of us will have to sacrifice something, but do not mislead the Country at one time of the year talking about a tax free budget and a no-nonsense budget and you are not going to increase the gap between the rich and the poor, and at another time doing exactly that.

I am not arguing about whether the Prime Minister's salary is enough or not, but I am arguing about the insincerity with which the politicians get up in the market square and tell the people that Parliament voted them salaries above what they wanted and then the Leader of the House can tell you all these have been agreed to by Cabinet and that the Prime Minister is present at Cabinet meetings. I do not agree with that and for that reason I will have to vote against it.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, the principle of paying pensions and retiring allowances to members of Parliament has been accepted, and far be it from me to seek to remove it, but I think in this Bill for the first time one is seeing a departure from the method of calculating the pensionable emoluments of a member of this Hon. House. Nowhere in the Retiring Allowances and Pensions Act of 1969(1969-8), I believe it is, does one find duty allowances any other allowances being included in the meaning assigned to the word "salary", and I take it therefore that if we pass section 2 of this Act we are setting the Prime Minister apart in this respect from other members of Parliament. I have always understood that the Prime Minister is *primus inter pares* and certainly it seems to me that there is no principle which could justify the addition of \$9,600 of today's earnings on to his basic salary of \$33,600 to give him a retiring allowance of two-thirds plus a gratuity which must work out in today's money at \$100,000. The housing allowance is calculated at \$9,600 per annum, and under the Act which we have just passed to increase it he may either take the allowance or remain in Culloden Farm or in anywhere else tax free, and if he so remains it is not included as income for the purposes of taxation. (A Voice He is getting the same as the Chief Justice). I do not care whether he is getting the same as the Chief Justice, because in my view there can be no distinction between the Ministers and the Prime Minister on this matter even although you have some Ministers who would sit down and let it pass because they cannot open their mouths. If it is good enough to and on emoluments to one person it should be good enough to add on emoluments to another person. There are some people who cannot speak out against a party, but when I have a conscience I will speak out, and that is the position as far as I am concerned. In my view this is an unfortunate distinction that members have sat down and agreed to, and somebody should have the guts to get up and say it in Barbados today.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member always tries to pull me out, but it is a question of putting the Prime Minister on a similar footing as the Chief Justice and officials of that high calibre.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. FORDE:

I hope the Hon. Leader of the House for whom I have the greatest respect - he has been so close to my family for several years - that I would not think that he is not of that high calibre. I would never think of him that he should be put on a lower status, so I really do not think that justifies the argument at all, but I go further, Sir. One of the charges being levelled in this advancing Country on this advancing Manifesto in these advancing years is the method with which one advances one's self interest, and let it be clearly understood that this is a bit of advancing self-interest legislation that has come down to the House. I do not want it ever said in this Country that it was not voted and brought in here with the approval of the Minister himself, because we are told we must tell our constituents and the public the truth, but it appals me to see that people can go to a country and say they would repeal the Pensions Act, it is unsatisfactory and they do not want it and you come in here.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order, I have had enough, use your right to reply. Continue.

Mr. FORDE:

I am happy to be told that the Prime Minister never said this. In fact, I would be glad to hear it from his own mouth because the records would be set straight. We know that the journalists have been blamed for almost everything under the sun, but in my view the principle of this is wrong, and there is no need for hurrying this before Parliament unless Parliament has had an opportunity properly to look at everybody else, and this is the point we are making all afternoon. 8.00 p.m.

It is this haphazard form of looking at salaries and this haphazard way of treating people differently which is very unfortunate. It is a new invention in the history of this Country in doing this sort of thing with parliamentary salaries. Now, reference was made to the former Premier of this Country and the now deceased former Prime Minister of the West Indies Federation, and I am glad to hear it acknowledged today that, when it comes to matters of this nature, nobody could say that he was self-serving. History will prove how much advancement we have really made when we have finished. You can fool a lot of people for a lot of the time, but you cannot fool history all the time, no matter how long has been too long. too long.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I am a bit hoarse. I had no intention of taking part in this debate today at all from the very beginning, because the whole matter to me, was a bit sickening. I agreed with the Bills; I voted for them; and I have no apologies to make for this, but the way in which the debate has continued all day has been sickening. We hear all sorts of foolish statements by people ascribing certain statements to the Prime Minister, which he did not say in the first place. In the second place.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir,

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

There is no point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has risen on a point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is accusing me impliedly of ascribing statements to the Prime Minister which he did not make. The Prime Minister said in Independence Square that he was going to repeal the Pensions Act and it was also reported in the Advocate newspaper, but not once did the Prime Minister call a Press Conference to say that what the Advocate contained was not true. I have the clipping here and you can see it, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am saying that you are ascribing these things. What is the point of order? You are talking all kinds of foolishness. You are talking as if this is some kind of selective way of treating a Bill, and that this is a novel way of treating the matter. There is no person who is getting a housing allowance whose pension is not calculated on that housing allowance. If the hon. member has no knowledge of that, then let him get up and say so, but do not get up and make generalisations and expect people to accept

them. It is a fact that everybody in the civil service who is getting a housing allowance will have his pension calculated on that housing allowance. The Chief Justice and all civil servants who are entitled to a housing allowance will have their pensions calculated on that housing allowance. No Minister is drawing a housing allowance, so do not try to make people believe that there is some sort of discrimination here, and that people are looking after self-interest. Those are the very words the hon. member used. The Chief Justice is not a civil servant, but for certain purposes under the Constitution he is treated in a certain manner. I am sick of hearing the nonsense I have been hearing this afternoon.

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

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; IVfr, HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, and Mr. LOWE - 12.

NOES:

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. FORDE; Mr. BOLDEN, and Mr. HINDS - 4.

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. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed. Clause 2 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH. I beg to second that,

Mr. BOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, is Clause 2 really right? It states that salary means the total housing allowance whether or not paid. This seems to be a contradiction of the English language. I would say that it is wrong and it should be deleted. I do not see how you can call it a salary and a housing allowance at one and the same time. I should like the Hon. Leader of the House to explain the matter to me. It has to be one or the other. If you are going to pay a pension on a housing allowance this is going to set a dangerous precedent.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, the Chief Justice gets it, and civil servants get it.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, every civil servant is entitled to ask as from now that his housing allowance be computed as part of his salary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like the hon. member to understand that he cannot challenge the principle of the Bill at this stage.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Are we not in Committee, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am entitled to talk on Clause 2 and say why I feel that it is wrong. I am asking for clarification of this Clause. 8.10 p.m.

Hon. F. G, SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the point is that this is the present legal position with whoever gets a housing allowance. The only reason why Ministers do not get theirs pensionable is that our compounded allowance is not broken down into housing, entertainment or travelling. If we took the \$800 that Ministers get and divided it into \$500 for housing, \$200 for entertainment and \$100 for travelling, it would also be pensionable, but since the Ministers do not get a housing allowance as such, that is where

the distinction comes in, because the only person who is provided with a house in the entire Cabinet is the Prime Minister himself, so that the time will obviously come when Ministers will have to get a housing allowance. That explains why ours is not pensionable and therefore it is no big departure. It is that the Prime Minister alone is permitted a house by the Country, and consequently, a house must have some housing value, and Ministers do not get housing or theirs would be pensionable also. There is no magic to it.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, on Clause 2 there is no magic to it. Government has eighteen seats and whatever they decide they are going to bring down here. The justification for this is that because civil servants get it, they must get it, not an examination of whether the concept is right or wrong, but an acceptance of the situation. I do not mind how many Crown Princesses get up. A lot of people get near the Crown and never get it. I would like to make it absolutely clear that I have not heard one word from any of the Ministers who have spoken that has explained this satisfactorily to anyone. Just to characterize it as a big set of nonsense is not satisfactory. The principle of it is wrong. The point is that when you are dealing with the salaries of Ministers and what not, you are making a complete distinction in this respect, and you are going to continue making distinctions time and time after, and merely to say that the civil servants get it or the Chief Justice gets it is not satisfactory. One must look at the principle.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, the principle can only be challengeable when it is related to the Prime Minister.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of personal explanation, if the Minister will understand that if he has not got a conscience, I can challenge it in respect of the Chief Justice, himself or anybody else. If he is afraid to talk out, I can talk out.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

If the hon. member is asking a question, that is a question, not a matter of personal explanation. Does the hon. member understand the Standing Orders and what Parliament is about? Can a question be a matter of personal explanation? What kind of foolishness are we getting to? The hon. member does not understand what is going on. We have gone through this with the civil service, we have gone through it not only for the Chief Justice, but for all the Judges, but the only time it is challenged is when it comes up for the Prime Minister, and then there is a principle at stake.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND and Hon. G. G. FERGUSON - 8.

NOES:

Mr. FORDE; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. HINDS - 3.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND and Hon. G. G. FERGUSON - 8.

NOES:

Mr. FORDE; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. HINDS - 3.,

Clause 5 was called and passed.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON and Mr. LOWE - 9.

NOES:

Mr. FORDE and Mr. HINDS - 2. 8.20 p.m.

The question that the Bill do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON and Mr. LOWE -

9.

NOES:

Mr. FORDE and Mr. HINDS - 2.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 2

A Resolution for the sum of \$25,460 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution deals with the interim payment, and the Second Schedule sets out that -

An interim increase on the salaries paid to the following persons in respect of 1972-73 shall be paid on the basis of \$40 a month on the first \$200 a month of salary and \$10 a month on each succeeding \$100 ; a month or part thereof of salary, but not exceeding a total payment of \$120 a month:-

Ministers Parliamentary Secretaries Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary.

The interim payment shall be a pensionable emolument in the case of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

The Addendum sets out in detail the position, and it reads as follows:

"At the time of the decision in 1972 to revise the wages and salaries of full-time public servants with effect from 1st April 1973, it was also decided to grant an interim increase in pay to such employees in respect of the year 1972-73. The basis of such interim pay increase to the monthly paid employees was as follows:-

On the first \$200 of monthly

salary \$40.00 a month

On each successive \$100

or part thereof of

monthly salary \$10.00 a month

Subject to a maximum total

payment of \$120 a month

The amount of the interim payment would be a pensionable and taxable emolument.

It is proposed that a similar pensionable and taxable interim pay increase on the same basis, should be granted to Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, and the Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister in respect of the salaries paid to them in the financial year 1972-73. In the case of the Personal Assistant and the Secretary, whose emoluments are not pensionable, the interim pay increase will not be pensionable.

This Resolution seeks the provision of the amount required to make the interim pay increase."

The position is that it is felt that it should be paid only to full time public officers or Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries but in truth and in fact we have been discussing it and it is the feeling of many that this interim pay should be made to all members of the House so that we will be given some sort of undertaking to have the matter further investigated.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that this is a matter which should be done in Committee of Supply, and that we can do it after the suspension for dinner.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something on the motion for suspension. We are coming back to deal with a money resolution which as I have said before is the basis of discontent. I said before that this question of salaries has been done in a slipshod manner.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

That has nothing to do with the suspension of the House. Nobody knows what will happen when we return and I am not going to entertain any more on that. What we do when we come back is entirely left to the Leader, nobody knows, and I myself do not know.

The question that the sitting be suspended for three quarters of an hour was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 8.30 p.m.

On resumption-Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

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 on a Resolution for the sum of \$25,460 in connection with the interim payments.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74, No. 2

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY DOLLARS to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates

1973-74, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 2 which form the First Schedule to this Resolution for the purpose of making payment of interim increases on the salaries paid in 1972-73 to the persons mentioned in the Second Schedule on the terms and conditions specified in the said Second Schedule.

The Second Schedule states that an interim increase on the salaries paid to the following persons in respect of 1972-73 shall be paid on the basis of \$40 a month on the first \$200 a month of salary and \$10 a month on each succeeding \$100 a month or part thereof of salary, but not exceeding a total payment of \$120 a month, and it is to be paid to -

Ministers

Parliamentary Secretaries
Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister
Secretary to the Personal Assistant
and Parliamentary Secretary

The interim payment shall be a pensionable emolument in the case of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries.

Then it goes on to explain the reason why it is being paid. It is to put officers in line with what was done in the case of public officers a little while ago as set out in the Addendum. Probably, I had better read the Addendum. It states:

"At the time of the decision in 1972 to revise the wages and salaries of full-time public servants with effect from 1st April 1973, it was also decided to grant an interim increase in pay to such employees in respect of the year 1972-73. The basis of such interim pay increase to the monthly paid employees was as follows: -

On the first \$200 of monthly

salary \$40.00 a month

On each successive \$100

or part thereof of

monthly salary \$10.00 a month

subject to a maximum

total payment of \$120 a month

The amount of the interim payment would be a pensionable and taxable emolument."

The position is that this is supposed to be based on full-time employees of the Government, but we have had a certain amount of lobbying and discussion among ourselves on this matter. We will pass this Resolution as it stands, but I have given an undertaking to have this matter further investigated. It is felt that members of Parliament are not part-time but full-time Members of Parliament, and that all members of Parliament should receive the interim payment. Many of us feel that way including myself, and I have given the undertaking that I will certainly have this matter regularised. Of course, I cannot change it now, because I am not the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister. In any case it will have to be done by way of a Cabinet decision, and the Cabinet will have an opportunity to reconsider the matter.

In view of the fact that certain part-time officers are receiving and have already received their interim payment, it would seem that in order to do what is equitable, fair and right, members of Parliament who are by no means part-time Officers but full-time members of Parliament, this matter should be revised and regularised. I do not think I need say any more, but I would be willing to answer any questions which might be raised. If we are to pay increased salaries to members of Parliament, then in like manner we should see that the interim payment is paid. All members of Parliament are here as equals; all have been elected, and all are full-time members of Parliament for five years, and they should all have equal consideration.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to second this motion, and I should like to add my weight to what the Leader of the House has said. I too feel that members of the House should receive interim payment, and when the matter is referred to Cabinet, I shall give it all the weight at my command to see that this inequity is adjusted.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to what has been said by the Leader of the House and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and I am glad to find that both of those hon. members have been converted since, perhaps, the last Cabinet meeting. It is certain from what both of them have said on this Resolution, that something was lacking in understanding and interpreting the full meaning of membership of this Honourable House.

We believe and we are sure that you, Mr. Chairman, are convinced beyond a shadow of doubt that each and every hon. member elected to this Chamber has been elected a full member of this Honourable House. Whether we meet one day a year, one day a week, a member is on call 365 days a year, and he is

on call 365 days for 5 years. If a leap year comes in, then there is an extra day to be added as the case may be. It means therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the whole matter of salaries revision with respect to Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, and all officers mentioned herein - the whole basis has been, more or less, that an ad hoc method has been employed, and this cannot find any measure of satisfaction where we on this side are concerned. We have too much at stake in a situation such as this.

If we were to look at the Addendum Sir, you will see that even the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister, according to the Addendum is not regarded among the Parliamentary Secretaries. In the penultimate paragraph of the Addendum it is stated:

"It is proposed that a similar pensionable and taxable interim pay increase, on the same basis should be granted to Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister, and the Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister....."

This makes us believe that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister is not a Parliamentary Secretary. 9.25 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of explanation, the Secretary there is Secretary to the Personal Assistant and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. It is one person who is Secretary to both people.

Mr. HINDS:

I thank the Minister for his explanation, but I believe that the Civil Servants who drafted this Addendum know where they should place their commas and an occasional semi-colon. In other words, they should know how to punctuate these matters with a view to removing any element of doubt where members of Parliament are concerned. However, Sir, the point is that this Resolution set out to make provision for the paying of an interim increase even to non-pensionable officers. One must appreciate the position of that type of person in relation to that of an elected member of Parliament; but the Resolution makes provision for paying that type of officer an interim payment. If that is the case why is it that this type of classification, this discrimination is affixed to members of Parliament who are not Ministers or Parliamentary Secretaries and such as are mentioned in this Resolution? We are glad to find that the Leader of the House has given his undertaking to go into the matter further, and we also want the Leader of the House to give us the undertaking that he will go into the matter to see that the salaries now paid to members of Parliament who are not Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries bear some sort of relation to the type of revision that has been given in respect of other categories such as we have had to deal with here today.

Mr. Chairman, there is no point having pockets of dissatisfaction looming over us; there is no point carrying on when we ourselves do not feel that what is taking place has been given the dispassionate and careful examination it merited, and I must say that we have heard enough to justify any claim we might make of the haste that is thrust upon us from time to time in matters of this sort, and I am sure that the Leader of the House will not, after he has carried out further investigation, come back and tell us that we are ending up exactly where we are today, because I will fight this as hard as I have ever fought on any other matter touching the poor taxpayers of this Country. I do not speak with reference in this instance to the Leader of the Opposition at all because he has been looked after, but I must say that it cannot be said that this Resolution set out at any point to make us feel happier or to give us the type of security. If we

were to allow ourselves to be given that kind of designation, what are we laying ourselves open to in the eyes of the public that we are part-time workers? We have got to give some sort of consideration to what is full time and what is not with respect to members of Parliament, and if we can address our minds to these brief points, I am sure we will end up somewhere I hope to the lasting benefit and credit of this Honourable House, and I must say that what I feel is lacking at Cabinet level is that there are apparently not men who are strong enough to stand up and tell the Minister of Finance exactly what is. We on this side of the House have no representation at Cabinet level and cannot expect any except.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, the allotted time as given by the Standing Orders.....

Mr. HINDS:

The Chairman knows his duties and he is advised by the Clerk.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will hear the point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am drawing to your attention the time the hon. member has been speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have already notified the hon. member,

Mr. HINDS:

I believe the hon. member wants me to wind up, and I will do so. I believe the hon. member who has just sat down will at the next Cabinet Meeting give his own backbenchers and members of the Opposition the kind of consideration they really deserve and see to it that the revision that has taken place in respect of salaries at this end bear some relation to the type of revision and provision that has been made for him as a Minister of Government.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be long, but again I think I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say that this measure is indicative of the approach taken by Cabinet in looking at the whole issue of salaries for members of Parliament. I find it strange that I can hear from the Leader of Government Business today in this House that he will go back to Cabinet and ask that this matter be investigated further. I cannot understand if the Government was serious when it was looking at the question of salaries that it could agree on an interim payment for members of the public service who are full time and part-time and can exclude from its consideration, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and Mr. Chairman of Committees, even if one does not want to take the Opposition into its consideration. \

9.35 p.m.

Something is wrong if this is the manner in which the Government is approaching its duty by looking at the revision of salaries, and it bears out very strongly the argument which I made, that there is no

proper investigation done in these matters. When one comes down to the small issue of interim payment you take three officers of Parliament who with respect, if I may say so, perform. Certainly Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Deputy Speaker occasionally, perform as well as any Minister of Government that I have seen and they carry the same parliamentary duties, and it is not fair that the Government should continually get away with this way of dealing with the people's business, on nice platitudes, on fair promises on all sorts of undertakings. It does not matter to me personally one wit whether or not there is an interim increase, I would like members to make this quite clear, and I do not have to come in here and argue any increase or decrease in salary on the basis of my personal position, but what I am going to argue about and will continue to argue about regardless of whether it comes from that side or this side is that one should look at a situation on the basis of principle. You cannot tell me that you have had all the time to consider this and you are going to come in here and take the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees or the Deputy Speaker, not to mention the other members of Parliament, and ignore them and then get up and tell me you are going back to Cabinet as though we need somebody to go cap in hand begging for us. Let us make it quite clear I do not want any member of the Cabinet to go back to the Prime Minister or the Cabinet begging for anything for me.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, this was based on full time employment as Ministers have to work, specified hours every day, and it was for that reason not that there is no basis, but on further consideration it would seem as though all members of Parliament should receive this interim pay, so it is not a question of anybody going cap in hand begging for anything.

Mr. FORDE:

The whole consideration of this could not have been based with respect on any full time basis. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central made it quite clear that they looked at part-time officers in the civil service. The Addendum to this resolution seems to spell out the basis on which this is being advanced to the House, that it is based on the same consideration that was given to the Civil Service. I have the greatest respect for the Leader of the House, but I think he has tried to put his side of the case in as good a light as possible, and I do not think any hon. member should be scared to say it is wrong, but it is wrong and it would be remiss of me if I sat down and voted for this Resolution. If the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees can wait, the Ministers can wait and bring it properly before the House, there is no hurry about this. I will be voting against this too on a matter of principle. The Government must understand principle sometimes.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I would like to express the view that I could not believe there was a differential in this matter. Personally I do not think there is any justification at all for interim pay for anybody, but the basis for interim pay came about because the Barbados Workers' Union negotiated with the Government, and the Barbados Workers' Union told the Government that all the money which was paid should have been paid from 1st April, 1972, and the Government said the cash position was such that they could not carry the bill from 1972. As a compromise it was agreed that an interim payment should be made but it has absolutely nothing to do with the basis of the person's employment, whether they work part-time or full time. I would resign from Parliament if you talk about part-time, I am not any part-time person in Parliament, I am not a Minister but you cannot be a part-time parliamentarian, that has absolutely no meaning to me. I am not putting out a smut lamp or a gas lamp, you cannot have a Parliament of all Ministers unless you have a bogus Parliament so I am no part-time parliamentarian. I have to meet the

Prime Minister of Denmark tomorrow. He is a Trade Unionist, I think, and he is here on holiday, so do not tell me that when I meet him I am meeting him as a part-time parliamentarian. Let it be made quite clear, Ministers are elected in here like anybody else, and when it comes to the question of part-time some Ministers can blow a comb for the amount of work some of them do, but do not tell me that a parliamentarian is part-time and therefore you are only holding on till the real man comes along.

I feel if there is any justification - and I do not believe there is for anybody - but if you brought down something for Ministers it would be niggardly to come down with a parliamentary salary structure and say to one he will have to be part-time and to the other he is full time. Parliamentary Secretaries are not full time people they work with Ministers, so I do not see that this could be any question of part-time or full time, this is an error of judgement on somebody's part. It would be ridiculous to say the least, to think of the Speaker or the Chairman of Committees as part-time people. As a parliamentarian the Chairman of Committees works harder in Parliament than any other person because a lot of work goes on in Committee, so in Parliament I do not see how you can have a structure like this.

I feel it was an error of judgement to have a situation like that which was not all inclusive, because to have a situation like that and make a distinction on the basis of some getting interim payment and others not getting, if this happens in the public service the Government would have a problem on its hand, so I hope that this error will be corrected because it is a serious error of judgement to make this distinction between full time as we are in the House now and part-time. I would hate to think that people are going to look at parliamentarians in the light of being part-time, because I do not know when we are full time politicians and when we are part-time politicians. The question that the resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows: 9.45 p.m.

Ayes: Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. G. L. EASTON and Mr. HOPPIN -11.

Noes; Mr. FORDE and Mr. HINDS - 2.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LOWE -13.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. WALCOTT, and Mr. LOWE -13.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. WEEKES; Mr. MORRISON; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. HOPPIN; Mr. WALCOTT and Mr. LOWE -13.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1973." 9.55 p.m

THE LEAVE PASSAGES (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Order seeks to amend the Leave Passages Order, 1966, in order to make appropriate adjustments to the qualifying salary points as a result of the recent revision of salaries and wages. The Order to which this Resolution relates and which has been signed by the Minister responsible for Establishments, the Prime Minister, says that the Minister in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949 makes the following order

"The Order may be cited as the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order 1973." Paragraph 2 of the Leave Passages Order, 1966 hereinafter referred to as the Principal Order is amended (A) in the definition "minimum tour of service and tour of service" (1) by inserting immediately after the words "primary school" appearing in paragraph (a) thereof the words "or the Deputy Head Teacher of a comprehensive school", and (2) by deleting the words "secondary modern

school" appearing in paragraph (b) thereof and substituting the words "comprehensive school" and (b) in the definition "Qualifying salary" (1) by deleting "seven thousand two hundred" appearing in paragraph (a) thereof and substituting "nine thousand", and (2) by deleting the words "five thousand seven hundred and sixty" appearing in paragraph (b) thereof and substituting the words "seven thousand two hundred". Paragraph 3(1) of the principal Order is amended by deleting the words "five thousand seven hundred and sixty" appearing therein and substituting the words "seven thousand two hundred".

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE PENSIONS (PENSIONABLE OFFICES) ORDER, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the final item is a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1973.

As the Addendum sets out, this Resolution seeks to give effect to the Order entitled "The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1973" which has been made by the Governor-General,

In accordance with the provisions of section 2(1) of the Pensions Act, 1947 (1947-20), it is necessary for the Order which declares pensionable offices to be approved by the House of Parliament.

The Order has been signed by the Governor-General who in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 2(1) of the Pensions Act, 1947, makes the following Order:

"The Order may be cited as the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order 1973." The offices set out in Schedule A of the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1973; (b) paragraph (c) of the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1973 and (c) the First Schedule to the Judges (Remuneration and

Pensions) Act, 1969, are declared to be pensionable offices. The Pensions (Pensionable Offices) Order, 1970, is revoked.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that,

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

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in accordance to the undertaking given in relation to giving oral replies to questions which were raised, I think there are only two hon. members in their places, but the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance has a reply which he can lay at this stage. We can deal with whatever we can provided the members are present. We will take full advantage to keep our promise and see that oral replies even this late stage are given with the Leave of the Speaker

QUESTION RE BEL AIR ESTATE

Mr, SPEAKER:

Question No. 86 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. George North.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister: 1. Would the Mnister state if the estate of Bel air in St. George which was offered for sale is now the property of this Government? 2. If owned by Government, would the Government (1) let it be known to whom the rents are to be paid, and (2) appoint someone to outline each tenant's boundaries to him?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the reply is as follows

"The estate of Bel Air has been acquired by Government and an agent has been appointed to collect the rents on behalf of the National Housing Corporation;

A development plan for the area is being prepared and the boundaries of tenants will be firmly fixed as soon as possible."

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member, I should like to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 71.

QUESTION RE TENANTRY ROADS IN ST. GEORGE

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 83 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. George North.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works: Will the Minister, when scheduling his 1973-74 tenantry roads programme, give priority to the following areas in St. George - Applewaites' Lower & Upper Tenantry, Bourne's Village, and Cole Hole?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

Consideration will be given to the inclusion of the areas mentioned in the 1973-74 road programme. It is not feasible to give a priority rating until all outstanding requests have been taken into consideration.

Hon. P. M GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to Parliamentary Question No. 79 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy who is not in his place is ready, and I seek leave to lay this reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I understand that the replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 74, 77 and 67 are also ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I think those are the ones which were printed and circulated and it was asked that they be put back on the Order Paper. The point is that the files

giving the background to those answers would not be with us today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The answers to Questions Nos. 74 and 77 will be reserved, but I understood that the answer to Question No. 67 was ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 67 is ready and I seek to lay it in the absence of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That seems to conclude Question Time.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th May, 1973, at 12.00 noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 10.07 p.m.