

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, 6th February, 1973.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12 noon 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); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, (Temporary Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read,

Messrs. E. D. MOTTLEY and W. C. B. HINDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

Mr. SPEAKER:

For the information of the Honourable Chamber, I have received a letter from the Accountant General which reads as follows-

No. A.2(l)/1973/48 Auditor General's Office,

Barbados. 31st January, 1973.

Sir,

Statements of Account of the Accountant

General and Appropriation and Revenue

Accounts for the year 1971-72

Section 26 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act, 1964, as amended by the Financial Administration and Audit (Amendment) Acts, 1967, and 1969, provides that the Auditor General shall report annually as soon as possible and not later than the last day of December following the

close of the financial year the results of his examination of the accounts of the Island. Such report shall be addressed to the Speaker of the House of Assembly and a copy transmitted to the Senate for information.

2. I have to inform you that it has not been possible to submit the relevant report by the end of December, 1972, inasmuch as the account and statements to be transmitted to me by the Accountant General, as required by Section 10(2) of the Principal Act, as amended, have not yet been received.

3. I should also mention that: -

(i) there are a few revenue as well as appropriation accounts for the year which are still outstanding; and

(ii) the account and statements due to be transmitted by the Accountant General by the end of July 1970 in respect of the financial year 1969-70 were transmitted partially (that is, only one each of six copies was received) during September, 1972, while the account and statements in respect of the year 1970-71 have in no way been received.

4. I consider that you should be made aware of the position for the information of Parliament.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

G. B. Brandford, Auditor General.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minutes of this Chamber for Tuesday, 23rd January, 1973, have been circulated, and if there are no dissenting voices, the Minutes will be confirmed.

There being no dissenting voices, the Minutes are duly confirmed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of the following-

A Resolution to grant the sum of \$16,546 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73 No. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, I beg to give notice of the following:-

A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land near Bottom Bay, St. Philip, for the purpose of providing an access road and a car park to the Beach at Bottom Bay.

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on the Act to repeal the Dental Registration Act, 1923.

I am also asking for leave to have this Report adopted later in today's Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there are no dissenting voices, permission will be granted to deal with it.

There being no dissenting voices, permission is granted.

Hon C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister intends making a very important statement later today, and I am asking leave for this to be done later today.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave is being sought on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister for him to make a statement later today, and if there are no objections, leave will be granted.

Hearing no objection, leave is granted. COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair. 12.10 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO. 27

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is for the sum of \$74,038. There are a lot of Items and the notes are very explanatory. If there are any questions which I can answer, I will be quite willing to try to give further information to hon. members, but the explanations are very full. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House says that the notes are very explanatory, and I take it to mean that he means they are explanatory from the Civil Service point of view.

The first Item is Item 16 - Overtime - for the sum of \$6,450. I must first say that this is the No. 1 unproductive exercise on the part of this Government that it is carrying on abroad. Exactly what the permanent Mission has done for Barbados can be seen from time to time by appearances on television. We have had two most recent appearances by a member from the Other Place, and the public's assessment of the Mission's performance is one of those matters which goes to justify our spending additional sums of money for what they now tell us is required for the paying of a chauffeur and messengers who perform overtime work outside of official hours, and they are loud in saying that overtime work is heavy during the period of the General Assembly meeting of the United Nations.

We believe that there will be occasions when overtime work will have to be done by such workers, but if we were to look back at our accounts and see how much money has been spent annually from the time we established our Missions there, I am sure that Government would by this time have been able to determine whether or not a saving could have been effected through deciding on a fixed figure for the chauffeur and messengers and forget the question of overtime, because we agree that these people perform a semi-security duty, although we can say that this is not necessary in the case of our offices abroad. Nobody would go to the expense or the trouble to kidnap them in truth and in fact, so any taxi driver for that matter could be called upon to perform some of these duties, but let us put that aside. What we would say is that if the matter could be considered, it would be from the point of the security of the employees themselves, and it might be better for them that if they happen to be called out to work on a Saturday or Sunday depending on the arrival of VIP's from abroad, that they would do so well knowing that they have security, and it is not merely a question of turning out to earn a few extra dollars by way of overtime. One very well knows that there are persons who when they have completed their 40 or 44 hours as the case may be, they just are not concerned whatever you are offering them about working any more, they have done so much, but we believe that this matter calls for much more work and study than Government has applied to it throughout the period, and we would advise Government to give this some consideration.

There is the question of \$4,000 for the Consulate General. In this case there have been staff shortages amongst the unestablished staff, and existing staff had been called upon to perform overtime work. Really and truly, Sir, we are not happy about this, we have never been happy over the way these votes for these overseas Missions have been spent, because we are quite satisfied that it is a case where each of these officers is having a swell time, to his own benefit and for his own purposes in many cases, and doing very little for the credit of Barbados. I pause to see if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will rise to their defence. 12.20 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Item 49 - Communications. We are told that of the total sum being sought E.C. \$10,000 is required to supplement the allocation of \$35,280 at Headquarters. As a result of the increased licence fee payable by Messrs. Cable and Wireless Limited to Government, the rebate previously enjoyed by Government was withdrawn and it became necessary to defray an outstanding bill for the period January 1968 to June 1970 in the sum of E.C. \$27,028 out of the Approved Estimates for this financial year. Savings resulting from the exercise of strict economy, however, make it unnecessary to seek supplementary provision of entire sum.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how strict this economy intends to be in the future, but it has been strict enough that they have to ask for a supplementary. They go on to say that the additional \$1,500 is required to supplement the allocation to the Consulate-General in New York and results mainly from increase in the cost of monthly rentals of telephones. Mr. Chairman, no one is going to be so naive as to suggest that an officer abroad, who is serving his country, should not live at a certain status somewhat becoming his position, but when you find that we are being asked to pay an additional \$1,500 as a result mainly from increase in the cost of monthly rentals of telephones, we have to pay attention to it. We understand that this officer now occupies a house that has 12 telephones. (Laughter) Mr. Chairman, I am serious about this matter. I am saying that 12 telephones in one house are unnecessary. We are asking the Government to investigate the matter and find out whether 8 telephones would not be enough for the officer. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: "Tell us the name of the Officer.") Mr. Chairman, we are speaking of the Consulate-General in New York, and we are saying that 12 telephones are too many for one officer. Our Prime Minister does not have 12 telephones in his house. How can it be fair to ask the taxpayers to pay an additional \$1,500 because of the increase in the cost of monthly rentals of telephones? We want this matter investigated. We know that the Officer must have a certain number of telephones, but we do not think it is necessary for him to have 12 telephones. The taxpayers cannot afford to carry the burden of this additional \$1,500.

With regard to Item 50 - Travelling - High Commission in the United Kingdom - \$4,200, we note that the High Commissioner has undertaken certain familiarisation tours where there are large concentrations of Barbadian nationals. There is nothing wrong about this, Mr. Chairman but it will cost us an additional \$4,200. This Officer has certain functions to perform. He has lived in England for very many years. I have heard him boast of knowing Britain backwards, but I am not saying that he boasted of knowing it in an official capacity. If the taxpayers' money has been spent for him to renew his acquaintance with his old friends in those areas where Barbadian nationals are living, there is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that this Officer has served this House; he was paid a gratuity and is receiving a pension - (Asides.) I wonder if the Minister can tell us what is the salary of the High Commissioner in the United Kingdom. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: "The High Commissioner in the United Kingdom gets \$15,600.")

Mr., Chairman, I do not know the story about the old car. It is stated here that it has been necessary to lease transportation on many occasions during the first half of the year when the old official car had to be frequently garaged for repairs. What is the position? 12.30 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to draw attention to something in my copy of this Resolution, because I had to be in search of another copy of this Resolution which I do not now have to hand. It is said that the old official car had to be undergoing repairs on several occasions during the first half of the year, and the original allocation under this item became exhausted as a result, but the most amusing thing is that despite the original allocation being exhausted, they still tell you that the normal grant of funds for running the car to the end of the financial year is still required. How could this be so? We find again that, - and we may not be opposed to this when the Leader of the House gives us the information, - it has been necessary to make provision for the payment of a special travelling allowance at the rate of \$US60 per month to the Permanent Representative during the period of the General Assembly when he is forced to use his personal car for official business. It is but time that we carried out an assessment of what has been our expenses in relation to the use of the official car of the Permanent Mission to the United Nations for the use of his car while the official car has been undergoing repairs when transportation had to be leased for the half year, what the garage bills amounted to, what the lease of transportation amounted to, what was the amount normally granted for the running of the car, and let us relate it to the cost of a new car, because a suggestion has been thrown out that the acquisition of the new official car has reduced the necessity to hire transportation, but funds are still required to meet normal expenses to the end of the financial year. If they purchased a new car, evidently there should be some money hanging around somewhere to cover some of these expenses, but we have to give the Permanent Representative \$US60 per month during the period of the General Assembly when he is forced to use his personal car for official business. When the Permanent Representative is using his personal car, what about your own chauffeur? He has got to be paid, but there is also a requirement to pay the drivers an allowance when they have to travel to the Ambassador's residence to assume duty. In other words, where the Ambassador is living, you have got to pay your chauffeur from the time he sets out from his home to go to the Ambassador's residence to take up duty.

Mr. - Chairman, there are workers here living in St. Peter who have to get to work at Seawell at 7.30 in the morning, and they have to hustle from St. Peter or St. Lucy to get there how they can. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do you know New York?)

Mr. Chairman, what we are saying is that whether the driver of the Ambassador's car chooses to live one million miles from his job is his business. Is he the only driver that can be trusted to drive the Ambassador? Why not recruit a driver who can save the taxpayers of Barbados this expense? I have been asked if I know New York, as if to say that the Ambassador must live west and the driver must live east, and it is o.k.; you must pay the driver from east to travel west to drive the Ambassador. The attitude of some of the Ministers is that it is the taxpayers' money and they are not concerned with the way in which it is spent. People have got to travel from St. Lucy to Seawell Airport and do not get paid until they are on the job, but he is paid from the time he leaves his home.

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

Mr. Chairman, under Item. 54 - Maintenance and upkeep of Government property, the note says that

over the past two months certain defects have been observed in the electrical wiring at the official residence at Pelham which are described as "precariously a fire hazard", and these repairs are now to be effected at a cost of \$3,800 E.C. 12.40 p.m.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that this House has not been owned by the Government of Barbados so long. It is true that in purchasing a property that every yard of electrical wire is not inspected and cannot be expected to be examined, but I am sure that with this house, "Pelham", as in the case of some others, it might be seen that while we were told that purchasing these properties would have effected a saving to the taxpayers, we are seeing otherwise as we go along, and I wonder if the hazardous situation still exists or if the repairs have already been effected, because I certainly would not like to hear that any harm is caused to any of our officers serving abroad. We are quite sure that all that is going to come to them will come without anything like this happening to them.

We come now to the Embassy at Washington. The note says that funds were included in the Capital Estimates 1972-73 for the purchase of a property as a residence for the Counsellor. It is expected that this property will be acquired in the near future. No funds were, however, provided for maintenance and upkeep, and the sum of E.C. \$1,600 is now being sought to meet anticipated expenditure in respect of this property to the end of the financial year. Mr. Chairman, we believe that the Leader of the House would be in a position to tell us if the property has been purchased by now, because if it has not been acquired by now and he does not have a definite date there would hardly be any justification in voting this money for upkeep. It is only reasonable that we should know.

We turn now to the maintenance of vehicles, and we begin with the High Commission in the United Kingdom. I believe we are going to have | the biggest joke over this, because here in the United Kingdom you have had to instal a new engine, gear box, radiator and temperature gauge. Is anybody asking us to believe that if the High Commission in the United Kingdom is in possession of an official car and it is giving trouble, would the people at the garage, the experts, tell us the first thing we need is a new engine? When you hear you want a new engine, all that is left is a mere shell which is a body, and knowing the Barbadian taxpayer to be such a good milch cow I could well imagine the letters that would be despatched here that all they have out there is a shell for an official car, and we would immediately hear that the car could be sold for what it is worth. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: If it is a mere shell how much would it be worth?) The Hon. Minister in an aside is asking how much it would be worth, but if it is not worth anything, is it worth taking a new engine and putting in it? What we are saying is that we should let it go for what little you could get for it and buy a new car, because after you have fitted a new engine you have to fit a new gear box, a new radiator and a new temperature gauge. My belief is that we are not really being given the truth about all there is in respect of this particular car, because I am sure the High Commissioner would want to know that he has taken such action as would please the taxpayers of Barbados, and I believe that hon. members on this side of the House if it were put before them that the car was in such a dilapidated condition, and that the mechanical part of the car has to require this new engine, new gear box, new radiator and the like, we would support that you get a new car provided the necessity for the car could be established. Nobody could be against that.

Now you have another car story. These car stories are very conflicting and very interesting. In respect of the Permanent Mission to the United Nations, the allocation to the Permanent Mission was E.C. \$7,600. Expenditure under this item to 31st August, 1972 amounted to U.S.

\$3,193, an increase of over U.S. \$2,000 over the comparable period of 1971. This has undoubtedly been the result of the increased age of the car which had to be garaged on nine occasions over the period at the cost of E.C. \$2,900 (U.S. \$1,526). Mr. Chairman, I think we need some officer attached to these Missions with some knowledge of this type of work, because there is no doubt that reports coming in from these Missions from time to time on the cars that are used for official purposes can at times be alarming. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, when news has reached Barbados that the official car was taken to the garage 9 times, it must make us feel uneasy. Nine times for what? I believe that these notes have been prepared by civil servants for members of the Opposition to read and either vote for or against, because the Government has its well-regimented majority. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: "Quarrel with the people.") I am not quarrelling with the people; it is the way you use the majority vote that matters. Were major repairs to the official car necessary to the extent that it had to be taken to the garage 9 times? They continue to say that in addition it has been necessary to make provision for the payment of a special travelling allowance at the rate of U.S. \$60 per month to the Permanent Representative during the period of the General Assembly when he is forced to use his personal car for official business. Why wait until the car breaks down 9 times, and then ask for an additional sum to be spent on repairing it? We are now asked to spend \$4,600 after we have spent \$7,600. From where is this money to come? What results are we getting after spending all of this money repairing the car?

Now, this Resolution is intended to take the Opposition for a car ride, because, the Consulate-General's official car broke down on the 8th November, 1972 in the middle of a flooded street and it had to be abandoned. This is the sixth time it has broken down in circumstances of rainy or snowy weather. These breakdowns and attendant repairs have now almost completely exhausted the Consulate's allocation under this item. Mr. Chairman, I have heard comments about bus routes. I wonder whether this is a pickup.

We are told that the car is reported to have a serious electrical problem which would require complete rewiring at prohibitive cost. It is therefore proposed to replace the car early in the next financial year. In the meantime it has been decided that the present car should be repaired at an estimated cost of U.S. \$400 and disposed of. We are asked to repair it at an estimated cost of U.S. \$400 and then dispose of it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We intended starting very much earlier on important business. The Prime Minister is here and there is urgent business to which he would like to attend.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 which stands in the name of The Rt. Hon. Prime Minister

be the next Order of the Day. It is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1973.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
ORDER, 1973**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, there are a series of Orders which I gave notice of on the last sitting of the House dealing with the salaries of the members of the Public Service. Several Civil Orders have already been made by me but are subject to an affirmative Resolution of the House. This Order deals with the increases in salaries for several categories of Government Officers.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. 1.00 p.m.

I should like to say that I am making a statement at the end of the submission of these various Resolutions relating to matters incidental thereto.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) ORDER, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 4 under Government Business is the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1973, made under the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, and this deals particularly with teachers and headteachers.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, no one I think would seek to deny headteachers or teachers generally from anything that this Resolution may seek to do for them. The question of their salary increases, one might say, may be well deserved, but that is not all. What we on this side of the House would like to know is that with the increase of salaries, we are going to witness an increase of attention to matters relating to education

generally, and we do wish, and I may say, we do pray that you may see something nearing what we once termed a dedication to duty in respect of these teachers.

One of the most shocking things we heard I think only yesterday, was a news item over Rediffusion that the Ministry of Education was looking for persons to fill posts as senior assistants in primary schools. To my mind the announcement was degrading to the profession in every respect for it is known that every teacher on entering the Service has a personal file and is reported on by his or her headteacher three times a year, I think, and there is to be found within the Ministry itself all the details that could be required for assisting the Ministry in pinpointing the qualified teacher, especially with the present complement of education officers, who visit schools from time to time. All this would make us to understand how sloppy the whole exercise must be at present, apart from the very considerable sum of money that is poured into education.

We would like to see, Mr. Speaker, in respect of these secondary schools, a new scheme of government, where the Governing Bodies for instance no longer regard either the Public Service Commission or the Teachers' Service Commission as a sort of rubber-stamp as we have witnessed from time to time in the past. We would like to see that the Governing Bodies are given an opportunity to concern themselves more with the discipline of the schools generally and not what we now witness in respect of the present setup whereby every parent is asked to come once a month to Bridgetown with every little trifling that normally should have been settled at some country school by members of the Governing Body and the Head of the school as the case may be. We would like to see with this increase of salary, an increase of responsibility and awareness on the part of everybody.

We see some children leaving school on afternoons, and it appears to some of us to be no longer the teachers' business, the manner in which these children leave the premises and go on to the streets. We would like to see a tidying up of the situation generally, and to all of this we would like to see Governing Bodies play a more active part where monies are being spent on the extension or renovation of school buildings, and not as it is at present felt that it is not the business of the Chairman of the Governing Body. We would like to see a general concern by the headteachers, by parents and by everyone of the various groups, but I must say that there is an area of disappointment despite the salary increases, among a number of headteachers in these secondary schools because they feel they ought to be placed on a sliding scale rather than at a fixed salary. The Headteacher and the Deputy Headteacher feel they are placed in a position that equates somewhat to officers in the Public Service who enjoy a similar status, but they are not so happy over having their salaries fixed for their responsibility. 1.10 p.m.

They would like to see that some attention is given in this respect.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to clear up two brief points, I am not replying. The hon. member for St. Peter knows that the appointment of teachers is a matter purely for the Public Service Commission and not for the Minister of Education. Under the Constitution, in the absence of a Teachers' Service Commission, Headteachers and all appointments right down the line are advertised for and made by the Public Service Commission. He must ask that any matter be referred to the proper authority and not to the Minister of Education. The Minister of Education in an endeavour to help parents with any grievances, alleged or real, has officers working in his Ministry until a very late hour on one evening per month.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one point on this Order, and it relates to section 3(1) which deals with the establishment of headteachers of Nursery, Primary and Comprehensive Schools.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is Item No. 4 and the hon. member seems to be referring to Item No. 6.

Mr. GREAVES:

I am dealing, Mr. Speaker, with section 3(1) of the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order 1973 which is the matter now under consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not my understanding. Order No. 4 is what we are dealing with and it seems that you are about to embark on Order No. 6.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Order Paper which I am operating with, and which I hope you are operating with, states that Order No. 6 has something to do with headmasters, deputy headmasters and the various categories of teachers in secondary schools. I am dealing with primary schools.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on, I am so sorry.

Mr. GREAVES:

I would just like to say that I am glad to see that some effort is being made in the area of nursery education. I know that this is a project which the Ministry of Education has embarked on and which might still be in the experimental stage, but I think that it is good from the point of view that every effort is being made here to give an opportunity, particularly to children who might not have the kind of environment, to have the kind of mental development which we know is very strong particularly at the level with children between the ages of 3 and 4, and we know that children can learn a great deal during the period before they reach the primary school. I would like to see this kind of development in our educational system spread throughout the country.

I am aware that this is still in the experimental stage, but the time has got to come when we must take a look at this in a more serious and in a broader manner, because this is something which is going to be important for us. We know that children who are from, for the lack of a better word, a better environment have an opportunity to learn a lot more because those children who do not live in as good an environment as these people - and I see the nursery type of education has provided this type of environment for them to be in a learning situation, and it is therefore good to see that provision is made for the establishment for a headteacher and further down for teachers in the nursery schools. I would like to urge on the Government that a close look should be given to this situation and every effort should be made to expand this type of education and learning environment throughout the country, especially in the rural areas where parents often have to leave their children and go in search of employment in the metropolitan areas. They have to leave home early and do not reach home until late at night, and have sometimes to leave their children in circumstances which are not the very best.

I can see that if the nursery environment is provided in these areas that parents would be a lot happier, and that at least their children would be able to develop to a stage that when they enter the primary school, they can benefit much more from the kind of education which is given there so that they would have almost, as it were, an equal educational opportunity to be able to share in the educational benefits which this country has to offer.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The next Civil Establishment Order is Order No. 5 on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. This one deals with the salaries of teachers in the primary and comprehensive schools. (Asides). There seems to be some kind of misnumbering of these Orders, and I regret the inconvenience caused, because the Order that we should be dealing with now is the one for teachers in primary schools.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 5 reads "To move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order, 1973."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I should like all references to the other Order expunged from the record, and I will now deal with Order No. 5, the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order 1973.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1973

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in the Schedule to the Order is set out the personnel who are affected by the Order which was made on 30th January, 1973. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1.20 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE SALARIES OF HEADTEACHERS, DEPUTY HEADTEACHERS ETC IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 6 deals with the salaries of Headteachers, Deputy Headteachers and the various categories of Teachers in Secondary Schools. The various categories of Teachers in those schools are set out in Schedule B of the same Order.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION TO DETERMINE THE CLASSIFICATION OF UNESTABLISHED AND
CASUAL STAFF, AND TO FIX THE
RATES OF PAY OF UNESTABLISHED
STAFF**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, Order No. 7 deals with the classification of unestablished and casual staff and the fixing of rates of pay of unestablished staff. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that the categories of workers, who will be affected, are set out in Schedules A and B of this Resolution. From this, it will be noted that the minimum which will now be paid to such workers would be \$42 per week or \$1.05 per hour. I shall have something to say in my Statement as to the number of hours work and the number of days work for these people.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, with this Resolution before us, we are witnessing what the Government is really doing. The Government is placing a 40-hour week fairly and squarely before us. The Government is accepting that. Now, no one would try to oppose this, but we should pause for a moment, look around, and take into consideration a few very relevant matters. We have a labour force, and we cannot deny that our unemployment figures, even during the harvesting period or the crop season, are high. Members may have failed to see certain things, because the Government has been maintaining its road works and light programmes in order to provide employment for people whether they are giving of their best or not. The Government has provided some form of employment for these people and has been embarking on this, from year to year to the extent that it has dulled the piercing edge of the unemployment figure from time to time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the Government does not run any lighting programme in order to provide work. The lighting programme is done at the request of the Government and it is carried out by the Light and Power Company, but the Government does not provide work for the people through any lighting programme.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me as though the hon. member, who has just sat down, is not in the same Chamber in which you and I happen to be.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We are dealing with Order No. 6. Please stick to the subject.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I made no mention of the lighting programme and the fitting of lights. We are considering whether or not it is necessary to have longer working hours. The problem may be solved by using the doubled-shift system. You can employ a worker for 40 hours, but in view of the numbers that are unemployed you can have a doubled-shift system. We know that in the garment industry several women are employed. I think it has been said that women should not be employed after 10 p.m. However, I think that some adjustment should be made in respect of women when they are employed at night, and they should be given transportation to their homes. 1.30 p.m.

We should see that wherever they are employed after dusk, they are given adequate transportation and protection to their homes. We will have to do a very considerable amount of planning. We will have to look at those areas where the biggest concentration of a particular type of work is to be found and industries will have to be located in such areas that the worker will not find himself or herself having to cross from St. Lucy to Seawell Airport and back as the case may be.

Now our problem, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to have a forty hour week. Is it that the workers are going to be urged upon to increase their productivity? We are hearing that this is no problem, but the economy of the country can stagger through a lack of productivity. There are many machines that are today left idle because there are no men to man them. What we have got to do is to direct our training and equip our people and fit them to man the machines, and so rely when we embark upon a forty hour week, let us urge on the worker to produce more. We have got this in the public service, and I am sure the Prime Minister ought to be the first person to embark upon this. He has from time to time caused us to know that the public servants are not all giving of their best. If that is the case, we have got to see to it that from the top a quickening of pace takes place; that the second in command, the deputies, whatever they are, will also quicken their pace, and if we can get away from having an abundance of clock-watchers which we now have in every field of employment more or less, I think that we will overcome the situation somehow; but it is not something you can merely embark upon. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, many workers in many fields and in many an industry. You have read out here this morning the report from the Auditor General. That in itself is living evidence that somewhere in the public service some people are not pulling their weight, and as a consequence the work cannot reach us in this Chamber on time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that lecture programmes will have to be embarked upon; there has got to be much discussion involving Permanent Secretaries and other officers if we are not to lose. It is not merely a case of saying that we are going to work a 40 hour week and end there. We want to know that what we were doing in 44 hours is now being done in 40 hours because we are giving increased remuneration to cover for any additional energy that one might put into the industry, and unless the accent is going to be put on productivity, I am sure the economy of this country will fall in the long run.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who has just sat down said in the early stages of his remarks that the problem is that we are going to have a forty hour week. It is rather surprising for us to sit over here and hear him describe the implementation of the forty hour week which is regarded as an advanced piece of social legislation as a problem. I think nobody would disagree with him that productivity is an important aspect in our development, and he, I suppose, has anticipated some of us on this side when he alluded to

the fact that the emphasis on productivity must be at all levels and not at one particular area of workers. It is unfortunate that often when people talk in terms of productivity, they refer only to one section of people without realising that there are lots of other factors involved in productivity other than the people, and that the whole question of utilisation of machinery, and the organisation of work, and all these other factors, are of importance.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on the interventions made by hon. members. Everyone knows my views on productivity in the public service of Barbados. As a matter of fact, I have made reference to it in the statement which I hope shortly to deliver on the overall revision of salaries and prospects in the public service of this Island. It is not easy when you are working with administration to measure in absolute terms the output of a worker. I know of one Permanent secretary who suggested to three members of his staff not very long ago, that in view of the fact that he was aware that in my office I deal with an average of seventy-three separate and distinct matters in any 24-hour period - I am not saying in an eight-hour day because I do not work an eight-hour day - that he would expect that the through-put of files coming to me when I was dealing with a particular subject should be an out-put of two per day from each clerical officer, and in a matter of days, one of those clerical officers resigned on the grounds that we were re-introducing slavery in Barbados, and for him to process two files a day was something which he did not expect to do when he joined the public service. This shows the mental attitudes of the people in the public service of this Island. 1.40 p.m.

The member for St. Peter has drawn to the attention of the House something of which I am not aware, that Your Honour had already vouchsafed to the general membership, that is, a letter from the Auditor General of Barbados deploring the fact that he could not present for the inspection of the Public Accounts Committee the accounts for the financial years, I think, 1970-71 and 1971-72 because he had not received the accounts from the respective Government departments.

What I want to say is this, that the system which we have established and under which we work is such that there is no reason why an Accounting Officer who is doing his job - and by this I do not mean a senior Accountant, or a junior Accountant, I mean an Accounting Officer at the level of Permanent Secretary or head of department - could not present the annual accounts for that particular Department or Ministry within one week. As a matter of fact, I would go further and say one weekend because it is only a matter of checking. I know this because under the Constitution I have to audit the Auditor General's Department, and when you ask a question it is the Minister of Finance, and I am the only person in Barbados who gets my audit done within the statutory time which is prescribed by law and by the Constitution, and it

means that I have to go through what they not have to go through because I have to go through every single voucher and every receipt of the Auditor General's Department. If you check the records you will find that I have always presented my reports in time.

I agree with the hon. members that this is a shocking state of affairs, but under our Constitution I do not even have the power of reporting a Permanent Secretary to the Public Service Commission, I can only remonstrate, and I agree with the hon. members that we want some more productivity, but I must point out that the way in which the level of productivity varies from one occupation to another is another thing in itself. The general public will be aware of our productivity because we will have less loafing

around, people coming to work on time and starting to work when they arrive on time, and not leaving before the statutory time for which they are paid. We are going into the 40 hour week now for the unestablished staff, because we have found that when they work 51/2 days per week that absolutely no output is secured from these workers on a Saturday morning because they come to work after the time they should arrive, they sharpen their tools and then take a coffee break, then they pack up their tools and go home. We cannot go on increasing the recruitment in the public service and nothing else.

I just say that in a brief reply to what the hon. member has said.

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

**STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER ON
THE REVISION OF SALARIES AND
WAGES OF PUBLIC
SERVANTS - 1973**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate at this stage to make a statement on the increased salaries and wages for the public service and other places. I will ask the Clerk to circulate copies of this statement shortly.

On 21st November, 1972, this Chamber approved resolutions providing for an interim payment to public servants pending the outcome of negotiations on salaries and wages which were being conducted with the organisations representing the various categories of public workers. On that occasion I informed the House that the interim payment would be followed by a general revision of salaries and wages to be cative from 1st April, 1973. The Resolutions and other legislation which I now introduce seek to give effect to the revised salaries and wages of all public servants as agreed with the Unions and Associations.

The main factors considered in revising the pay of employees in the public sector have been

- (a) the cost of living;
- (b) comparable areas of employment in the private sector;
- (c) the desire to improve the living standards of officers and employees particularly at the bottom of the salary structure;
- (d) the state of the economy and Government's finances;
- (e) the need to attract and retain high quality personnel in the Service.

The level of increases in the first year ranges from 39% on current basic annual salaries and wages at the bottom to 25% on salaries at the top and these increases will be followed by annual increases over and above the normal scale increments in each of the years 1974/75 and 1975/76 of approximately 5% of the salaries and wages in each preceding year. The provision for annual increases is novel in the

public sector and is intended to facilitate more rational financial and economic planning and to ensure that the purchasing capacity of the civil servant keeps reasonable pace with the rising cost of living. It is also the first step towards the institution of a national incomes policy.

It is evident that salaries at the middle and top levels in the private sector are not necessarily related to productivity and one effect of this is that public servants in the higher echelons, tend to think that they are relatively underpaid. Despite this there has been no significant loss of personnel to the private sector and as a matter of fact where scarcity of skills exists, it is not confined to the public sector.

At existing rates of salaries and wages of public servants, including employees of Statutory Boards operating on Treasury subventions, the current bill is estimated at \$50 million a year. The proposals in these resolutions will require additional expenditure of approximately \$13.75 million in the first year, \$7.5 million of which will accord increases of approximately 30% to 10,000 employees at present receiving salaries of less than \$3,000 a year, while 4,300 officers will receive increases of approximately 25% at a cost of \$5 million; the remaining \$1.25 million going to the employees of Statutory Boards. The annual increase of 5% will involve additional expenditure of approximately \$3.2 million in 1974/75 and \$3.35 million in 1975/76.

In a purely economic sense I do not consider that the country can afford this additional level of expenditure on salaries and wages. It is my view that increases in remuneration should normally relate to productivity. But when the cost of living has increased due to circumstances beyond our own control as it has in the past two or three years, increases in salaries and wages cannot be avoided.

The Government has for some time been concerned that sufficient return in productivity is not being derived from the great expenditure on personal emoluments and in a positive attempt to improve the administrative machinery has obtained the services of a United Nations Adviser in Organisation and Management to assist in the setting up of an Organisation and Management Unit in the Prime Minister's Office. Skeleton staff was provided on a temporary basis, two in-service courses in Organisation and Methods Theory have, so far, been conducted and a senior officer sent on overseas training. The process will be intensified in the immediate future and in the meantime permanent staff, including an understudy to the Adviser, is being provided. 1.50 p.m.

Judges: It is the practice to revise the emoluments of the Judges and the Director of Public Prosecutions as well as the emoluments of Ministers and Parliamentarians as a separate exercise but at the same time as a revision is undertaken for the Public Service. It is hoped to introduce the necessary resolutions in the near future after discussions have taken place at the appropriate levels.

Magistrates: Magistrates, like many of the professionals and non-professionals in the Service have made representation for a regrading of their posts. These requests will be examined and any consequential adjustments will take effect from a future date.

Police: Since 1961, the pay of the Police has been computed on the basis of a formula, the factors of which were an adaptation from a similar formula which had been recommended for the Police in Britain by a Royal Commission in 1960. Because the formula has had the effect of according the Police a higher level of increase than the rest of the Public Service, I told this House on the occasion of the 1969 general Salaries Revision that it was my view that the formula had more than achieved its purpose of correcting

any imbalance between Police pay and the pay of other public servants and that a good hard look must therefore be made as to its further use. A review of the application of the formula has been undertaken and I believe that I have managed to satisfy the representatives of the Police that their pay should be accorded the same levels of increases as the pay of other public officers. In abandoning the formula, I must, however, make it clear that the Police will not be left behind in any subsequent revision of salaries and that they will maintain their general relativity with other categories of public officers and employees. If any new circumstances of a permanent nature should develop which require a review of Police pay the necessary adjustments will be made.

Pensioners: The Government recognises that the cost of living has also eroded the value of pensions and therefore intends to make provision in the 1973-74 Estimates for each Government pensioner to receive an increase of \$30.00 a month with effect from 1st April, 1973.

Old Age Pensions: I have asked the Ministry of Health to present its proposals for increases in old age pensions and revision of the means test, in accordance with the Government's declared policy. This proposal should be forthcoming shortly and the necessary authority will be sought from this House not too long from now.

Hours of attendance: A five day working week will apply to casual and unestablished staff with the coming into operation of the new rates of pay. It is hoped that a similar arrangement can be made for some other branches of the Service but a decision in this regard will be made in the near future. I should, however, sound a note of warning to those civil servants who see such an arrangement as an opportunity for a reduction in their already short hours of work. A Five Day Week will generally mean that the number of hours now worked in six days will be compressed into five days where these hours do not exceed 40 hours, by the extension of the length of the working day.

In conclusion, a matter of grave concern to us all is the attitude of many civil servants to their work and in some cases to the public whom they are paid to serve. The Unions have demanded substantial increases for the workers and in the spirit of good industrial relations the

Government has agreed to very reason increases. The Government and the people of Barbados are entitled in return to an honest day's work for this reasonable pay. Effective and speedy ways and means must be found to weed out the incorrigibles in the Service whether they be managers, supervisors or the supervised if this country is not to be a second class nation and if there is to be meaningful management of our own affairs.

**(1) THE
RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE DEATH OF THE RT. HON. LESTER BOWLES
PEARSON**

**(2) THE RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE DEATH
OF MR. LYNDEN BAINES JOHNSON**

**(3) THE RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE DEATH OF
MRS. MILLICENT THORNE**

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I will ask the House to take note of the passing of three very

distinguished persons, if there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the permission of the House, the Prime Minister wants to take note of the passing of three very distinguished persons.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

May I deal with them, Sir, altogether and separately? The first is the passing of the former Prime Minister of Canada, the Rt. Hon. Lester Bowles Pearson; secondly the passing of the former President of the United States, the Hon. Lynden Baines Johnson, and thirdly, the passing of the mother of the Hon. Lady Grace Adams and grand mother of the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs. Millicent Thorne. I shall be very brief, Sir, because on these occasions we do not wish to be too mournful, but I had the privilege of knowing all three persons. Certainly, Mr. Lester Pearson for over ten or twelve years. I was fortunate enough to have been the guest of the deceased President of the United States, Mr. Lynden Baines Johnson, over a period of four days. I had many discussions with him. I can say that I have known the grandmother of the Leader of the Opposition nearly all my life, and I regarded her as a friend. I might create a little jealousy if I informed the House that she used to refer to me as her son, so I will refrain from doing so. If I did so, it would only be to illustrate the affection which I had for the late Mrs. Millicent Thorne.

I would only say, Sir, that these statesmen, the two Leaders of their country, have been logised in the Press and over the Radio long before they were deceased. Mr. Pearson's part in the World Bank Investigation on the position of developing countries, which saw the light of day in a Report described as "Partners In Development", will be a permanent record and testimony to the quality of the mind and thinking of the Leader of the team which included one distinguished West Indian Economist who produced that monumental work.

President Johnson, more than any other President, has put on the Statute Book of the United States, Federal Legislation dealing with civil rights, and ever since the Civil War in the 1860's, I think that greater progress was made under his administration in the enactment and enforcement, which is more significant of civil rights, than any other person.

I regret and deplore the passing of Mrs. Millicent Thorne for more than one reason, not only because it is strange to believe that she was my friend and a person for whom I had a great admiration, and who always had a twinkle in her eye and some slightly satirical remark to make about, not necessarily myself but about what was going on in the country from time to time, but because of the circumstances in which she died. 2 p.m.

I think that all of us must deplore these situations and we must wonder whether we are doing enough in this country to ensure that people can live in peace and quiet, whether we are doing enough to ensure that the young people of this country must understand that there are opportunities available to them without resort to crime, and I think that if we want to pay tribute to Mrs. Thorne, we should each dedicate ourselves both as legislators and as individuals to doing everything possible to see that situations like this do not arise again.

There are three Resolutions. One is in respect of the Rt. Honourable Lester Bowles Pearson, former

Prime Minister of Canada. It reads as follows:-

House of Assembly

BE IT RESOLVED that this House places on record its profound sympathy with the Government and people of Canada, at the death of the Rt. Hon. Lester Bowles Pearson, a former Prime Minister of Canada.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the Government of Canada. 6th February, 1973

Speaker

The second one is similarly couched in respect of Mr. Lynden Baines Johnson, and the third Resolution reads :-

House of Assembly

RESOLVED that the Honourable the House of Assembly places on record its profound sympathy concerning the death of Mrs. Millicent Thorne the grand mother of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and mother of Lady Grace Adams, wife of a former Premier of Barbados and Prime Minister of the West Indies.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to her relatives.

Speaker

I beg to move that these Resolutions do now pass.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the passing of these Resolutions of sympathy, I think the Prime Minister has spoken on behalf of the Government as such, more especially on behalf of the passing of the former President of the United States of America, Mr. Lynden Baines Johnson, and the former Prime Minister of Canada. But I should like to say a few words in so far as the passing of the late Mrs. Millicent Thorne is concerned. I too happen to have known her from early childhood and she is a lady for whom I had a great regard and respect. She was endowed, just as her children and probably her grandson, who is Leader of the Opposition, with great talent, ability and a very shrewd mind. She was the mother of Captain H. Aylmer Thorne who is a very distinguished French scholar and linguist and who has been residing in Martinique for many years and who is well known by my family, and by my deceased brother who had the privilege of living in Martinique for many years and spoke French as fluently as the average Frenchman as does Captain Thorne at present who is still alive - I had the privilege of seeing him in Martinique at a distance when I was there not long ago - and also her daughter Lady Grace Adams, formerly Thorne, widow of the late Sir Grantley Adams of blessed memory, who has done a great deal for this country in the early days of 1937-1938. Lady Adams possesses many gifts and has rendered a great contribution to the country as an Assistant Mistress or as Deputy Headmistress of Queen's College for many years, and is now a member of the Privy Council appointed by our

Government and Our Prime Minister who has the capacity to do so. So both in the capacity as mother of the Leader of the Opposition and as wife of a distinguished son of the soil, the late Sir Grantley Adams, she has made her contribution.

I join with the Prime Minister in deploring the passing of Mrs. Thorne in such grave circumstances in that it is a question of bad behaviour and hooliganism, if I may use that word, by a small section of youth, because it is alleged that she met her death by violence at the hands of young men eighteen years of age to whom she was very kind in the past. I will not go into that, because it is probably the wrong time.

I would like to join in the Resolution of sympathy moved by the Prime Minister in respect of the passing of the late Mrs. Millicent Thorne.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to join with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House in supporting the Resolutions in connection with the death of the Right Honourable Lester Pearson and the Resolution in connection with the death of Mr. Lynden Baines Johnson, both of them Chief Executives of their countries of Canada and the United States of America. There is very little that can be added to what the Prime Minister has said. Particularly I should like to associate myself with his remarks in respect of President Johnson whose fight for civil rights may have been one that surprised many persons unaware of the past history, but fully lives up in my view as in that of the Prime Minister to everything that has been said about him. He was a person who without the glamour of a Kennedy or of a Roosevelt yet achieved more in social justice for the people of the United States than perhaps many Presidents who went before, and I am sure history books will regret his involvements with overseas expeditions and excursions which tended to tarnish his very great achievement at home. I am sure he will go down in the history of the United States as having achieved a great deal in his thirty or forty years of public life.

In respect of the other Resolution, I should like to thank all hon. members who have commiserated with my family and myself in the circumstances. It is given, I suppose, to very few persons to be the victim of a murder or alleged murder in their family. It is given to even fewer to find the body of a dear relative whose life has apparently been put an end to prematurely, but this is indeed what my mother, Lady Adams and I, have had to go through in recent days, and I would like to thank you and all the members of the House for your kind commiserations, and to thank all hon. members who personally have spoken to my mother and myself about this unfortunate incident.

There is a great deal that could be said about a society in which these things happen, but I hope that this will not be regarded by person in or outside Barbados as a general indictment of the social conditions which prevail in Barbados today. I am sure that in all countries at all times savagaries and barbarisms happen, monsters are produced, and I would hope that society would do this in that spirit and not with any act of vengeance either of individuals or classes of persons.

I thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House for the kind things which have been said. I thank you on my behalf and on behalf of my mother and my uncle Captain Thorne to whom the kind and good wishes of all the people of Barbados have been of great assistance in this our moment of trial and sorrow.

Mr. SPEAKER :

I should like to associate myself fully with all the remarks that have been passed. In tradition I would ask all hon. members to stand for a brief moment in silence to signify the passing of these three Resolutions.

Members of the House stood in silence for one minute.

We should have adjourned at 2 o'clock, but because of this very important business, we are still sitting.
2.10 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I have not suspended the Standing Orders because I thought the members of the Opposition might wish to deal with matters. I beg to move that Standing Order No. 18 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting,

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Standing Order which relates to rising is Standing Order 5(3), and in my submission nothing else has to be suspended. I would move an amendment and substitute "5(3)" for "18".

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Standing Order 5 be suspended.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting be suspended until

3 p.m. when questions and other Private Members' Business will be dealt with.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 2.15 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed. We are now in Private Members' time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Private Members' Business, I want to apologise for entering the Chamber late today, and at this stage I will seek leave to ask several questions which were set down today and which were not asked due to my absence from the Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. member for St. Lucy also has questions down, and the member for St. Thomas has now put in his appearance, so I think all the questions could be given notice of at the same time. It is entirely up to the House if the hon. members should be given permission to give notice of their questions. Leave is given for the hon. members to give notice of their questions.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of National Insurance

Is the Minister aware that Barbadian seamen who work on British Registered ships are not covered either by the National Insurance scheme in Barbados nor by corresponding legislation in Britain; and if so, will the Minister take the earliest possible steps to work out a reciprocal arrangement with the United Kingdom by means of which Barbadian seamen will be covered against accidents occurring at work, whether their ship is registered in Barbados or in the United Kingdom?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Questions standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware that the residents and users of Tent Bay have been requesting from the Government for the past 10 years that suitable bath and toilet facilities be made available to them at Tent Bay?

If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister say what plans and provisions have been made and how soon will these facilities be provided?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Now that many persons are endeavouring to increase the Agricultural potentials in this country, is the Minister aware that many persons are suffering loss to animals and crops by wild or straying dogs?

If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state what steps are being taken to control or get

rid of these dogs?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Would the Minister state what steps are the Government taking in order to allow Farmers to legally electrify cattle and animal fences?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

(a) Is the representative of the Barbados Government in Florida a full time employee or not?

(b) If not a full time employee how much of his time is he required to use in the Government business?

(c) Does appointment involve visits to Bermuda and the Bahamas?

If the answer to (c) above is in the affirmative,

(a) How many trips has the representative in Florida made to (1) Bermuda (2) Bahamas within the last six months?

(b) What are the costs of these trips?

(c) How many Barbadian citizens are residing in (1) Bermuda (2) Bahamas?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

In view of the number of fires which have occurred in Bridgetown in recent years causing serious loss of property and lives?

Would the Minister please state as follows:

1. What steps are being taken by Government to combat and prevent these fires;

2. Would the Government institute legislation requiring the Government Electrical officer to carry out electrical inspection of all houses in the Bridgetown area, with power to order the disconnection of electrical supply where necessary?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

In view of the recent increase in animal and poultry feed in Barbados and the decline in the number of pigs and poultry being kept in the United States from which we make large imports of pork and poultry parts, would the Minister State

(a) Whether the Government is prepared to make and/or increase the level of subsidy on all animal and poultry feeds;

(b) If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state the amount of the subsidy?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that due to the increase of traffic in the country, children going to and from school find it difficult to cross the road?

If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister in order to preserve the safety of life, provide pedestrian crossings and/or crossing lights on the following roads:

Constitution Road next to Queen's College;

Martindale's Road next to St. Michael's

Girls' School;

Six Roads, St. Philip, next to Princess

Margaret School;

Waterford Road, St. Michael next to

Combermere School;

Roebuck Street, next to Modern High

School?

To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

(a) Is the Minister aware that the roads in the Parish of Saint Joseph have gone from bad to worse within the past 10 years?

(b) That during this time little or no major road work has been done to the parish;

(c) That as a result of the manner and method in which the roads in the parish of Saint Joseph are being dealt with the following roads are in need of urgent repairs:

(1) Tent Bay Road (4) Spa Hill

(2) Mellows Hill (5) Frizer's Road

(3) St. Sylvan's Road (6) Melvin's Hill

What steps are being taken to improve the roads in the parish? 3.05 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if Private Members are ready.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

The instant Order of the Day is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Marriage Act, 1904.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I do not propose to proceed with that. I was confused with the length of the printed matter underneath the Item. I want to proceed with Item No. 5 I beg to move that "Item No. 5" be substituted for "Item No. 2", so that I may deal with the second reading of a Bill to amend the Immigration Act, 1952.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

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

A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION ACT, 1952

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I merely want to intimate to hon. members that the Government has been working on amendments to the Immigration Act, 1952, for some time, and a new Act is coming down dealing with proposals which may incorporate what the hon. member has in mind. This new Act has been in preparation for two years or longer. I do not know whether the hon. member still wants to proceed with his bill.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I find it a most unusual intervention, but I am sure the Minister means nothing by it. I am sorry that the Government is producing an Immigration Act. I am equally sorry to hear the former Attorney-General say to his colleagues that he is not supporting this bill. I know the former Attorney-General is against the rights of women, therefore, I have every confidence that he will not be voting for any Act to improve the rights of women in Barbados.

Now, Sir, I wish this bill to be carefully considered by hon. members. This bill is one which is introduced, not as an Immigration matter primarily, but as one which concerns the rights of women. Under the present law in Barbados, a man is entitled to bring his wife to live here with no, restrictions

whatsoever. If she was married) indeed, before Independence Day she can live here if she is a dope addict and acknowledged to the principle of overthrowing the Government of Barbados by force and violence, or she can live here if she is the proprietress of the largest brothel in Bridgetown where drugs are sold to school children only. A man can bring such a woman to live with him in Barbados as his wife, but by the present law a Barbadian woman can marry a man who would sit at God's right hand for decency, desirability and the unavailability of his particular professional skills in Barbados. Whatever qualification you care to name, he can have it but he will have no right to be here. It is not an empty problem; it is not a substantial problem, for we have the words of the former Minister of Home Affairs that over the last six years only 70 such applications by the husbands of Barbadian women have come to his attention.

It is a fact that a Barbadian girl can marry a foreigner, but not have the right to live with him here. I am suggesting to hon. members that this amounts to discrimination between the sexes. Eight of us and I, I believe in this House are married to non-Barbadians. Eight of us, I think I am right in saying, can all have our wives live here with us. That applies to the 23 male members of the House. As I glance opposite me, the entire front bench opposite me is married to women that are not Barbadians. I myself am not married to a Barbadian. They are even giving her trouble with citizenship now, Sir, but that is likely to be a case before the courts so I will not dwell on it. There are numerous others, the mightiest in the land, who are married non-Barbadians: the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Prime Minister, the hon. member for Christ Church West and so on, and we can live freely here. If the hon. member for St. Michael North East, which God forbids should become a widow - I wish her many long and continued happy years of married life, but if she should become a widow and marries a stranger, why then should a malicious Minister of Home Affairs tell her to leave her business behind in Collymore Rock, leave her seat behind, and go and live where her husband lives? That is no empty suggestion, Sir.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, speaking with all the authority of a nineteenth century English pater familias has stood up here in the House and said that that is the law from time immemorial. A woman must follow a man wherever he wants to go and so on. The man is head of the family. It is time that this discrimination should be done away with. Now, Barbados is one of the very few civilised countries where this practice any longer continues. 3.15 p.m.

In Great Britain although a few years ago an English woman could have her husband to live with her freely, I must say they have taken a step in the wrong direction, and that concession has to some extent been withdrawn. I will deal with that in due course because you must not think it is not under fire in Great Britain too.

In Barbados where there is a grave excess in numbers of women over men, Mr. Speaker, yet things are made harder for those women who may want to live in Barbados and continue to live in Barbados even though married to non-Barbadians because they have no certainty that they can live with the husbands of their choice, and many of them have this dreadful choice placed before them. Whom do I choose, marrying a man who may not be able to live here which will mean I have to leave my mother and all my connections, or staying at home with my family connections? It is a dreadful and wicked thing that we should be placing women in this position any longer.

Now the figures: the latest vital statistics on registration which I have to hand are those for 1970. They

show that there are 12,700 very nearly, women in Barbados aged between 30 years and 40 years. There are 8,000 men of the same age between 40 and 50 years of age there are 7,330 women and there are only 7,000 men of the same age. There are in fact 25,000 women in that vital age group of 30 years to 50 years, for by the time a woman is 30 years old, you have to assume that where she lives she has chosen to live. There are only 15,000 men living in Barbados of the corresponding age group. It is also a common place, Sir, that the majority of men who find themselves wanting this particular concession are men of this particular age group 30 - 50. That is the marrying age for men. I wonder how many of us in here were married before the age of thirty! Maybe there are some, but that is the marrying age for men. If there is one thing that there is a need for on general social lines in Barbados, it is a need for qualified men of those ages 30 - 50. We have lost men of those ages. That is a real missing generation in Barbados. It is as if we had fought a war. We have lost men of those ages to the massive emigration of the 1950's. There are the people who went away 10, 15, 20 years ago. The women in many cases are left behind. They are socially useful to Barbados, but of necessity we see them here in these numbers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you would think that if a woman of thirty wants to live here with her husband in Barbados you would say it is socially desirable, since there is such a great excess of women over men, that a Government would encourage this at least in that age group. I have given two arguments in other words. I have given the first argument on general principle. I have given the second argument on particular social need. I am going to give the third argument on the lines of public demand. I urge hon. members to realise that there is a public demand in Barbados that women be treated in the same way as men. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Pay alimony too?) The hon. member for St. Michael South Central above all should be in a position to appreciate this argument. He is a person who has enjoyed the citizenship of another country based upon his matrimonial connections, but he will come to Barbados and say that a Jamaican should not have the same privilege as he. I have heard him say so.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, I had to get a work permit in Jamaica and I did not quarrel.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. Please take your seat.

Mr. ADAMS:

The hon. member is a citizen of Jamaica, so what if he had to get a work permit? It was made possible for him to become a citizen. Can the same be said to be true of the numerous applications in the Ministry of Home Affairs for persons born in Great Britain or North America or Norway to take another example who have made applications here? It is bad policy. But, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear that one member understands the issue, the hon. member for St. Michael West, because let it be clearly understood that I am not urging that the Constitution be amended to make it possible for a man married to a Barbadian woman to have citizenship automatically. I am asking that he be exempt from the provisions of the Immigration Act in exactly the same way as women married to Barbadians are now exempt from the provisions of the Immigration Act. I am not suggesting that a man can derive citizenship from his wife. I do not believe that this is a part of the United Nations recommended practice, and certainly it is no part of my view of the law of citizenship. I am only asking that the same privilege extend to a Barbadian man to bring his wife here, be extended to a Barbadian woman to bring her husband here. The same privilege, which a Barbadian man has to live here with his wife is the one to be extended to a Barbadian woman who chooses to live here with her husband. I am asking in effect that the concept of wife in the

Immigration Act be abandoned in favour of a concept of spouse, husband or wife. That is what I am asking hon. members to deal with.

Now I have had the advantage today of hearing the arguments of the Government in advance of a formal speech. The argument of the Government is that a new Immigration Act is being prepared, and, as the Hon. Leader of the House has put it, that the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition will be dealt with in that Act. The Hon. Leader of the House has no way of knowing whether that is true. I am not going to say it is not true, but I am going to say it is not in the present draft.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member says I have no way of knowing it is true. I should like to inform him that I have acted as Minister of Home Affairs on a few occasions even in this present Session; so I do not know how he means I do not have any way of knowing.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Leader of the House would care to get up and interrupt me and say "I give the hon. member the unequivocal pledge that when the Immigration Act comes down that Barbadian women will have the same privilege to keep their husbands here as Barbadian men", I will sit down. If the Leader of the House will tell the House unequivocally here and now that what this bill seeks to provide will be provided by the Government, I will sit down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member is trying to draw me out, but I have been here long enough to know what he is trying to do. With all due respect, what I will tell the hon. member is simply that each case is dealt with on its merits, and that at the present, the husbands of Barbadian women, after consideration of the case in question, are allowed to remain here. The hon. member is trying to make the public believe that none is allowed to remain here.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, it is exactly what I am trying to get away from. Wives of Barbadians do n have to be examined on merit; why should the husbands of Barbadian women be examined on merit? That is exactly what we on this side wish to get away from.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member take his seat. I am not going to permit it. A point of order for the information of all hon. members has to deal with a point as provided for by the Standing Orders of this Chamber. What has that got to do with the Standing Orders?

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, in a way, I am glad to draw out the hon. member, but I would ask him not to interrupt me again because obviously Mr. Speaker doesn't....Anyway I am finished with interruptions now, Sir. It is clear that the hon. member is not getting up to give the pledge which I called for, and I am going to characterise all arguments on that side, that they are voting against this bill because the Immigration Act is coming down, as common hypocrisy. Any argument of that sort is fundamentally not going to the root of the matter. Hon. members on that side will know that they are voting against this bill if they vote against it because they don't want Barbadian women to have the same rights as Barbadian men, and because they do not wish to give up the cheap, petty power which they have to penalise foreign men who marry Barbadian girls. If the number is no more than 70 husbands they do not want to give up power over 70 husbands when there might be two or three thousand wives, and nobody in Barbados could believe they would be voting against it because of the prospect of a new Immigration Act. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the only man in the history of this House to vote against the first reading of a bill, has voted against the first reading of this bill. 3.25 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, I am voting against the second reading of this bill because in my view no piecemeal amendment by a Leader of the Opposition can lay down what is in law the policy of the Government. Immigration is a matter of government policy, and I am not supporting a piecemeal, half-baked amendment brought in by any member of the Opposition. I have always had a respect for women, and this is borne out by my family life, so he cannot get in here and talk nonsense.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before the Hon. Leader of the Opposition proceeds, let me read this.

Standing Order 28(b) says that no Member shall interrupt another Member except to elucidate some matter raised by that Member in the course of his speech, provided that the Member speaking is willing to give way and resumes his seat and that the Member wishing to interrupt is called by the Chair. Strictly speaking, the hon. Member who has just sat down has nothing to elucidate because he has not spoken.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I have my own opinion and you are to rule. That is what you were appointed for.

i

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have given every hon.

Member the latitude to which he is entitled, and for the benefit of all, I will read Standing Order 28(a) which says that no Member shall interrupt another Member except by rising to a point of order, when the Member speaking shall resume his seat and the Member interrupting shall simply direct attention to the point which he desires to bring to notice and submit it to the Speaker or Chairman for decision. There are too many fraudulent points of order. Carry on.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the truth is provoking the hon. Member so I will speak perhaps a little less

vehemently. It is quite a simple matter, I have thrown down the challenge quite clearly. I want any hon. Member who is going to say that he is voting against this bill because there is going to be a new Immigration Act also to say, or else be branded in the eyes of Barbadian women as a cowardly politician, whether or not he supports the principle of it. That is the essence. The bill itself is very simple. I am asking to add to the exempted categories of section 5 subsection (1) of the Immigration Act a new paragraph, paragraph (h), "any male person married to a citizen of Barbados if the marriage was celebrated in Barbados or would have been a valid marriage if celebrated in Barbados," The reason for that wording is that the Prime Minister pointed out, perhaps the only cogent observation of the efforts made on the question of immigration, that there is a certain abuse of the present Marriage Act. I think that I am correct in saying that in the last session he cited the case of a school girl at Queen's College at the age of 14 who had been married by proxy to a man in Bombay whom she had never seen, and he then applied for permission to reside in Barbados on the grounds of marriage.

We in Barbados do not believe as King Richard believed that you can marry a man to a woman by sending your sword, your proxy or just a ring some thousands of miles away and then wait a few years until the woman is old enough to fulfil her marital obligations. If the marriage is celebrated in Barbados obviously it is a marriage, the laws of Barbados would recognise, or if the marriage would have been a valid marriage if celebrated in Barbados it would be a desirable proviso to protect the abuse of the provision itself. I do not think that any of us in here no matter what view we take on the principle of the matter like the idea of any little girl being married by proxy and then the husband says he has a right to live here. It is noteworthy that it is only from the lunatic fringe of the Government that we hear these assaults. There is undoubtedly the point of view that the Opposition should not take part in the governmental process at all, but unfortunately the Standing Orders do not agree with that view because all Private Members of the House have the right to introduce amendments or bring in bills of their own. The Constitution of Barbados confirms this right and we are exercising this right in bringing in this bill. I personally do not believe the Immigration Act will be here for years, I believe the Immigration Act will be like the Education Act which started life around 1962. I believe it is just being held out to stop reform by the more conservative Members of the Government Party who do not want to see any change in the laws, and who like the Duke of Wellington believe that the Constitution as they found it was completely perfect and any change could only be for the worse. I mean the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member not to be personal in his remarks.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is chiefly that hon. member who is taking objection. Do you know why I am a little heated with the hon. member? It is because when I got up to move a bill here the hon. member told other hon. members that he was not going to vote for it thereby prejudicing the minds of those hon. Members who might otherwise have been open on this bill. I presume that when on an alleged point of order he said he does not want any piecemeal bills brought in by the Leader of the Opposition, he was referring to the drafting of the bill, but I am not a draftsman and I am the first person to tell the Clerks to ask the draftsmen about it. That is what we are here for, everybody has to be advised and I am to be advised by the legal draftsmen. I am not prejudice about these things, there is no word in, this bill that is precious to me, the principle is precious. 3.35 p.m.

If the drafting is in question, send it to a Select Committee and let the Select Committee look at the drafting. It is a very easy matter to do that, but it is the principle of the bill that I am urging on the House. Everybody in here knows that the Immigration Bill may not be presented this Session. We have heard of bills that were to be presented in here and we have never seen them. Where is the Road Traffic Act, Sir? Where is the new Homicide Bill? Where is the Education Bill? Are we to wait forever for these, Sir? I remember the arguments coming from the then Attorney-General, in a sober moment, that you must not amend the District Auctioneers Act - this was some years ago, Sir. It may not be the Attorney-General, but I was told it was the Attorney-General. An argument was being put forward that it should not be amended because the Government was considering the position of District Auctioneers. That was three years ago; the Government has not considered the position, and the Act is now being amended. It could have been amended long ago. I can refer to the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956. In 1969 there was a very able Select Committee that would have carried out a lot of reforms to the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956, but we were told that the Government was considering this, that and the next. There are still no amendments to the Magistrates' Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, 1956.

Now, I do not want to go too far outside, but there is a clear abuse which has been known since 1961. There was a typographical error in an Act which came before the House in 1961. We sought to correct that, and we could not correct it because we were told that the Government was bringing down another Act. It means that a Magistrate can still try, at the present time, Sam Lord for wrecking vessels and killing people off Sam Lord's Castle, but he cannot try somebody who breaks another's pair of glasses that is worth \$30.00! We could have corrected all of that, but the same heavy hand of conservatism was laid upon the initiative of those Private Members who may have had a contribution to make, and who may have had something useful that they could have done by the way of a little law reform. The heavy hand of conservatism, and it was certainly the hand of the former Attorney-General, was laid upon this initiative, and we did not get the opportunity of carrying out the few amendments which would have helped everybody and could not possibly be a matter either of party division or party advantage. It was an all-Party Committee, as I recall it.

It is time that we stop this. Members must not try to bring, in my respectful submission, to the House extraneous matter into a simple thing like this. Either you are for women having the same rights as men, or you are not for it. If you are for it, you can pass this Act, send it to a Select Committee, have it dealt with in the drafting aspect, pass it into law, and in a year, two years, or three years you can bring down the Immigration Act to embody it, or if you are against the rights of women, you can be men. You can get up and say that you do not believe that Barbadian women should have the same rights to have their husbands living with them as Barbadian men have the right to have their wives living with them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasise that every argument that every case is dealt with on its merits is an argument against women, because the wives cannot be dealt with on their merits. They can stay here no matter how depraved and wicked their characters. There is no merit in dealing with a wife. There is an argument that a husband has to maintain his wife. Suppose his wife works for as much as he? Will he still have to maintain her? I would like to see that argued successfully before the Magistrates' Court or the Supreme Court of Barbados.

In these days we should not be looking at any foolishness like a husband has to maintain his wife. We should be looking at modern and progressive legislation like the legislation in the State of California

where they are even abolishing alimony. They have compulsory community property. These are the examples we should be looking at, and we should not be repeating all of this old world foolishness about a husband has to maintain his wife. We should be taking a serious look at whether proposals of this sort should not be introduced into Barbados. We should not say that because it is law in England - that is what I always hear being trotted out from the Members on the opposite side - it must be the law of Barbados. Even in England, Sir, things are moving.

Let me give an example. A set of Immigration Rules and Instructions to Immigration Officers recently came before the British Parliament for consideration. Those Rules were rejected on two grounds; two separate lines of arguments prevailed, and Government was defeated in the House of Commons of England on the Immigration Rules. Mrs. Shirley Williams, an outstanding fighter for women's rights and a very prominent Member of the Labour Party as well as a most able Junior Minister, moved the rejection of the Immigration Rules on the ground, partly, that they dealt differently with women and with men. This is what I said about the concession that an English woman could always have here husband live with her. [Interruption in the Gallery]

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the gentleman sitting in the Gallery behave himself! [Interruption.] Ask him to leave.

Mr. ADAMS:

In these days, as I say, the concession has been withdrawn. There was a most vile provision in the Immigration laws, namely, that if a man is a criminal in England but not English and you deport him, you could also deport his wife and dependent family. This was obviously an assault upon the rights of women, because there is no provision that if a wife is deported from England, her husband can be deported. There is no provision to that effect whatsoever, and it was on these grounds that one part of the majority, which rejected the Immigration Rules, based its argument. The other part, of course, based its argument upon a more conservative view of their brethren in Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Of course, that is not of so much interest to hon. members in here, except the hon. member for Christ Church North Central who now has the assurance that his descendants even on to the third generation will be re-admitted into Britain. That is only by the way, Sir.

Now, that legislation was rejected on some very sound arguments indeed. It was said that women could be treated differently from men in the matter of husbands and deportation. Why are we in Barbados holding on to these conservative views? I expect the support on this issue of the hon. member for St. Michael North East. They cannot do you anything if you support the Opposition. Let me apprise all hon. members to that effect.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Do you think you are talking to a jury?

Mr. ADAMS:

If I had the hon. member for St. Michael West on a jury, he would agree with everything I say, because he admires logic. He is a man who appreciates a good argument. It is only in a very few cases where his professional interests stand in the way of letting him see common sense that I have ever known him to reject a logical argument. The hon. Member for St. Michael West and, indeed, the hon. Member for St. Michael South West should understand that it is people like them who must have a

feeling. Both of them have shown, at different times in the House, that they can bring a broad and experienced view to bear on problems such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking all Members to give this bill a second reading, and commit it to a Select Committee. I give them the pledge that, if once the House accepts the principle, I am not going to force this Bill through Select Committee and third reading. There is still another stage, Sir, because there is no Rule that says that if you vote for a bill on its second reading you cannot oppose it on the third reading. You cannot vote against its passing. A Member is entitled to be as inconsistent as he likes in the House of Assembly. This is why I am urging the Government to send this bill to a Select Committee, if it is felt that there is a problem. 3.45 p.m.

That can't be a problem to Barbados, but what is a problem to Barbados is this: I am going to call some names. There is a Neilson married to a Barbadian for years and years; how can you tell that man not to live in Barbados? A man comes here and makes his home in Barbados and you tell him he must not live here! I heard the hon. Member for Bridgetown, always, I fear as befits his youth, open to prejudice, say "you are on bad ground." Mr. Neilson is a person for whom no member of the Opposition has one good thing to say. He is a person who thought that by close association with the Democratic Labour Party, he would acquire rights in Barbados. I don't care. You can give a man citizenship, and let him continue to vote for the hon. member for St. Lucy, and use North Point as the recruiting ground for the D.L.P. I don't care. In my own constituency there are non-Barbadians who are outstandingly opposed to me and I don't care. I will defend their right to continue to vote against me in St. Thomas - non-Barbadians married to Barbadian women. I would not want to see them removed from Barbados on those grounds.

There is not a bad case as far as I am concerned. The rights should be absolute so that a woman can choose a vagabond to be her husband just as a man can choose a prostitute to be his wife if they so care. We are all Barbadians and we must all have the same rights, male or female. I do not care anything about good, bad or indifferent cases. To me there is no merit. The equality between the sexes demands that men and women have the same right in matters of this sort, and I am going to characterise every Member of the House who gets up and speaks or who sits down and votes against this bill without being man enough to say what his views are in some language outside the House because it is going to be very unparliamentary, but I am going to characterise them all as the enemies of women's rights if they vote against this bill. What is more, the hon. Member for St. Michael West says I am not speaking to a jury now. Hon. Members in here may feel they are above juries, they can't be swayed by argument because that is all I can presume he means, that juries are susceptible to argument, but Members of the Democratic Labour Party have their minds closed. Let me tell him that when I appeal, I will be appealing to the great jury of Barbados, men and women alike. I urge on hon. Members the passage of this Bill.

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

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion. In the first place, when we think that men in Barbados have got the right to marry any woman of his choice whether she comes from Timbucktu, China or Russia, and despite the political feelings between Barbados or the democratic countries as against the Communist countries, that man has got the right to bring his wife to live in this country, and it is an unrestricted right. If you believe in equality of the sexes, then there can be no reason why hon. Members

should vote against this bill which would give women that same right to marry the men of their choice and to reside in their homeland without having to uproot themselves to live in territories where they may not want to reside.

There are several reasons why Barbadian women would like to marry husbands and live with them in Barbados. I know of a particular case of a woman who is married to an American and it is commonly known that 90 per cent of the West Indians would like to reside in the United States. They believe it is a land with gold on the sidewalks, a land of all opportunities as against the Caribbean where everybody is struggling to make a living. But this lady finds it best to live in Barbados for many reasons. One is that she has lived here all her life and the most pressing reason is that she does not enjoy the cold months in the U.S.A. If this husband is prepared to give up living in the United States and come to Barbados, what is wrong with that? Why can't he have the same privilege to live here as the woman from China who would come and live with her Barbadian husband? I know of another case of a Barbadian who is married to a Canadian and he is living in Canada, but his wife has taken the two children and lives in Barbados, and if the former Minister of Home Affairs was present, he could substantiate everything I have said, because this woman brought her two children here, left them in the home of the paternal grandparents and used to come in every morning at 2 a.m. or 3 a.m. I know that the Minister of Home Affairs was trying to put her out, but they had no authority whatsoever to touch her. They even referred the matter to the Social Welfare Department, because they could not move her. She was an undesirable, but she had the right to live in Barbados because she was married to a Barbadian citizen.

Looking at these instances, how can you deprive a Barbadian woman of having the right to bring her husband to live in Barbados. The Hon. Leader of the House says he knows that there is a new Immigration Act coming down. I would like to classify it in this manner. It is like I know that Jesus Christ is coming back to earth. But when? I have heard so; I agree with the hon. Member. The Leader of the House has heard so and he does not know, and the hon. member for St. Michael West has heard so, but he does not know, because from the time I have come to this Chamber I have heard of several bills which were coming down which would improve the present standing of the laws, but none of them has reached this House as yet.

I was sitting here and I wrote down many of the bills. There is the Immigration Act. I heard of it when the last Minister of Health was Minister of Home Affairs, but I have not seen it as yet. There was the Education Act as stated by the Leader of the Opposition, and there is the Revision of Laws of Barbados. From the time I came back to Barbados in 1964 I enquired about a set of Laws of Barbados, and I heard that the new set would be coming out at the end of that year and it was useless trying to acquire an old set. We have only got one year until 1974 and the laws have not been produced. An amendment was brought in this House to the Hire Purchase Act in the last session, but the House was dissolved before it could have been dealt with and I was told that they were bringing down a new Hire Purchase Act, but it has not yet come.

The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works says he will not join hands in any piecemeal legislation. He says he is going to do it when Government does it, but if there are some things which will enhance the position of the Laws of Barbados, then these could be attended to, because there is no doubt that our laws are antiquated, and if we are going to sit down and wait for all the revision, then God knows when we will get any revision being done, but while we are waiting for revision we are penalising the women of this country who should have the same equal rights as the men of this country.

If the men are entitled to go elsewhere and marry women of their choice, or if they are entitled to stay in Barbados and marry women of their choice who may be non-Barbadians to come to Barbados, it should be equally right for the women of this country to enjoy the same privilege, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my speech, and I am not making any apology for anything I say. The hon. Member for Christ Church West brought in a Resolution here dealing with the rights of women, and this only shows you the quality of the Leader of the Opposition in contradistinction to the Member for Christ Church West, because the Member for Christ Church West understands that this sudden change which is historical, which has existed over the hundreds of years cannot be altered in a day, and that you cannot just take away rights from one person and hand them over to another, because under the Laws of Barbados one of the privileges is that women get maternity leave while men do not; so you are discriminating against men. 3.55 p.m.

From the moment that God created Adam and Eve, if you believe the story, there was a difference.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, does the Speaker know of any man who has had a child recently, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Do not be frivolous.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

What I am trying to prove to him is that from the day of creation, there was a difference between man and woman, and when the Member for Christ Church West comes in, he is asking for a Commission to be set up to go into all aspects of discrimination rather than come in with a little amendment to what is in many terms a minor aspect of the whole question of bringing men and women equally together. The Member for Christ Church West shows a statesman-like approach but the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is showing a politically, emotionally, motivated type of approach to the whole question. Barbados is a developing country, Barbados has unemployment problems and the mentality of the employing class in Bridgetown has not developed to the point where they would give a black Barbadian a job on equal terms, and I can cite an example where people have been offered \$900 per month when that company does not have a black person earning \$500. We have to look at it as a Government realising that there are still employers in town who will employ a man from the slums of London in preference to a degree man from Cave Hill because of their mentality. They think that certain types of jobs are strictly for white people. I defy the Leader of the Opposition to tell this House of any single country in the Universe where a foreign husband can have automatic residence.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the United States of America, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of France.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

They have an active immigration policy, but the member for St. Philip South can tell you of a national who came in to my office last week and who had to send a million and one things before that right was

given to her to join her husband in Puerto Rico. You cannot go into America as you like either.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation, the point which is being made is that men and women should be treated equally. A woman has no greater right to join her husband in the United States than a man has to join his wife. That is what my speech was directed towards, there is still no way a woman can bring her husband from the United States here.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, to develop my argument logically now, I have never discriminated against women, but I love my country too much to allow a man to walk in here and take bread out of the mouth of a Barbadian man who has to support his family. Suppose there is a man who comes down with a Ph.D in Education and Industrial Relations, how would the hon. Member feel if the Member for St. Michael West says that because he has a Ph.D., he has experience and is married to a Barbadian woman, he should be given the job that the hon. Member for St. Lucy now holds in the Union?

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation, if a woman married to a Barbadian man comes in, all the things of which the hon. member complains will happen too. A woman can be born in the slums of London and come here and get jobs freely. We are only asking for equality.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of elucidation.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I say categorically that 95% of Barbadian women are married to Barbadians, so you could not be discriminating against that 95%. Not 5% of our women are married to non-nationals, probably 99% of our marital population in Barbados are now presently engaged to Barbadians, so you could not be discriminating against them, because every Barbadian who has brought up a family and who has daughters who are going to marry Barbadians anyhow - unless they go abroad and marry foreigners - cannot be told that this country is discriminating against all Barbadian women. There must be an emotional unsupported argument that you are discriminating against all Barbadian women. He cited statistics, why did he not cite statistics of the number of Barbadian women married to Barbadian men, and he will find that it is approximately 98%. There is no country that I know of, where a man, a non-national husband, has automatic rights of residence; he has to go through immigration, and it is a question of interpretation of immigration. If a Barbadian man marries a Barbadian woman, the only country he can walk into is Barbados, no other country. In any other country he has got to get a work permit and go through immigration. A Barbadian woman married to a man from England or America has two countries, the country of her birth or the country of her husband, and I do not know what people do when they are courting, they suddenly say they are going to bring their husbands to Barbados and let them live. I say this, that any woman who goes around with a man who is from a foreign country must expect to go and live prima facie in the land of her husband; she takes her domicile from him. The law says that you take your domicile from your husband, so if he is a Jamaican, automatically your domicile is Jamaica, so you have to change the law of divorce now before you get to marriage.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the hon. Member must not mislead the House as to domicile.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order. Let the hon. Member proceed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

What I am saying is that you have a domicile of origin and the moment you marry a man, you assume his domicile. The woman should be free to keep her domicile of origin. 4.05 p.m.

I am saying that you cannot change things by bringing in immigration. The Commission, as recommended by the hon. member for Christ Church, is sound, because there are a multiplicity of other areas in which the law discriminates and you cannot do things piecemeal. Let us have a Commission and let us see how Barbados can set an example in removing what are obvious discriminatory practices in the entire country. The hon. member for Christ Church West has done his duty, but obviously the Leader of the Opposition is putting his own Party man in difficulties. Having said what he wanted to say, he is now stifling the hon. member for Christ Church West. All of this political manoeuvring in the Party does not worry me. He is now taking all of the steam out of the hon. member for Christ Church West when he comes to debate what is a sound Resolution, because he is dealing with all aspects of discrimination. He mentions income tax, areas in which discrimination takes place, and so on. It takes place in a million other ways. You have the inheritance of property and so on.

If you want to make women equal with men and give them certain rights, making allowances for the difference which God himself created from birth, or whoever created a man and a woman, let us do it in a business-like way instead of voting for a little piece that is going to allow people to come into the country. I am not against women at all; I am for my country, and it is a sweet and glorious thing. I will die for Barbados, but I am not going to come in here with any monkey, piecemeal amendment to an Immigration Act because it has political appeal, and because somebody can get on a platform at the next election and say "Sleepy Smith did not vote for this." As far as I am concerned, if they do not vote for me, thank God I have a profession. I am not the world's worst lawyer, and the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, obviously is not as good as he pretends to be, because he credits the the member for St. Michael West with logic. If you ever use logic to a jury, you will lose every case you have. I think the member for St. Peter would know that. You have to use a little emotional appeal to the hearts of the women, and that is what will give you a verdict of "Not Guilty". If you go in for logic, they will lock up your client. When he says that he does not use logic, he must ask the hon. member for St. Joseph about the little emotional thing about appealing to the motherhood and so on and your client will walk through the door. If he thinks that he can fool somebody that he is logical when he is appealing, I think the Speaker will agree that the Jury are not logical at all. You have to use emotion and psychology to get home.

I am all for seriously considering the Resolution by the hon. Member for Christ Church West. The Members of the Opposition have four lawyers in their ranks. Take the question of alimony and costs in a divorce case, for example - up to now, I do not care how rich the woman is, the man is always called upon to pay the costs - I do not think it has been changed, because I understand that the Divorce Rules have not been brought up to date. If a man divorces his wife or she divorces him, he still has to pay the costs of the alimony! Why do you not deal with that? Is that fair? I have been at the Bar in Barbados for some time, and I have never yet heard a Judge ordering a woman to support a man when the marriage

breaks up or for wilful neglect to maintain him.

Now, a Woman brings a child, but, because the man agreed to have intercourse one night, the court says he must give her 10/- a week. She had the fun, and she is probably the one who enticed the man. You cannot get equality in everything. It is the man who will be run down every week with a bastardy summons or affiliation proceedings, as they call it. He was the one who was holding back, and she was the one who was enticing him forward. The poor man then has to pay. Is that not discrimination? Let us start getting realistic about things. There are several other things I could talk about.

Let me clear up a point. I went to Jamaica as a non-National. I went to Jamaica before it was Independent in 1958. I am comparing the Jamaican system. In 1958 I went to Jamaica. I am the only Member, as I have said in here, who resigned from this House and walked back in here as if I owned it. People who remained here could not get in, and I walked back in here as if I owned it. I will walk back in here as long as I want to. I was in Jamaica when Jamaica was in the Federation. Jamaica left the Federation in 1962. Jamaica passed a Work Permit Bill and back-dated it for 10 years, and I found that I would have to get a Work Permit to remain in Jamaica. I, therefore, had to take out Jamaican citizenship to be like the boys, so that they could not push me around. It was not a free choice, but when you are confronted with a Work Permit law back-dated 10 years and you are not getting what you think your ability entitles you to on your proven ability, what can you do? You must get citizenship like the other people. I had residence, too, but I had to go back and get a Work Permit after I had entered Jamaica when it was part of the Federation and a Colony. That was my position, and I have passed through this sort of thing. I should be the first person to welcome a free-for-all, but I realise that we have serious employment problems.

Mr. Speaker, you can get a man giving a hungry woman a \$1,000 to get married. She can be a Barbadian woman, a prostitute or anybody, and the moment the ring is placed on her finger and the magistrate pronounces "I deem you man and wife" the man can walk through the door. She would get some money that she would never have got and would, probably, have to work a thousand nights for, and he would walk through the door to live here happily ever after. If he is white, he can go down Broad Street and get a bigger job than a lot of people around here. That is the sort of thing that they want to give a carte blanche invitation for in this country. Let us change the law where the man is no longer compelled to support his wife, and make some law where she must go out and work and share with him. The wife works because she wants to help her husband to make the family's budget big. This is a domestic arrangement, but if you are sick, or if she treats you bad and you walk out, the law does not say that she has to give you a penny when the week comes. If you do not get a little National Insurance under this Government, then you will be in a bad way.

We cannot deal with one aspect of the matter. We have to deal with the entire question. I defy him to tell me of any developing country - do not talk about the United States and Great Britain - of the Third World, of which Barbados is a member, that allows non-National husbands to have automatic residence. America can take in people, because they talk in billions and trillions. They can spend a hundred and fifty million in one Moon Shop. You are talking about a country that has ten percent unemployment. You are talking about a country that is involved in Colonialism. You are talking about a country where the economic strength is still in the hands of white people who believe in a white accountant, and they do not want a black accountant to see their figures. They do not even want the union with black members to see their figures. They did not want the union to see their figures when they were

negotiating. When you get a situation in which you are not approaching employment on a National basis, regardless of race, creed or colour, the Government still has to reserve for itself that residue of control which is necessary to stop the flooding of your country with certain people who come from abroad. Prima facie it looks like discrimination. (Pause.)

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member cannot do two things at the same time. 4.15 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long except that the remark used by the hon. member for St. Joseph about a man giving up his country shows a great inferiority complex. Nobody gives up America to come down here.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation, I have never said that a man giving up his country showed anything of an inferiority complex. If his instructing solicitor is advising him on that, he had better let him get his facts straight.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that when the hon. Member for St. Joseph in his argument can use words about an Englishman giving up his country to come here which he used....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation. I never said that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

He did use the words "give up" because I drew it to the attention of the hon. Member for St. Lucy, because I even mentioned to him that he was giving it up for the sea and the sun and a beautiful place. The hon. Member did use the expression. That shows that he thinks that England is better than Barbados or that America is better when he is giving up something. He is coming for something better because all men desire some improvement and something better; and no Englishman, American or Turk would give up his country and come to Barbados to such salt as Bajans say.

I am against this bill. I do not think the matter should be handled in this haphazard way. There are very many areas in which discrimination is made against men in the laws of this country, against children, against women in other areas and it should be tackled by a comprehensive commission to go into all aspects of this question, and not just by amending one section because it sounds good politically and the Leader of the Opposition thinks he will get a few extra votes, but he is entitled to them if people are not prepared to put their country first, but to put some emotional argument about letting them come here. Of course, the main thing he has chosen this Order for, is that he would stop the hon. member for Christ Church West from having a good field day on what I say I would vote for, rather than this piece of amendment to the Immigration Act, because it has some political appeal to people who are not thinking.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. Member who has just sat down in that he has more or less stated the case of the Government in so far as this amendment to the Immigration Act of 1952 is concerned. The Policy which has been adopted here over the last few months has been to inveigle us

into allowing a bill to pass the second reading and then let it go to Select Committee. Again today we have a demonstration of that, but at this stage in so far as the principle of this bill is concerned, it is a principle which has been under examination by this Government from the time it has come into office in 1961 and it has been examined over and over again by successive Ministers, but we are not in a position to accept the principle of this bill and support the amendment as proposed by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

I do not care to make any long speech because I think the hon. former Attorney General and Minister of Communications and Works has done very well indeed and has stated the case for the Government, but it is the duty from time immemorial of the husband all over the world to support his wife, and even though the average woman or wife in some cases tries to supplement the small earnings of her husband, legally she is not burdened with the responsibility of maintenance as such. The argument is very skilful as used by the Leader of the Opposition. He tried to gloss over and spoke to us as if we were in the law courts and tried to convince us, but he did not do so well.

Mr. Speaker, one has to think in terms that Barbados has a population of 242,000 in the last census. Barbados has about 500,000 or more people living abroad; there may be 150,000 living in the U.S.A., 100,000 in the United Kingdom, 30,000 or 40,000 in Canada, and there are Barbadians all over the world including Panama, Cuba and the Islands. Let us assume that there are 50,000 women of the age between 30 and 50 who would bring back 50,000 expatriates for jobs. Barbados at our stage of development can ill afford it. It is as simple as that. Nobody is against women. Who voted for me for the 26 years I have been in here? Not only the old women, but the young ones, and despite any devious, skilful ways and manoeuvres by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the old and the young will vote for your humble friend despite these remarks and gesticulations by the Leader of the Opposition. To come here in this devious way trying to put a trap into which hon. Members would fall because he feels they cannot vote against this because women would get up against them since women run the home and the country and control the vote, is not going to work.

I do not think I need say anything more because I do not care to make long speeches. I like to get the business of the Government done and the people's business proceeded with. But you were not on a good wicket, you will lose the game, and the trap of trying to get us to agree to a second reading, we have seen to it at long last because it will not go to Select Committee where some members fail to attend or their attendance is more or less in the breach - I am not speaking of you, Mr. Speaker and some other members who are always there - but the fact is that when a matter goes to Select Committee after the principle is accepted here on the second reading, the Committee reports and it is adopted. These tricks are over. We cannot at this stage accept the principle of the Bill which aims at bringing in expatriates in large numbers, because if we brought in 50,000 from abroad, where would the jobs come from? How many people would go hungry?

Hon. Mrs. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to say something because I am the only female member on this side and I know that regardless of what I have to say, I will be criticised. If I say I will vote for it I will be criticised and if I say I will not, I will be criticised, but Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest with myself and to my country. I am a very dedicated Barbadian. I happen to be the mother of children who have married foreign men. One is living in a foreign land and I have told this child more than once that when she is married to a foreigner she has to accept the place where he lives; she must accept his nationality and she

must be prepared to bring his children up in his homeland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the position is this: Barbadian women want equality. I am not in total agreement or total disagreement. Women have been fighting for a long time for equality because most of us have been discriminated against. I am not here to recite ways in which we have been discriminated against, and I was hoping that the hon. Member for Christ Church West would have been here today and perhaps I would be able to speak on women's rights, but we are dealing with the Immigration Act and an amendment thereto in which Barbadian women would like their non-national husbands to become citizens of Barbados. Barbados has a population of a quarter million people and jobs are difficult to obtain. 4.25 p.m.

We have an international agreement where Barbadian men cannot go to Trinidad or Jamaica or anywhere and marry their native women and automatically become citizens. I do not see why we in Barbados should open our doors when we have not got enough land or enough jobs to accommodate our people so that these people can come in. What has happened to our Barbadian men? I should not be here thinking about Barbadian men, but I have a husband and I have a son, and my son has his rights in Barbados. I would hate to think that any foreign man can come into Barbados and deprive my son of his rights. I could not stand for it, as a mother, and I think that the women who are mothers and who are talking about this have not really known true motherhood, because if they did they would know they have to fight for their children's - especially their sons' - rights.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could be allowed to read a passage from the Bible. This is from Genesis Chapter 3 verse 16 after Eve was tempted by the serpent and she ate the fruit and gave some to Adam. God said to the woman, "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." I have no objection to my husband ruling over me. I go on to read what He said to Adam. "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." We have some Barbadian men who I do not think are real Barbadian men because they want to lean on the women and let the women protect and support them, but it is high time that Barbadian men be the chivalrous men they were before. (Cheers).

Mr. SPEAKER:

The time for Private Members' Business has now expired.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, I know Private Members' Business is out of order now, but I hope that the hon. Member would read Chapter 2 verse 24 at the next sitting. It reads "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife and they shall be one flesh."

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Government Business is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE DENTAL REGISTRATION ACT, 1972

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I have a Report from the Select Committee which was appointed to deal with the Dental Registration Bill, 1973. I would like to state that this Committee met under your chairmanship on three occasions, the 15th and 31st January and on 5th February. This Committee considered the proposed amendments to the Bill and I now present the said Report. Copies have been circulated to all honourable Members. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Report of this Select Committee be adopted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one matter which I would very shortly canvass upon third reading, and it relates to a point which unfortunately seems to be a red rag to many hon. members, an immigration point. I would urge upon the Government to consider that if it had stated in more than one place that it intends to expand the number of dentists in Barbados, to consider that it would be quite unable to do so by bringing in foreign dentists under present immigration conditions, because I am informed beyond any possibility of contradiction that in this day and age it is impossible to get a dentist to leave one country and go to another under any terms of a three year responsibility, because the initial investment in dental equipment is so great that nobody is going to pick up money, thousands of pounds or dollars as the case may be, to equip a surgery, if there is any possibility that at the end of three years he has to go somewhere else.

If you really are using a two prong policy of expanding dental care in Barbados by means of training Barbadians on the one hand, and on the other hand you are also going to try to bring in foreign dentists as you bring in foreign doctors, it must be understood that the two professions have a deep and

fundamental difference at the start of practice, namely, that a doctor can go somewhere and practise with a stethoscope in his pocket and nothing more, but a dentist needs a lot of expensive equipment to run his surgery, and this contention is borne out by the fact that many dentists have not come here and set up practice. You cannot get a foreign dentist to come here in private practice, you can employ them at the hospital if the Government provides the equipment but you cannot get them to come here and buy equipment under present immigration conditions. The Government could as well abandon all hope of improving the dental service in Barbados if they are not revising the immigration laws.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in the motion under Private Members' Business gave the impression that foreign men married to Barbadian wives could not come here no matter what qualifications they had.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation, I am very sorry if I gave such an impression, they have no right to come here.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

They have just as much right as any foreign person to apply for a work permit. 4.35 p.m.

Now, if a dentist, male or female, married or unmarried, were to apply to come to Barbados now, it is my impression that that dentist, being a qualified person in our local terms, would get a permit to come and reside and work whether or not that person was married to a Barbadian. I do not think that the question of our present laws prohibiting anybody, who is married to a Barbadian woman, from coming here to practise is applicable.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I am sure that nothing I have said about the dentists was intended to relate to marriage. I am saying that Government's policy is only to give 3-year work permits to the dentists. It has nothing to do with marriage and wives. I have said that you cannot get a dentist to come here to work on a 3-year basis. You will have to give him a longer time than that. If you want a dentist to buy a chair and bring down here to set up a practice in Bridgetown, he is not going to do it on a 3-year permission. You will have to give him a guarantee that he will be able to stay here, and it has nothing to do with marriage.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, equally on a point of elucidation, I understood the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to say that a person would have to have some particular local Barbadian ties, and this is where I understood the question of being married to a Barbadian was concerned.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to keep getting up on this. I said the only foreign dentists who are here are persons with particular local ties. There are only two, Sir. The hon. Member for St. Michael South East is better qualified to tell you the local connections of one of them. One is married to a Barbadian, and one has local connections.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, under this new Act, the dental technicians and such related persons will now be granted permits by the Minister not exceeding three years to perform certain services. We know that there is a great scarcity of dentists who are available in our country. I would like to urge on not only the Ministry of Health but the Ministry of Finance that they should now think of providing either scholarships or the necessary funds to assist persons who have been granted licences, particularly the dental technicians who claim that they can do ninety percent of the work that a qualified dentist can do, so that at the expiration of their licences in three years those persons would be able to go abroad and qualify under the same bonded system that obtains for civil servants.

I think there are seven dental technicians who are now in practice. If the Minister could regulate the licence in the light of what I have suggested, I believe we would be able to build up the dentists' population in Barbados. Rather than bringing in expatriates, who are very reluctant to come here for three years and then go somewhere else to start all over again, I hope that the Minister will bear my suggestion in mind and make provision for it in due course.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I see the point raised by the hon. Member.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I should like to draw to Your Honour's attention that this is the third reading. I have no amendment. If there are no amendments on the third reading, I do not see how Your Honour could be permitting a debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is my understanding of the Standing Orders that very short speeches could be made on the third reading. There is nothing to prevent short speeches. Standing Order 47 (3) deals with amendments as such, but there is nothing to prevent short speeches.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised a point that dentists would not come here for three years. That may well be so, but if 20 dentists apply to come to Barbados because the field is wide open and the Government was so foolish as to give them indefinite residence, what would become of 20 Barbadians who qualify and come back to find that foreign dentists have got the practice to which citizens are entitled?

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to explain to the hon. member for St. Joseph that Government has already given consideration to school-leavers by sending them overseas on scholarships to study dentistry as well as dental technician work.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of explanation. Mr. Speaker, I am not dealing with school-leavers. The period of training persons to be dentists is six or seven years.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, under the Standing Order the Speaker cannot allow a member to make two speeches.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thank you. The hon. member is on a point of elucidation. Make your point of elucidation briefly.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking of the dental technicians who are already pulling teeth, but who are not qualified dentists under the new Act. I am asking the Government to make provision whereby such people can borrow money, be bonded, and go abroad to spend a year and become qualified dentists. That is all I am asking.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that they would not be qualified dentists, because you cannot become a dentist in a year. In any case, the Government is making the necessary provision for training and sending people overseas. We now have some people in training who should be returning to Barbados in three years as qualified dentists. If you are talking about sending the dental auxiliaries for a year's training, then the Government will consider the matter.

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

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE GUARANTEE
BY THE GOVERNMENT OF A LOAN TO BE
BORROWED BY THE BARBADOS HOUSING
AUTHORITY FROM THE BARBADOS
DEVELOPMENT BANK**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, Item No. 2 stands in the name of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Government of the payment of a principal sum not exceeding \$2,000,000 and the interest thereon, the said principal sum to be borrowed by the Barbados Housing Authority from the Barbados Development Bank. I am asking for leave to deal with this Item in the absence of the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in the Addendum it is clearly set out that the Resolution seeks to approve a guarantee by the Government for the repayment of a loan of \$2,000,000 to be borrowed by the Barbados Housing Authority from the Barbados Development Bank under the conditions

(i) the loan of \$2 million shall be taken up as follows:

(ii) the rate of interest payable by Public Officers on new loans should be increased from 7% to 8%.

(a) \$600,000 immediately.

(b) the balance after an interval of 6 months at a monthly rate not exceeding \$100,000.

4.45 p.m.

The position, Sir, is that for some time this public officers' loan fund has not been functioning. They have been awaiting funds to finance it. This measure will permit many people who have been waiting for some time to be accommodated because I can tell you that as Minister of Housing in 1969-70 I was aware of the fact that this fund was not functioning effectively, it has to be funded, and we are seeking ways and means to do so. It has reached a stage where we can only accomodate the ones in the lower categories where the loan is not very substantial.

The appropriate Minister is not here, but this is a matter which I know needs urgent attention. It has been in need of attention over the last two years in my opinion. I do not know what the Minister might have done recently, but I know there are many people who have been awaiting these loans, and I would like to see some action on this. This is the public officers' loans. It functions under the Housing Authority as such, but is separate and distinct from the sugar workers' loans and the other loans. The position is that the Housing Authority should raise this loan of \$2 million from the Barbados Development Bank at the rate of 7 1/4 per cent for the purpose of making loans under the public officers' housing loans fund, and the Barbados Development Bank itself should obtain these funds by way of an investment of \$2 million at 7 per cent which the National Insurance Board should be invited to make in the Bank. \$600,000 will be take up immediately and the balance after an interval of six months at a monthly rate not exceeding \$100,000. The loan will be for a period of ten years during which no part of the principal should be paid to the National Insurance Board. At the end of the ten year period unless the National Insurance Board agrees to an extention, the loans to public officers should be suspended until repayment received by the Housing Authority and the Housing Authority satisfied the loan from the Development Bank. The rate of interest payable by public officers on loans should be increased from 7% to 8% and it has been agreed that at least 1/2% of the repayment by public officers should be allocated by the Housing Authority to a sinking fund on fixed deposit.

I am giving hon. members a little more information than they may have. I can commend this guarantee by Government in that it is quite safe and there is no risk involved and there is ample security. There is real property security and there is collateral, so that the guarantee in this case is no problem.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House welcome this Resolution because it seeks to provide loans for certain Government employees in a category which is not covered under the Urban Development Corporation. As far back as 1969 the then Government said that there was a backlog of applications on the part of public officers for housing finance and at that stage they had promised to release a certain amount of money. I do not know what is the position as regards any money being released between 1969 and now, because although one may say that it does not come under the direct operation of the Housing Authority, at any rate the money released is still controlled by the Housing Authority and I think it is only fair that if we are going to guarantee the sum of \$2 million and place it in the hands of the Housing Authority, this House should be in a position to know what is the financial position of the Housing Authority and what has been in operation during the last two years.

As far as I am aware the last report published, the Thirteenth Annual Report of the Housing Authority, was published on 1st April, 1968 for the period 1st April, 1968 to 31st March, 1969. Nothing has been published since then, and I think that if we are going to place money in their hands, we should have some idea of how this money is being spent to ensure that it is being spent for the purposes for which it is voted. Now this leads me to other points, and one is the whole question of housing in Barbados. I think the Barbados Workers' Union should be given some sort of credit for its efforts in the housing development which they have started, because they realise that there is a need for housing for the working-class people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Don't stray too far. The Resolution deals with housing for public officers.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This deals with the question of the money being given to the Housing Authority, and what I want to deal with is the operation of the Housing Authority. I do not see why we should vote money just because the Addendum states that it is for public officers, and we should grant the money without commenting on the operation of the Housing Authority.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is not the time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would give way, I think the hon. member has been in here long enough to know that the Housing Authority is divided into two sections; there is the general workers' loans and sugar workers' loans which are administered by the Housing Authority proper, and then there is the public officers' loan which is separate and distinct, if the hon. member would give way on a point of elucidation I could probably give him what he wants to know about the money advanced for that purpose over the last years and what is outstanding and so on. This is information which I think hon. members may want to know.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will permit that in your reply, but not on a point of elucidation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I will give way to the hon. member at this stage to assist us in the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

As a matter of reply I will allow it, but not now. Would the hon. member please continue. I will not permit the Leader of the House to read these figures on a point of elucidation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Can I give way to the Hon. Leader of the House who can give the figures which I think would assist hon. members on this side?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Strictly speaking, that is not a matter of elucidation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It isn't that I am giving way to the hon. member, but I think this was done a few weeks ago when an hon. member on this side gave way to the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That creates no precedent. Continue. 4.55 p.m.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I was attempting to shorten it but since there is no assistance coming forward I will have to deal with it at length. Although the Resolution speaks of the public officers' loans, and although one may say that it comes under certain parts of the Housing Authority, certainly incorporated in the past reports of the Housing Authority has been a report dealing with the Public Officers' Loan Act and how the money has been disbursed. This is what I am seeking to ascertain at this stage, how the money has been disbursed since the last report issued in 1969. In that report we noticed that the Housing Authority was empowered to borrow money and advance to the public officers at the rate of 4 1/2% per annum, and then the Government was prepared to meet the difference between the interest charged to loanees and that paid by the Housing Authority for any loans obtained for that purpose. In the space of about 4 years we notice now that the entire interest, as it would appear from the Addendum, the rate of interest on the new loans will be increased from seven to eight per cent. Anyone looking at the last report would see that at that stage money was lent to the public officers at the rate of 4 1/2% per annum, now under this Resolution the rate is to be increased from seven to eight per cent, but I would like to find out from the Government the reason for this and whether it has anything to do with the failure of the Government to get back from the public officers any money lent to them. I would like to find out also between 1969 and today how much money has been lent annually and how much money has been recovered. I believe these are the figures which the Hon. Leader of the House has, and I hope that when he replies he will give us the necessary information.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make certain comments on this Resolution, particularly since it relates to housing. The Resolution deals with the provision of money for housing officers, and it is good to see that some attempt is being made to satisfy the burning desire of people in the public service to own their properties and to build houses of their own. I think that all of us are aware of the fact that people at the lower level of the public service have been experiencing a certain amount of difficulty in obtaining loans to build houses or to purchase the houses they want, and this attempt to satisfy this need is indeed a

welcome one.

I would hope that one would see much more emphasis being placed on making the people who are not in the higher income brackets being in a position to own houses, because we realise that the provision of proper housing for people in the community is something to which this Government is committed, and indeed is something which is of importance to the development of the human personality. Since the Resolution deals with the Housing Authority and gives the Housing Authority the authority to administer this, I would just like to make a couple of comments on the whole question of housing. I think that the first thing which one has got to examine is the fact that there is need for a new concept in our housing policy because there is too much emphasis on the cluttering of housing developments in the metropolitan area.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like the hon. member to confine his remarks to the specific subject of the Resolution.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I was adopting the line that in as much as the Housing Authority was the authority committed to the expenditure of this money, that in the confines of this some reference should be made to the way in which the Housing Authority is administered and how the Housing Authority administers its affairs.

Mr. SPEAKER:

This is not the time for that.

Mr. GREAVES:

Just let me make a point on the question of the management and the administration of the various funds which are committed to the Housing Authority for administration. As I said, there have been a number of complaints about the system which operates there and the way in which money is granted to deserving people, and I think that this is something which has got to be looked into because one must be aware of the fact that there is need for.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that that is exactly the same point on which you forbade the hon. Member for the City to debate.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made a valid point, but I was watching the drift of the hon. Member's speech.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I have drifted back to my original point. The main point I want to make is that I sincerely hope that every effort will be made to ensure that people who are more deserving of these loans will get them, because there have been numerous complaints of people, particularly people who work in the road.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

This Resolution has nothing to do with people who work in the road as such.

Mr. GREAVES:

I am talking about people who are employed by the Barbados Government and who are entitled to loans. My understanding is that this Resolution covers people who are employed by the Barbados Government in the capacity either of Permanent Secretary or of Messenger who fall under the description of a public officer. 5.05 p.m.

I was looking through the Report from the Housing Authority, and they made mention, under the section dealing with Public Officers, of what is the definition of a Public Officer. I was just looking for the definition, because I think it would give us an idea of what we are talking about. I am sure that the Report indicates that the people we are talking about are people who are working in various capacities with the Government. It says that a Public Officer means any Officer holding an office established under.....Sir, it goes on to include the people on the unestablished staff, so I think that I am on safe ground here. I do not see any reason for an objection. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that this category of people often experiences difficulty in getting loans from the Housing Authority to build their houses for the simple reason that they do not have friends at court.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. I do not think this is right. When I sought to deal with this point you stopped me, and you said that this aspect of the Housing Authority was not relevant. I think that if your Ruling applies to me, then in all fairness it should also apply to the hon. Member.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order!

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If you rule that I was irrelevant when I made a speech, certainly when the hon. Member deals with it he should also be considered as being irrelevant.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point. Confine your remarks to the subject.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I believe you are aware that I am not dealing with the same point the hon. member attempted to deal with. I am now dealing with Public Officers, and I have given you the definition of a Public Officer as set out in the Report. It says that a Public Officer means any Officer holding an office established under and by virtue of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949, or any Officer who is holding a post included in the item.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has just read that section. Do not repeat it; get on with the matter.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I said that these people have experienced difficulty, and I hope that consideration would be given to such people and that they would not be pushed around when they try to get loans to better their condition.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the Government has found it necessary and is willing to guarantee this loan in order to assist those persons who, in my opinion, are in a very difficult position so far as housing in this country is concerned. I should like to see the Housing Authority set aside a sum of money to assist those persons who want to purchase the land on which their houses stand, and also to assist persons who want to repair their houses.

I should like to find out from the Leader of the House, who is handling this Resolution, the amount of money outstanding from the Fund as it now stands. I should also like to find out from him the level of repayments, and what is the extent of the arrears in respect of this Fund. My reason for asking these questions is that I have been very concerned and disturbed very recently over the number of persons, particularly postmen and that category, who constantly flood your office or meet you on the road with complaints about going to certain banks in order to get loans. They are told to get somebody to back the note; they are told to get plans to show how they are going to repair the house, and they are finally told that the banks cannot help them.

Mr. Speaker, there are Insurance Companies operating in this country today, and many of the Public Officers, who would seek to borrow money from the Housing Authority, are persons holding Life Insurance Policies in those Companies. Every morning you wake up and hear over the radio how many loans have been granted. Some people apply for loans, and they are told to get plans. The plans are passed by the Town Planning Department, and then the people are told that there is no money available as a frivolous excuse.

I have said that it is time the Government begin to control a lot of the advertisements, because where they are false, I would adopt the American standard. I would prosecute them and put the money into the Housing Authority so that the money obtained from the prosecution could be used as loans for people who need money to repair or build their houses, or to buy the land on which the houses stand. Mr. Speaker, any practising barrister knows that, day after day before the Magistrates' Courts of this Island, you will find people being evicted from house spots. They say that the house is too old to remove it; they work with the Government, but they cannot get a loan to repair the house. You will find somebody from the Housing Authority sending a note to the Magistrates begging them not to issue an eviction, because the Department cannot cope with the demand for house spots, loans, and so on.

When we have reached this stage in this country today, I think that, in guaranteeing the loan and the Housing Authority making the necessary loans available to persons who qualify under the Act, the Housing Authority should also see that the repayments are kept up to date. The person who takes a loan and does not repay it, automatically prevents his neighbour or his brother, his sister, his cousin or his uncle from obtaining a loan. That is why I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us how much money is outstanding, what is the extent of arrears under this Fund, and what steps are being taken to recover the money.

Mr. Speaker, we have to look at our less fortunate brothers who are in need of housing. Under the new Taxation Act, there will be a lot of evictions. There are not only going to be evictions from land, but evictions of Public Servants who are renting houses. When your land tax goes up, automatically your rent is going to go up. You will not be able to pay, and there are going to be evictions. The only answer

will be to go to the Housing Authority. The Commercial Banks in Bridgetown do not lend money for repairs to chattel houses. That is something a lot of people do not realise. The Banks will tell you over the radio every morning, how easy it is to get loans. I have heard an unknown taxi driver who tells you over the radio how proud he is to know that a certain Bank has come to Barbados, and that people now know the facilities of the Bank. I wonder how much he has been paid for saying that. I wonder when he hears his voice if he says to himself: "Am I not fooling my brethren" for probably \$15.00? There is no institution in Barbados that will lend the common civil servant sufficient money to go and buy 10,000 square feet of land. They will always base the repayment of the loan on the level of their salaries. 5.15 p.m.

I know certain insurance companies that operate in this country for years that would not even go so far as to join the salaries of husbands and wives together in order to give them a loan to purchase their own house, but if you come from the Gold Coast, you could have come from Timbucktu, if you are buying land in Sandy Lane estate, as one solicitor has told me, you buy 22,000 or 40,000 square feet at \$1.20 per square foot and they would lend you the money; but no person in that category is the person who will qualify under this Act, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the fund when handed over to the Housing Authority should be administered in such a way that there is a recurring fund to help all those persons who will now find themselves applying to the Housing Authority for assistance either to build a house, repair it or purchase the piece of land where the house is, to save eviction.

I hope that when the sum is passed that we will not hear, anymore, of persons running up and down and into the various Banks and saying that the Banks say they will lend them the money if they get somebody to back them because the Housing Authority has not got the money. I can call the names of three Bank Managers whom I telephoned personally on behalf of a postman and the final one told me that he would tell me the honest truth: that the Housing Authority is the place to accommodate these people. I hope the Minister can tell us what funds there are, what are outstanding and what method of recovery there is.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. member for St. Joseph, has finished his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has taken his seat and I am not giving way.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There are two hon. members on their feet. Let the hon. member for St. Joseph take his seat.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the guarantee of \$2 million. I am glad that the Government has seen fit to do this. I am not going down into any Gold Coast because I do not consider that \$2 million is going to prevent people in the Civil Service from coming and saying that they cannot get houses. I am not one; of those people who believe that \$2 million can suffice the needs of all the people in the Civil Service who want to borrow money to build houses, because this has a limited effect. This

will only meet certain needs and depends on the number of Civil Servants who apply. This is under the public officers housing fund rules. This is something we have dealt with in the past, not anything new, but it is a question now that the Government has agreed to allow the Housing Authority or the public officers to borrow money and this money is not coming from the Bank. This money is coming from the National Insurance and it is made available for these uses, and the policy of the National Insurance Board and our view, have been that we should make some of this money available for this kind of investment in Barbados because we do not feel that all the National Insurance money should be invested in the highest f m of return by exporting it where you can g t the highest return. You can get a higher return than 7 1/2% on your investment, but we feel that some of it should rotate in Barbados in finding better housing; so this is something that is going to be to the credit of Barbados and help better housing.

I should like to suggest that the time has come that for the public servants or for anybody borrowing money, the laws should be amended to suit the circumstances. You know, Mr. Speaker, that I do not hold any brief for the lawyers because they are too antiquated and look too much out into the far distant past, and because the Roman law said this, they do not want to make any attachment. You cannot develop a country based on the English legal system; you cannot develop Barbados based on the Roman system or the French system; you have to develop Barbados based on the economy that you are operating, and Barbadians do not have the tradition of paying for these things. The only tradition they have behind them is slavery, and in order to get them in this you have to discipline them, and the only discipline you can have is to take out their money by law for a house. No man should expect to live in a house for free. It has to be one of his first charges, like a man in business must realise that one of his first charges is the wages he pays to people, and therefore the Government or the Housing Authority should have laws to reflect this thinking. Tell the Crown Law Officers whoever they are, to get legislation drafted and bring the country up to date with this, so that you do not have to ask these people who go to live in these houses to pay, and then you have all this stupidity of going into court. You do not want to waste time going into Coleridge Street to pick up money from people. You want to be able to attach it on to his salary. Any man who wants to build or own a house must be able to come forward with something. You are not compelling a man to build or own a house, but if he wants to own a house, he must be in a position to pay for the house. After all it is property, it is an investment that he can pass on to his family. It is something he can write in a will, and if he can do that, do you want me or somebody in the community to pay for something that he can put in a will and pass on to his children?

I do not go for this idea of making fun with people. There is too much of this idea that you can play the fool with people. In my view \$2 million is not a large sum of money for this purpose. I heard the honourable member for St. Joseph say that he hopes nobody will come and say they do not have any money. \$2 million can only build 200 or 300 houses. I feel it is a good system, but as I said, I think the time has come when the Government will have to think of extending this to other organisations and institutions, because the only way you are going to house Barbadians a little quicker is to put more hands to work at this job of housing than relying on the Government service alone, and I hope that the Housing Authority will institute modern methods of collecting and the Government will pass the laws. The responsibility is on the Government to pass the laws to make it obligatory and compulsory that everybody who borrows money from the Housing Authority must as a matter of right, like income tax, have it deducted at source. You will find out where they work, how much they earn and let them agree to have so much deducted from source, and make the employers in this country take it out without giving them any money for so doing. This is a public service you are providing and we are not paying out any commission for doing public work. 5.25 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before you put the question I would like to give some more information for the benefit of honourable members who have spoken. I am speaking as of 11th September, 1972, there were 91 applications for loans totalling \$693,640, and those applications have been approved but not yet granted, owing to lack of funds. There was an additional number of outstanding applications, apart from the 91 which have been approved and are awaiting funds, totalling 1,220 for amounts totalling approximately \$5 million, so the applications under consideration during July, August and September total \$5,693,640.

The position is that as far as the monies advanced to this fund are concerned, the original loan was \$500,000, a Barclays Bank loan of \$1,830,000, a Barbados Development Bank loan from the National Insurance Fund of \$3 million, and the monthly repayments total approximately \$50,000 which is applied as follows:

Repayments of Barclays Bank \$25,000 loan

Interest on Barbados 16,975

Development Bank loan of \$3 million at 63/4%

Administration 4,500

\$50,475

The position then is that repayments to the Board are almost fully committed and there is nothing left to grant any further loans.

In 1969 when the Barclays Bank loan of \$1.8 million was due to mature, the Government agreed that the Housing Authority should negotiate with Barclays to amortize the loan for a period not exceeding 8 years, and as a result of this negotiation, the Housing Authority requested and Barclays agreed to amortize the loan on a monthly payment of \$25,000. At the end of September, 1972 the amount outstanding was \$1.3 million. In order to improve the financing of the fund it was agreed in 1969 that the Housing Authority should raise a loan of \$3 million from the Barbados Development Bank by way of an investment of \$3 million which the National Insurance Board was invited to make to the Bank. The interest payable by the Housing Authority to the Barbados Development Bank amounted to \$16,875 per month at 634%. It has been noted that the Government also agreed in 1969 that the \$3 million loan should be for a period of 10 years in the first instance during which time no part of the principal should be repaid to the National Insurance Board. At the end of the ten years, should the National Insurance Board not agree to an extension? Loans to public officers would be stayed until the repayments received by the Housing Authority satisfied the loan from the Development Bank, and the administrative expenses of the Public Officers Housing Loan Fund Division of the Housing Authority was \$4,500 per month, and this as well as the interest payment of \$41,975 (\$25,000 to Barclays Bank and \$16,975 to the Development Bank) financed from repayments by borrowers from the fund which total approximately \$50,000.

I am trying to satisfy hon. members to give them as much information as I can so that they will have

an idea of the funds available and the amount of loans outstanding. I should like to add this, that the hon. member for St. Joseph along with other hon. members - because most hon. members in here speak of the low income groups - the fact is that over the last few years the fund has been advancing even though slowly more to the lower income groups but enough money for the higher or middle income groups was not available. I share the views expressed by the hon. members for St. Lucy, St. Joseph and St. Peter that the ones in the lower brackets under \$10,000 will be accommodated on equal footing with the others, many of whom have been accommodated to a greater extent in the past. I agree also with the Member for St. Michael West when he says that \$2 million merely touches the surface, because you need another \$8 million in my opinion before you can service the needs of the ones who have been waiting for the last five or ten years.

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

When progress was reported, the honourable Member for St. Peter was speaking. He may continue.
5.35 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering whether hon. members wanted some diversion to deal with other matters at this stage. Should we go back and complete the Resolution?

CONTINUATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73, No. 27

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, without seeking to praise anyone, one must confess, having listened to the reply by the Leader of the House on the last Resolution and looking at the Addendum of that Resolution and comparing it with the Addendum set out in this Resolution that those who are responsible for the Addendum in this Supplementary Estimates should be complimented, because it sets out fully most of the information that one would require in the House. The last Addendum was certainly bereft of any information whatsoever, and the information that the Leader of the House gave in his reply should have been set out in the Addendum for the assistance of the Members on this side of the House.

I want to deal, first of all, with Item 16 - Overtime. The note states that the necessity for supplementary provision stems mainly from the requirement to pay overtime to the chauffeur/messengers for work done outside of their official hours, etc. I want to know if it is the official policy of the Barbados Government to employ two chauffeurs for the Permanent Representative at the United Nations, because, to the best of my information, I understand that there are two chauffeurs although he has one official car. One takes him to the United Nations daily, and the other one is stationed at his house in Pelham. I would like to know whether the Barbados Government is paying for both chauffeurs.

I think that it is an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers of this country, because one chauffeur is driving his official car and one is driving his private car. I do not think that the taxpayers of this country should condone this sort of behaviour. If he wants to have a private chauffeur, then let him pay the chauffeur.

Now, in addition to this, you are giving him, under another item as the Representative to the United Nations, a travelling allowance. So far as the Chauffeur of the Consul-General is concerned, I feel that the additional sum of \$4,000 is in order. I have visited New York, and I know that this particular chauffeur does a lot of overtime work at the Consul-General. We on this side welcome that part of the Resolution. He does a lot of overtime work, and I think he should be paid for it.

I understand the hon. member for St. Peter was dealing with this question of the travelling allowance for the chauffeur to the Permanent Representative to the Mission at the United Nations. His chauffeur, apparently, gets paid for going to Pelham on the grounds that Pelham is far away. Now that the Consul-General of New York has gone into his stately mansion in Long Island, his chauffeur has to travel to his home late at night after taking around Members of the Government, who from time to time visit New York, and he is not given any Allowance in those circumstances. If you are going to give an allowance for the other chauffeur to go to Pelham, then I think it is fair that the chauffeur who has to travel home late hours at night - it is quite certain that, whenever he is finished working with the Members of the Barbados Government or other dignitaries who visit New York, he must take the State car back to the Consul-General's residence before he can travel to his home.

On the question of the additional \$1,500 under Item 49 that is required to supplement the allocation to the Consulate-General in New York and results mainly from an increase in the cost of monthly rentals of telephones, I challenge anybody in the Government to deny this. They have rented a house for the Consul-General which has in 12 telephones, and they are asking the taxpayers of this country to pay for this. I think this is grossly unfair to the taxpayers of this country. As the hon. member for St. Peter has said, not even the Prime Minister has 12 extensions in the official residence at Culloden Farm. Why is it that the Consul-General should be given a house with all of these telephone extensions?

I want the Government to know that the time has come when a stop must be put to the lecturing during office hours by the Consul-General in New York. During the time, he is supposed to be working for the taxpayers' money in this country, he goes off to lecture at one of the Universities. I know that this is a fact. He lectures in the afternoon between 1.30 p.m. and 3 p.m. at a University. This cannot be right. No Permanent Secretary or civil servant can leave his work from 1.30 p.m. to 3 p.m. to go and lecture at a University. That is grossly unfair to the taxpayers.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Do you not hear one broadcasting cricket?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

You allow that. If this is the sort of Government that is going to allow civil servants to take time off to do this sort of thing and then ask the Government to pay for his work, it is grossly unfair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

It is the Public Service Commission. Do not blame the Government. It is the Public Service Commission that has given him leave. I agree with you that it is not right.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Let us get it straight then, Sir. Some directive should come from the Government as a matter of Government policy that a stop should be put to it. I am not saying that you have any control over the Public Service Commission, but if the Minister and the Government let it be known that they object to this sort of conduct, I am quite certain that the Public Service Commission would put a stop to it. It is wrong for this sort of thing to happen in Barbados and in New York. The present Consul-General and the one before him have taken time off during office hours to go and lecture at Universities.

With reference to item 54 - Maintenance And Upkeep Of Government Property, this is how the taxpayers' money is being wasted. You take this palatial mansion at Pelham where from the time you get out of a car you are walking on carpets from outside right into the house. It is stated here that over the past two months certain defects have been observed in the electrical wiring at the official residence at Pelham. Repairs should be undertaken as soon as possible since the existing wiring is considered dangerous and is described as "precariously a fire hazard". 5.45 p.m.

"The estimated cost of material and labour as submitted by the contractor is U.S.\$1,925 and the sum of E.C.\$3,800 is accordingly being sought to meet this expenditure."

Now this is less than three years after you purchased the house that you find that the entire wiring is considered to be a fire hazard. What sort of inspection was made at the time when this house was purchased? Last year there was a Supplementary Vote for unforeseen repairs which had to be undertaken at Pelham, the official residence of the Permanent Representative to the United Nations, and for that we voted an additional sum of \$2,000; so every year in addition to the money that is voted in the Estimates, we find we have to come back and spend money on these residences. The hon. member for St. Peter said "not spend", "vote". We have to come back and vote money to be spent at the official residence at Pelham. There must be some stop to this squandering of the taxpayers' money.

I represent perhaps one of the most depressed areas of Barbados and the Minister of Communications and Works not so long ago visited part of the constituency. He did not tell me he was going, but I still went along with him, and he saw the conditions under which people are living in certain parts of Bridgetown. I objected three years ago to the purchase of this house because it was a waste of the taxpayers' money, and you are virtually spending on the upkeep of this house the money spent on the rental of the house, so that you have actually gained nothing by purchasing this house, because the same rent you were paying then you are now paying for the upkeep of the house. This cannot be fair to the taxpayers.

When the Representative to the United Nations was in London, you bought a house and gave him to live in and he did not live in it, and you had to turn around and pay for a flat, and now he goes to Pelham and something goes wrong with Pelham. This individual is a luxury that the Barbados Government cannot afford. He goes to the United Nations and this financial year already we had to vote \$13,000 to buy a new official car for him, and now we find another Supplementary under Item 55 for the Permanent Mission to the United Nations \$4,600. The note states that the allocation to the Permanent

Mission was E.C.\$7,600. Expenditure under this item to 31st August, 1972, amounted to U.S.\$3,193 an increase of over \$US2,000 over the comparable period of 1971. This has undoubtedly been the result

of the increased age of the car which had to be garaged on nine occasions over the period at the cost of E.C.\$2,900 (U.S.\$1,526). In August last year, we were told that the official car, the Lincoln Continental was purchased in April, 1970, at a cost of \$US5,635 and between April 1971 and May 1972 the amount of \$3,267 had been spent on essential repairs. The note to this Addendum says it was \$1,520 U.S. while the last note said it was \$3,267. This House of Assembly and the taxpayers of this country are being taken for a ride by this Mission to the United Nations. We have really got to analyse and look at the productivity of this particular individual and see what he has been costing the Barbados Government.

In London it was a question of two chauffeurs making a quarrel. The house was too far for him to live in and you had to bring him to London and rent another flat for him. He goes to the United Nations and he has to have two chauffeurs, one at his home at the disposal of his wife and one at his own disposal at the United Nations. What sort of luxury is this? Not even the Prime Minister of this country has this, and you tell me that the Government must sit back and agree to this sort of thing?

Now that is, not all for the Permanent Mission to the United Nations. If you go a step further, you will see Item 50 - Travelling. I do not understand this at all, because since August last year, we voted money for him to buy a car. I would like to find out if the car has been bought as yet, and what is the position with the money we have voted, because we are told that it has been necessary to lease transportation on many occasions during the first half of the year when the old official car had to be frequently garaged for repairs, and the original allocation under this item is now completely exhausted. The acquisition of the new official car has reduced the necessity to hire transportation. What do you mean by that? I thought the acquisition of the official car would do away completely with the necessity to hire transportation, and at the same time you come back and ask us to give him money to run his own car? This gentleman is a luxury the Barbados Government cannot afford, because as I reckon, in the space of two financial years on travel and repairs of vehicles alone, this gentleman has cost the Barbados taxpayers \$27,900. This cannot be right with so many roads here in need of repair, with so many people

in need of proper housing. I wonder what travel he does in the United States, when he is always in Barbados. In addition to the travel, you have an amount that must be spent on rewiring of the whole house. I would like to know how these things are done. What control has the Government over these things in External Affairs? When last was there an audit in External Affairs? This is a very serious matter because we voted in the original Estimates over \$31/2 million, and by the time the financial year would have been completed we would have spent \$4 million in External Affairs at a time when, as I said, people in Chapman Lane, Green Park, Lightfoot Lane and all these areas live in depressed housing conditions.

The hon. member for St. Michael West and the member for St. Lucy talked about raising the standard of people which can only be done if money is injected into housing in this country, but you are not doing that; your priority as I see it is to take this money and spend it overseas on foreign affairs indulging in luxuries which this Government cannot afford.

Now there is an interesting feature under Item 55 - Consul General, \$4,100. 5.55 p.m.

The note states: "The official car broke down on 8th November, 1972 in the middle of a flooded street and had to be abandoned. This is the sixth time it has broken down in circumstances of rainy or snowy weather. These breakdowns and attendant repairs have now almost completely exhausted the Consulate's

allocation under this item.

The car is reported to have a serious electrical problem which would require complete rewiring at prohibitive cost. It is therefore proposed to replace the car early in the next financial year. In the meantime it has been decided that the present car should be repaired at an estimated cost of U.S. \$400 and disposed of, and that the Consul General should lease a car for official use at the rate of U.S. \$200 per month.

Proceeds from the sale of the present car will be accounted for as Revenue."

I would like to know which car broke down on 8th November, because there is going to be a new car for the Permanent Mission to the United Nations and for the High Commission in the United Kingdom there is to be the installation of a new engine, gear box, radiator and temperature guage. This no doubt refers to the Mercedes, but it is obvious that the people who are driving these cars are not treating them properly. Something must be done because I do not think it is fair just to come and ask us to vote money each time on the grounds that a car broke down six times and this sort of thing. I would like to know from the Minister responsible which official car broke down on 8th November and had to be abandoned. As far as I know, the official car of the Consulate General in New York was an Electra, and I know that after the 8th November, that car was in use in the United States, so it was not abandoned on 8th November.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

They mean that they had to abandon the car and get out, they do not mean that the car was left there and never used again, they had to seek other means of transportation until the car could be taken to the garage.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

What I would like to find out from the Minister is if the car was in use after 8th November because it was in perfect working condition then. If something has gone wrong with it, it is obvious that this has happened since 8th November because towards the end of November that car was in working order. This Addendum is not correct, no car was abandoned on 8th November, and as far as I know subsequent to the 8th November the car was in working condition and being used by the Consulate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

What I am saying is that on that day, the occupants had to get out because the car broke down, they left the car and got other means of transportation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The Minister does not seem to appreciate the point. What has become of the car? What is being suggested in this Resolution is that as a result of the car breaking down it was of no more use and that this was the sixth time it had broken down.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

if the hon. member will give way, I will try to explain this more fully. The Consul General reported that the official car broke down on 8th November, 1972 in the middle of a flooded street and had to be abandoned, that means temporarily abandoned. The cost of repairs to the car because of water damage

has been assessed by the agents as U.S. \$400. This is the sixth occasion on which the car has broken down in circumstances of rainy or snowy weather, the Prime Minister being a passenger on one occasion. The Consul General has accordingly recommended that the car be disposed of immediately after repairs and that he be permitted to lease a car at the rate of U.S. \$200 per month pending the purchase of a new vehicle for which funds will be sought in the draft estimates for 1973-74. During the visit of the Minister of Legal Affairs, who is also Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs opportunity was taken to inspect the vehicle, and he supports the Consul General's recommendation.

The present car is reported to have severe electrical problems, which would require complete rewiring at prohibitive cost. The repairs to the car would be U.S. \$400. Lease of a vehicle for five months at \$200, and operating costs. (Asides.) You will not give me a chance; I have not yet got through with the paragraph. This has contributed to high maintenance cost during the year, and funds provided for the operation of the vehicle have now been almost completely exhausted. It will therefore be necessary to provide funds to meet expenditure on gas, oil, etc., for the remainder of the financial year, and supplementary provision in the sum of \$4,100, is required. The figures I have are: repairs to car U.S. \$400, which is \$800 E.C.; lease of vehicle for five months at U.S. \$200 which is \$1,000; operation costs U.S. \$650 - \$1,350, making a total of \$4,100. They have not set out what the cost of rewiring is.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sir, I do not understand that. What is the serious electrical problem which would require complete rewiring at prohibitive cost? I am not going to sit in here and vote money because the Consul-General wants a new car. If it were in Barbados it would have to be condemned by a Board of Survey. No civil servant or quasi-civil servant can get in New York and decide that he wants a new car and ask the taxpayers to pay for one. What is the value of the car? The prohibitive cost must bear some relation to the value of the car. Now, \$400 could only be considered prohibitive if the car costs \$1,000. The car that I saw in New York at the end of November was in working condition and it was valued at more than \$1,000. Do not come in here to tell us that the Consul-General recommends that a new car should be bought, and that the Attorney-General agrees with it. We are not here to sit down and vote money because a civil servant decides that he wants a new car in which to drive! How can we be sure that he does not want a new car because the Ambassador to the United Nations has a new car? We cannot support Resolutions in this manner. If the repairs will cost \$400 and a new car will cost \$5,700, what is the position? I never knew that the cost of rewiring a car could be considered as prohibitive. I suppose the hon. member for St. Joseph, who is au fait with these matters, will deal with that aspect of the matter.

Sir, the note states that it is therefore proposed to replace the car early in the next financial year. In the meantime it has been decided that the present car should be repaired at an estimated cost of U.S. \$400. Let us read with common sense. The rewiring is at a prohibitive cost. You are going to repair the car at an estimated cost of U.S. \$400 to put it in a condition where it can be sold. You are not going to sell a car with defective wiring to somebody and hope to get a good price for it. The second part of the Addendum suggests that you are going to repair it and put it in a condition fit for sale. How could \$400 be a prohibitive cost? What is the value of the car? Do not tell us that the Consul-General wants a new car. If he wants a new car he should buy one. We are not going to spend the taxpayers' money in that manner.

When the Minister gets up to reply, I would like to know, under Item 50, how much the Lincoln was

sold for, and what has become of the money. I am sure the Prime Minister would not come into this House and tell us that he wants more money to rewire his house or even Parliament unless he had a Board of Survey. This idea of allowing the Foreign Affairs Department to do as they like is totally unsatisfactory, and a check must be put to it. If things are going to be abandoned, then we must have a Board of Survey on them before we seek to replace them. The Consul-General cannot take it upon himself to condemn things. If it is decided to condemn a vehicle at the Ministry of Communications and Works neither the Minister nor the Permanent Secretary can decide to do that without the Report of a Board of Survey. The Consul-General cannot decide to condemn a car and expect us to agree to it. This is unsatisfactory and we are not going to support this Resolution.

Mr. BODLEN:

Mr. Chairman, I remember when we last had a Resolution before this House asking for money to buy a new car, I raised the issue of the speedometer reading of these cars. It is very difficult for me to understand how, year after year, the Government of Barbados is called upon to change cars and do extensive repairs which no reasonable human being or no reasonable business man operating a car would be called upon to do. 6.15 p.m.

Now I have not yet seen in the Addendum to any of these Resolutions the ages of the cars or the speedometer readings of the cars, and I have said before that if you are going to buy expensive cars like the Lincoln Continental, the Electra, the Mercedes or such cars, they all carry a guarantee period in which the makers, because of the prestige name of the vehicle, will repair the cars so as to save their name. First of all, in looking at the Mission to the United Nations, I have made a quick summary here and we are asked for \$13,550. This is supplemental to what we voted already, and it seems strange to me that under Item 16 - Overtime the note says "it is also occasionally necessary to pay other members of the non-representational staff during the same period for work done outside of official hours." It does not say what is the work that is being done outside of official hours. We know that occasionally something may happen.

When we come to the motor cars in particular under Item 50, the note says that it has been necessary to lease transportation on many occasions. If you take simple mathematical calculations, you will see that what is happening is that the Government could have bought a new car based on the repairs of one car and the leasing of another, and then the Government would find itself with three cars so that if one breaks down, you could use the other. But as it stands we are asked to vote \$7,300 - under Item 55 - Permanent Mission to the United Nations, \$4,600, and under Item 50 \$2,700 for the leasing of a car; so we are actually voting the price of another Lincoln Continental within the space of less than a year, and still we are told that these cars which are supposed to be new cars are not in proper working condition. I really do not understand this.

Now I would like to hear from the Minister what is the age of the car which is being used by the Permanent Mission to the United Nations; I would like to know the mileage which has been recorded to date or at the time when the request was made. The same thing also is required in the case of the

Consul General because these are factors which will determine whether the type of vehicle which the Government has bought is suitable for the work it is doing, and whether the cars are being mal-treated

by the chauffeurs, and then this Committee would be in a position to say that it is justified in passing this money now, but also letting Government take some hint or directive as to its future dealings with these particular types of motor cars or the drivers or whatever the case may be.

When we look at the Consul General's car, it fascinates me when I hear that the car has a serious electrical problem which would require complete rewiring at prohibitive cost. This is sheer rubbish, because the Minister of Communications and Works would know that a car or a vehicle can only have serious electrical problems in the spark plugs or the coil, and all these new cars carry alternators, and those come in what the trade calls "jacket wiring" which you pull out and plug back in. Mr. Chairman, when you see an Addendum which tells you that a vehicle has serious electrical problems and a complete rewiring is prohibitive. I think whoever wrote this Addendum thinks that everybody in here only drives a motor car and does not know anything about it. In order to justify this they say it has broken down in circumstances of rainy or snowy weather. The simple answer to this is that the moisture is jumping the wires, and I would bet my last dollar that all you have to do is to change the spark plug wires from the coil, down through to the plug to the distributor cap and the car would be as good as new, and this would not involve prohibitive costs. If they want to know, I can tell them that there is a firm in Florida called J. P. Whitney & Co. that sells electrical goods for any motor car from the Model T Ford down to the 1973 Buick, and I guarantee them that it is not going to cost \$400 to rewire that motor car. I would like the Minister to tell the House what are the serious electrical problems and the cost of rewiring. There are certain parts of a car that you do not rewire. It dies and when you strip it down some of the wire looks as new as when it was first put in. As the honourable Member for the City said, if the Consul General believes that because the Permanent Mission to the United Nations is going to pose in his new car, he is going to pose in one too, it brings me back to the typical American or the Baptist Priest. As soon as the fellow around the corner gets a new car, the next Sunday morning you hear "Oh dear, Oh dear, Mr. Jones has got a new car; you cannot expect your pastor to drive in his 1972 car." And the collection starts. Because Brother Jones is getting a new car, Brother Tom wants a new car too.

Another point is this. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works knows that if the Government of Barbados has a vehicle which they say is defective in any respect, it has to go before a board of inspection. I have known of a case where a Police jeep struck a wall and the right front wheel was knocked off completely and the right back wheel was folded up like a concertina, and they said it had to go before a Board of Survey to be condemned, and even then it could not be sold by private treaty; it had to pass through the official Government auctioneer and be put up for sale at public auction. If you look after the taxpayers' money in Barbados to such an extent, why must the Consul General be able to recommend to Government that he be given a new car? The Prime Minister of this country has been driving around a Mercedes, I believe, for the last six or seven years. Let us forget the political sides on which we stand now; if the Prime Minister is able to drive around his own Mercedes for ten or twelve years without coming to the House of Assembly and asking the taxpayers for money, and without a chauffeur, why is it that as soon as a car becomes two years old in New York, these people want new cars? I heard last year in this House that if you trade them in after two years you get a good resale value, but they don't wait for the trade-in, they find all sorts of excuses about the electrical system breaking down and that the car has been in the garage six times and so on.

Mr. Chairman, if I had a new car and it went into the garage six times in one year, I would be in the agent's office making so much noise that they would call all the police in New York to lock me up. I would use political blackmail. I would tell everybody not to buy the Lincoln Continental or the Electra

because they would break down in snow water. I know the agents would not like to hear this, especially coming from a Mission from abroad that the agents have said that the car must be rewired at a prohibitive cost, so you have sold it. 6.25 p.m.

If you are going to spend \$400 to put it back in a saleable condition, are you then going to tarnish the name of Barbados by saying that the Barbados Government sold a broken down car for an elaborate price, or are you going to sell it as it is? If the car is so bad, why should the taxpayers of Barbados pay for repairing it to be sold? There is some line which most people have not seen in this list of requests. Last year we were dealing with the very gentleman who now occupies the position of the Permanent Representative to the United Nations. When he was in England, there were complaints about motor cars, and we had complaints that when the officers in the Mission wanted the cars they could not get one to use. The Leader of the House on his way back from Africa was in England and spent five or six days without having the privilege of driving in any of the Government's cars in England because both cars were always out being used by persons other than the Barbados Government representatives in England. He was marooned because he could not get one of the official cars to drive him, and had it not been for his son the Hon. Leader of the House might not even have got to the airport.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Although most of what the honourable Member has said is substantially true, I was not marooned.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I withdraw the word "marooned", but it is absolutely true. Those cars were being used in England by Guyanese who were driving around. There was a big row in England when the keys to one of these cars were held by Guyanese who refused to give them up to any of the Mission's personnel, including the chauffeurs. If you follow the trend, you will see that these new cars follow one man. Can we afford this luxury? Now the present representative in England finds that he now has to put a new engine, a new gear box, radiator and temperature gauge in the car. What are we really doing? It is not fair that one gentleman is taking the taxpayers of Barbados for a ride left, right and centre. Are we going to sit down here and vote money every time a request comes, to satisfy the whims and fancies of one man? Is it not time that the Government takes a serious look and sees what he is costing the taxpayers of this country? Peter is now following Paul, because we hear now he has moved to the United Nations and the Consul General feels that if that gentleman can do it, so can he. There is no doubt about it, any car will stop in any flood whether it is a busy street in New York or whether it is in Constitution Road, Baxter's Road or in St. Joseph, because the new system of electrical wiring which they use, carry a carbon in the plug wires, and after the car has been driven for a while this carbon attracts moisture and in flood times this will go. Every car agent will tell you that all you have to do is to change the distributor cap with the wires and you have the car working perfectly, so I do not understand this serious electrical problem and this prohibitive cost.

What is the prohibitive cost in relation to the motor car and the number of miles the car has done? These are the factors that should be determined. In this day and age when the country is struggling to get an agricultural policy going to feed people, and trying to provide housing for people and so many other fields that require money, we cannot afford to spend all this money on these things.

Look at Item 54. The note states: "Over the past two months certain defects have been observed in the electrical wiring at the official residence at Pelham. Repairs should be undertaken as soon as possible

since the existing wiring is considered dangerous and is described as 'precariously a fire hazard'. The estimated cost of material and labour as submitted by the contractor is U.S.\$1,925 and the sum of E.C. \$3,800 is accordingly being sought to meet this expenditure."

Mr. Chairman, last year's note to a Supplementary Provision in respect of repairs which had to be undertaken at Pelham, the official residence of the Permanent Representative to the United Nations, stated that in addition, substantive increases had taken place in respect of wages, labour charges and insurance charges on the official residence and they requested the sum of \$2,076. There are several factors again which have got to be considered in this light. When you talk about serious defects being discovered in the electrical wiring, as I said, some people get fooled easily. The building codes of New York State require that all electrical wiring must be in conduit. Conduit wiring is designed because you can change any particular section. It is different from Barbados where any Tom, Dick or Harry builds a house, cuts a channel down the wall, places any electrical wiring in this channel and makes a joint in the ceiling and hope for the best, because you cannot cut it back out, but that has had a life of 30 or 40 years. In conduit wiring you only have to look in the ceiling where the defects are and correct them.

In England the official house was too far away from the centre of London and it was too cold. I heard the present High Commissioner in London admit in this House that the house to him was first class and that he would gladly live in it but others might not appreciate its beauty. I can also tell you what used to go on at the house because I know. You should ask about the after six happenings in that house when both cars are used to drive from London to the house with persons other than Government officials. 6.35 p.m.

You are going to find yourself in the same position with the particular house as you were with the residence of the Representative at the United Nations. Every time there is an opportunity to put in a supplemental, you will get a supplemental for large sums of money coming from this Mission. I would urge on the Government at this stage to take a serious look at the money we are spending. You cannot expect the poor, unfortunate taxpayers of Barbados, who go to the Housing Authority to ask for \$300, \$400 or \$600, to feel good when they are told that there is no money available and then to hear over the radio or to read in a newspaper that every two or three months the Consul-General in New York or the Representative at the United Nations is requesting fantastic sums of money.

Another point is that serious defects have shown up in the last two months. The gentleman knows that November, December and January are the cold months when you would be using electrical heating, or something of this nature, which would put an excess amount of load on the wires. However, the first snow-fall you have had during the winter in New York started last week on Saturday. The temperature had been in the sixties all along, so how did they find the defects? How did they find the defects in December and January, if the Addendum is correct? They can fool some people by saying that it is now winter, and when you had to use the heating system you were able to find out certain defects. Everybody has been saying that he had an Indian summer; the temperature has been in the sixties constantly until the cold-snack came two Saturdays ago. I was, unfortunately, in the United States at the time. When I arrived in the United States on the Friday night the temperature was between 52° and 56° and by the Saturday evening dropped down to 30° and later 10°. There was no heating being used at that time, so I would like the Hon. Minister to tell us about the defects and the work which has to be done. That is my contribution, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to everything the hon. members have said on that side. I am not going to answer in detail, but they have certainly laid down some principles which I think the public of Barbados should not be permitted to believe. Barbados is an independent country. I am not going to dwell on whether the Opposition opposed it in a federation or not, because that is past history. Going into independence means that you must have overseas representation in countries abroad, so we cannot talk about houses in Church Street or in Lightfoot Lane. I know that they have bad houses and bad roads, but I would not, for political gain, tell the people in this country, in order to please them, that we are spending money in Washington on buying a house when they need a house here. I am not going in for that type of politics at all. You have to teach the people what is good for them and for their country. I want it to be quite clear that the people in Barbados, whether they live in a hovel or a palace, must understand that Barbados must have overseas representation and you cannot put our representatives to sleep under London Bridge, Washington Bridge or in the slums of Harlem or in the slums of East London. You have to give them a proper house befitting the dignity of an Ambassador or High Commissioner abroad.

The next point is, is it cheaper to rent or to buy a house? The house we bought in Washington and the one we bought in New York are good investments. It means that the people in Barbados, even though some of us do not have houses, have an investment in Washington, in London, in New York and in Canada. The houses do not belong to the Government but to the people. Do not encourage the people to believe that this money could be used for housing for them. Nobody in his right mind could send an Ambassador to Washington or New York without giving him a proper house in which to live. Why encourage people to believe that we are spending money on houses in New York, London and so on, which, could be used for their own housing. I would not encourage them into that thinking. If they think that I am speaking wrong, then they can kick me out. I am not going to encourage them to think that we are spending money in New York, Washington and London that could give them houses and roads in Barbados. It is equally important, because from that type of representation Barbados is a member of the United Nations, a member of the Organisation of American States, a member of the Inter-American Development Bank and the Associated Agencies of the United Nations. It is through this type of representation that we were able to get \$2 point something million to help build the Community College. It was due to the fact that the Ambassador was living in circumstances befitting the dignity of a small country that he could afford to approach the World Bank or any of the American Agencies. When he has to give a dinner party, do you want the people to be sitting around a rusted table top in some hovel in Harlem? I would not encourage people in that type of nonsense. He has to entertain and live to a certain standard.

Now, I will agree with you that the Ambassador must be conscious of the economy of his country and not ask for unnecessary things. I agree with you that there could be economies and there should be more scrutiny. Some of us get in here and tell the people that the Government bought a house in Washington and it could have built 50 houses for Barbadians here. I will not encourage people in this country with that small-minded, pusillanimous type of thinking. It is not fair to the Government. Barbados has to be represented. We as a Government have shown a remarkable sense of restraint. Let us compare Jamaica that has more poverty than Barbados. Let us compare Trinidad. We have restricted our overseas representation to the areas in which it is a must: Canada, Australia and our best friends to the North, the United States with the Monroe Doctrine and influence in the region. Canada, America, the United Kingdom with whom we have ties for over 300 years, and the United Nations. Those are the four main

areas, as you will see from the Addendum, in which we have decided to put representatives. We have not splurged with somebody in Bonn; we have not splurged with somebody in Geneva; we have not splurged with somebody in Belgium because of the European Common Market, or in Africa because of our close ties. We have shown remarkable restraint and commonsense.

Now, I will deal with the officers later on, because the cocktail parties abroad make some people feel that they are a special breed of animal. I know that I am a special breed of animal. I want the people to understand what independence means. It means overseas representation; it means that your Ambassador has certain things to do. I do not know whether he has two chauffeurs or not. If he has two, then the Government should look into the matter and see whether two are necessary or not. I do not doubt the hon. member, because I do not know. I try to run my little Ministry over here. I am not concerned with the status or standard or improper life of the Ambassador. I have my own views on that, too, which I am not going to say in this House.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Sir. If the honourable Member has his views, let him get up in here and tell them to us.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members are on their feet.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

The hon. member must give way, Sir. 6.45 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

You cannot bait me. I have my views and I know the Prime Minister has his views, but it is not important to this. Whether he has two or not I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will take that back, because if there are two and the Government can use one, then it is our bounden duty to use one. There is no doubt about that.

On the question of overtime, we pay overtime here to people. We have got to pay overtime in New York and we have got to pay on the rates comparable to the New York rates, and when the hon. member for Bridgetown mentioned \$3 million or \$4 million, we have got to pay the officers not in the Barbados salaries.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of elucidation, the one thing which I said quite clearly is that I was not questioning overtime paid to anybody. The honourable Member for St. Peter did not question overtime; he questioned the travel to get to Pelham.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The hon. member for St. Peter, as I understood it, did deal with overtime and he did suggest some method whereby it could be obviated completely.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation, what I suggested was that rather than go on from year to year paying

overtime, Government should consider what has been spent over the period and see if it would not be better to have a definite arrangement with the chauffeurs or whoever have to be paid this overtime and see if we could not arrange a basic wage and effect a saving in this way.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I appreciate what the hon. member has said, but the Leader of the Opposition can tell him that whether or not you like cocktail parties, in the particular representational sphere there are a certain number of cocktail parties you are forced to go to as an ambassador abroad. You have to give one perhaps on your country's national day if you have any close association. You may have to go out to a dinner; and anybody would tell you that at functions very often you get a chance to see somebody that you could not see to press a point of view that you cannot press otherwise, and if used usefully like some C.I.A. and some other people use them, they can be very useful meetings. There is no way at all in which you can arrange to fix a salary and keep a man one night 10 o'clock, one night 11 o'clock, one night 12 o'clock, one night 7 o'clock and one night 6 o'clock. You cannot work it in that fashion. A cocktail party may be from 5 o'clock to 6 o'clock, a dinner from 6 o'clock to 10 o'clock. I think the hon. member would agree that what you can ask is that if you cut down on the two chauffeurs, you should then see to it that overtime is kept within the budget that the Government votes and should only exceed it in special circumstances with detailed explanation. You cannot escape overtime; it is part of the life of an ambassador to be going to different functions from time to time, or the man having to meet him or to meet the Prime Minister. I don't go near them, but if I went into London and wanted a car, I would insist that they meet me, since I am a Member of the Government and one of Her Majesty's Ministers; but fortunately I can get around without them. But that would be part of it. You could not ask him to meet me on B.O.A.C. coming in at 12 o'clock a night without paying overtime. What I agree with is that he must see if he can economise.

In the case of communications, apart from telephones, it depends on what is hot. You can never predict telecommunications to come through at what you vote for it anymore locally than abroad, because if sugar is coming up and you hear the Minister say so, you have to get on the lukewarm line and relay something, and it will vary from time to time. I agree that the ambassadors abroad should be told that they should only use the telephone in emergency when a letter to the Minister or the Prime Minister would not do, and not just pick it up because he wants to hear somebody's voice. I agree there may be room for economies and these should be guidelines to people, because we have to make the ambassadors abroad realise, if they don't, that Barbados has a lot of needs, and where we are committed to overseas representation, they as Barbadians, whether they have been out of the island long or not, must still try and mesh themselves into the social and economic aspirations of the people, and not, because they find themselves in London or New York, attempt to live like the ambassador from the U.S.A., the United Kingdom or France. They must live within the means of an aspiring young country whose people at home are making sacrifices to keep them to the luxury to which they are not accustomed and have only become accustomed because of their postings abroad.

What I think we can say is that in view of the criticism of the Opposition, since we do not have in England.....and I can tell you these are vouched

American contractors or car dealers and we do not take the Consul's words for it; but the Minister will deal with that in some detail. These are based on some assessment whether the contractor knows that Barbados has no comparable engineer or mechanic to tell him that that is too high, as I would do if I

went to Courtesy Garage Ltd., and I thought that the bill was high, I would go to my garage man opposite the Garrison Service Station and say "Tim, tell me what do you thing." We do not have that, but there is time and opportunity when we should set up some machinery where we can vet, because people think you have coppers. As soon as they hear Mission, the fellows think you have coppers. So long as the Mission's car or the Ambassador's car comes into the garage, even here, you will know that it makes a difference in price, if "Little Quashie" goes or the little man goes. I agree that there is room for vetting the bills and the needs for repairs.

Now I deal specifically with the upkeep of buildings, because I see that honourable Members are not quarrelling with the rental of office machines and matters of that nature. Having bought this house, if the contractor says it needs rewiring, you cannot gauge a house by the three years you have bought it. In Barbados there are some rats that if you build your house today they can gnaw away the wiring tomorrow the way they are being built as the honourable Member for St. Joseph has said. They must have rats in New York, because I heard that they have quite a few in Harlem. Wiring is a peculiar thing. As a matter of fact, when I stayed at Pelham and I went to put on the switch in the winter, I used to get a shock and I would think that the wiring was bad, - the honourable Member for St. Joseph would know about this - but whenever I put on the switch when it was cold, I would find some spark flying at me. I don't think it was wiring; it may have been due to a general electrical fault. Even if the contractor says the wiring needs repairing, even although the house was bought three or four years ago, I think it is an expenditure which the Government has got to meet. We cannot send our Electrical Engineer up there. We cannot send our Mr. Johnson up there to check on it, because it would come to more than that, and if he checked it out and it needed it, you still have to pay the American contractor. You cannot pick up the men from the Government Electrical Department and send them to rewire Pelham. So let us be realistic. These are based on contractor items which we have got to face.

I have judged from this debate that the Members on the opposite side certainly like the High Commissioner in Canada because I do not hear any criticism about him, or it may be because we have got more Canadian aid because of the representation in Canada that they think the expenditure, if worked out, is good enough.

The question of the vehicle needs some examination and some details. I am sure the Minister will give details if he has them, or if he has not, he will convey to the Minister of External Affairs the views of the Members of the Opposition. You do not say anything about utilities, national insurance, clothing and uniforms, and you did not even quarrel about entertainment unless the Leader of the Opposition will deal with that, but up to now no Member has spoken on that. It is all right to talk about here you have a Board of survey to survey Government vehicles. People do not know, but there is no item of Government furniture in this country that can be disposed of or condemned unless there is a Board of Survey, whether it is a chair, table or typewriter, or fan. In England, America or Canada it would be extremely difficult because even with the Board of Survey here when it comes to a technical piece of machinery at the hospital or a technical piece of machinery at the Harbour, I as Chairman of the Estimates Committee have my doubt as to whether the people on the Board of Survey are competent to condemn it. There is a lack of skill and consequently it would be extremely difficult to send to America, Canada or England a survey team to condemn or survey vehicles. 6.55 p.m.

What we must do, and I agree with this, is to see to it that the people in the Missions abroad are made aware of this country's economic position, that they are made aware that this country is a poor country

trying to make its place in the sun, that we are forced to have overseas representation because it is a concomitant of independence, but do not let the people of this country feel that this money could be given to them for roads, water or light. I know how it hurts to see the lack of proper roads, the lack of water and the lack of light and so many deprivations in this country, and therefore I know how you feel when you voice your criticisms, but let us not tell people what they should not be told, that the Government is sacrificing them and buying houses abroad with money which could be used for housing for them.

So that the Minister of External Affairs should not rely without strong and valid evidence on the word of people who may be like Pastor Jones and, I think, Pastor Tom, and want everything that they see the Americans with, and they have a burning desire to keep up with the Joneses, (they might get the American syndrome or the South American and want a cadillac instead of a house) a close watch is kept on what goes on in these Missions. Therefore, anything that the Opposition has said to impress upon the Government the need to watch the economy, the need to save for local use monies which are being squandered abroad, I am one hundred percent behind them, and I probably share the view that in some cases, the Government should seriously evaluate the work of some of its overseas representatives.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, it took the Minister a long time to agree with the Opposition. We are not saying that we are opposed to overseas representation, what we are saying is that we do not agree with the squandering of taxpayers' money in the manner in which it is being squandered at the moment, and for this reason we will not support a Resolution such as this. The Minister might say that he knows about bad housing in Barbados and people trying to get political gain, but let me ask the Minister where his social conscience is. He beats his chest and says he is a socialist, but what kind of socialist can he be? What sense of priorities does he have? How can you afford to spend the amount of money you spend overseas when people in this country, especially in my own constituency, are badly in need of housing ?

I remember years ago when the Barbados Labour Party first introduced a Resolution in this House to buy for the first time a state car for the Governor I was a young boy listening in the Gallery and the Prime Minister, the High Commissioner in London and the Member for St. Michael South Central made such an attack on the Barbados Labour Party that that debate was quite lengthy. When you are in Opposition you have a social conscience but when you are in Government you can do as you like.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation, I quarrelled with the then Government about the Governor's car in 1956 because when the Resolution was introduced by the then Leader of the Government, the late father of the Leader of the Opposition, their main reason for such a measure was that the car was too small and the Governor's plumes would go through the top. That was my opposition to it.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That was his reason for opposing it, but obviously that was a flimsy reason. The reason why I oppose this today is because there is a squandering of the taxpayers' money, and it is dishonest for this Addendum to state that the official car broke down on 8th November and had to be abandoned when I know that at the end of November last year, the same car was being used in New York. It is dishonest for the Government to come in here and tell us this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I have not really attempted to give any information to the honourable Member, but to say it is dishonest, is carrying it too far. I am speaking in connection with the maintenance of the motor car at Item 55. The expenditure under this Item was incurred on the purchase of petrol, oil, insurance, repairs, servicing and tyres for the official car. Expenditure between 1st April and 31st August, 1972 amounted to U.S. \$3,192.63 (E.C. \$6,065.99). During the same period in 1971, the expenditure was U.S. \$1,056 (E.C. \$2,132). In the month of April the labour cost was U.S. \$222.25, parts \$146.26, making a total of U.S. \$368.51 (E.C. \$700.16). In May labour cost was U.S. \$241.32, parts \$602.18, making a total of \$843.50 (E.C. \$1,602.65). June, \$13.50 labour (E.C. \$25.65). July, \$107.99 labour, \$53.85 parts, making a total of \$161.84 (E.C. \$307.49). August, \$69.18 labour, \$17.65 parts, making a total of \$139.83 (E.C. \$265.57). 7.05 p.m.

The total in U.S. is \$1,526.18 and E.C. \$2,899.74. That gives you an idea of the position. In addition there is a commitment of U.S. \$93.07 representing the cost of repairs: Labour U.S. \$77.62; parts \$15.45, on the ninth occasion it had to be garaged towards the end of August. This car was replaced eventually, I think, some time in November. I am trying to get information relating to the age of the car and the number of miles on the speedometer.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have been asking for the age of the car and the number of miles on the speedometer. I have heard a figure for tyres, and I want to know the true position. Do not let us fool ourselves, the tyres on the cars which the Mission uses, are called steel-belted radials and they are guaranteed for 40,000 miles. I think the Government should call for the bills on these cars. It is plain that, if in the course of about six months you are spending \$3,192 on a motorcar, you might as well buy an aeroplane. They must be driving that car through a jungle.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sir, I had to ask the Minister for information about the Consul-General's car, but he volunteered information regarding the car used by the Representative to the United Nations. I do not want that information. We were given that information some time ago, but the information given today does not tally with the information which this House was given in August last year. In August last year we were told that between April, 1971, and May, 1972, the cost was \$3,276. Today the Minister tells us that between April and August 1971 the cost was \$3,192. Obviously the figures do not tally. I would like the Minister to give me the information regarding the Consul-General's car. I am referring to that as dishonest, because the Addendum states that the car broke down on the 8th November. I know for a fact that the car was in use at the end of November, 1972. I do not see how the Minister can tell us that the car broke down on the 8th November, 1971, according to the Addendum, when it was in use! How can they say that the car broke down and had to be abandoned at that time? What is the age of that car? When was it purchased?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Sir, if the honourable Member will give way, I will give the information. The Consul-General's car was purchased in June, 1971.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Then in one year the car was giving all of this trouble! Mr. Chairman, the Minister cannot be serious.

Are you telling me that the car was purchased in June, 1971, and by November, 1972, it was no use? The Minister of Communications told us that he objected to voting money because it was said that the Governor's plumes were going through the top of the car, and the same Minister has the conscience to sit down in here today and vote for this Resolution to spend all of this money in one year! How can he tell me that he has a social conscience?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

How does he know how I am going to vote? Suppose I go home now?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, if the car was bought in June, 1971, and has been garaged six times in a year, and it has now reached a point where there is a prohibitive cost to repair it, can the Hon. Minister give us the date on which the car was first garaged and the defects apparent at that time, as well as the cost of the repairs?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

What was the period for the guarantee of the car? What steps were taken to get a new car? We are not going to sit down in here and vote money just like this Sir. A car has to be garaged six times in one year! We must have all of the relevant information in this matter, if the Permanent Secretaries can push things in the hands of Ministers and send them down here, we are not going to vote for Resolutions to spend money unless we get adequate information. The Opposition is not going to operate in this manner. The Minister of Communications told us that we cannot send people abroad and expect them to sleep under Washington Bridge and so on, but it would be all right for the people over here to live under those conditions while we are sending all of this money overseas for the upkeep of certain officers. That is what he will tolerate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. I never said it was all right. I feel as deeply hurt as the honourable Member when I see poor people living under certain conditions. I am doing my best so that some of these people will get the benefit even in Church Village. I am giving them good roads in Church Village, and your father was in the House for all of these years and he never gave them one. I have put in roads in Garnett Street and Church Village. I am conscious of the position of poor people, so do not come here to tell me any nonsense. I have helped you by putting some roads in the area that your father represented in the Vestry for a number of years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have given both sides a lot of latitude on this Resolution. The Resolution has absolutely nothing about housing and roads in Barbados, neither in Church Village nor elsewhere. We are now going to deal with this Resolution in its perspective.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, my reply to the honourable Member is that my father never ran away to Jamaica. He never abandoned the people he had to represent and ran away.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not in the Resolution.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I accept your Ruling, Sir. I only made a comment. In his reply the Minister criticised the Opposition, Sir. We on this side of the House have said that there should be some annual survey carried out by somebody from the Ministry of Communications and Works together with somebody from the Public Accounts Committee investigating all of these Overseas Missions. They should have a look at the work carried on, the condition of the Government houses, the vehicles, etc., so that no Minister can come here and tell us that a civil servant says that a car is in bad shape after a year-and-a-half of service and he wants a new car. If he wants one, he should buy it out of his money, but he should not expect the taxpayers to pay for it.

Now, the Prime Minister of this country does not take any money to buy a State car, but we are asked to vote money to buy a new car for a civil servant who has broken up one after a year-and-a-half! We are saying that there must be some machinery set up that will visit the Overseas Missions annually. The machinery should be comprised of Members from the Ministry of Communications and Works and the Chairman, perhaps, of the Public Accounts Committee. It is interesting to note that when the now High Commissioner was the Minister of External Affairs, he had invited the Leader of the Opposition to visit such a Mission, but no sooner than the occupant of that office left the country, the invitation was withdrawn, and the new Foreign Minister took the tour by himself. If we are going to vote money, we want to see an audit of the Overseas Missions done annually. (Asides) It is done, but we do not see it. We want to see the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee having the right to visit the Missions annually along with somebody from the Ministry of Communications and Works in order to evaluate the condition of the buildings, the furniture, the vehicles, and to look generally at the accounts. We are not going to sit down in here and vote money without proper information. 7.15 p.m.

The Minister has not yet replied about the official car breaking down on the 8th November. I want to know how the Addendum can state that the car was abandoned on 8th November and it was still in use in November 1972. I would like to know when the serious defect arose. This is the Consul General's car I am talking about.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I just want briefly to point out that the Government is so concerned that if you look in the Draft Estimates for 1972-73 under Auditor General, you will see a sum of \$10,450 marked Item 17 which reads "To meet the cost of visit to carry out an audit of the accounts of Overseas Missions in London, Ottawa, New York and Washington." This is not the first visit the Auditor General has made, because the Government sends him periodically and he has to do one visit every year. I do not know if he has gone, but we have included money for him to see that the accounts are properly kept. I am not saying the accounts may not be kept because the bills have been incurred unnecessarily, but it is for him to see that the accounting system is in keeping with the procedures he laid down. It is Head 4, Item 17, if the honourable Member for Christ Church West would like to see it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, at this stage the hour for suspension has passed.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Standing Orders have not been suspended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do not report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8 p.m.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

When the sitting was suspended, the honourable Member for Bridgetown was speaking.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I think that I was on the point of addressing the Chair when the suspension was taken.

Now I think this debate has gone - I am hearing some honourable Members say, long enough, I do not know what the honourable Member thinks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I think I am the person to decide that.

Mr. HINDS:

I do not think it is a matter for the Chair. However I sat here and listened most attentively to what the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central had to say, and I believe that arising therefrom it is generally agreed that our ambassadors and officers abroad should be told that they have got to live within the economic means of their country, and that one of their principal functions must be to interpret the aspirations of a developing nation. I think this is accepted on both sides of the House, and coming from the Hon. Minister, they are words which I think we cannot let fall to the ground, and we have got to give them the due attention they deserve. My view is that it is an admission. The honourable Member for St. Michael South Central is a very responsible Minister of Government, and when he makes use of these terms under reference, it is an admission on his part and somewhat on the part of Government that these things are not now happening. In other words, that our ambassadors abroad are not living within the economic means of their country. (Hon. F. G. SMITH I have not said that.)

Mr. Chairman, the Minister also went on to tell us that he feels the time has come when Government should, as a result, evaluate the work of some of these overseas representatives.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I am asking that the question be put.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is left to my decision unless a motion is duly made.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

The question that the question be now put was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows, Mr. CHAIRMAN declaring that there were not nine honourable Members voting in the affirmative:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. MORRISON, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES -7.

Noes: Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY and Mr. W. C. B. HINDS- 2. 8.05 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, as far as I can recall at the time when the question was put, there were nine Members present. I want to make it clear that we had nine Members at the time and nobody can deny that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, Clothing and Uniforms at Item 58. With regard to the High Commission in Canada the note says that it became necessary to recruit a new chauffeur for the High Commission in Ottawa, and consequently to provide him with uniforms. The sum of E.C. \$480 is now required to meet this expenditure.

It has been said that there has been no criticism coming from this quarter touching the High Commission in Canada. We on this side of the House want it to go on record that we are somewhat in accord with the conduct of the High Commissioner in Canada and that we believe that he is truly representing and is attempting to interpret the aspirations of Barbados abroad as an independent nation. As for the Consulate General where there is a request arising out of this flooding of the street on 8th November when the chauffeur is supposed to have suffered damage to his shoes and a pair of slacks, we know the cost of clothing, but here it is that replacement of a pair of shoes and a pair of slacks is billed at U.S. \$65. We are wondering if the price is put at this figure because it is the taxpayers' money being spent. Undoubtedly we are not asking too much if we ask the Minister to give us some breakdown as to what the shoes and the slacks cost, because we are saying that U.S. \$65 is definitely too high.

With respect to Item 60 - Entertainment - they are asking for \$2,500 in respect of the High Commission in the United Kingdom. We appreciate the fact that our new High Commissioner would have to be introduced to and would have to meet new people and entertainment by him would be higher in some respects at this time than what is expected to be at a later date, but if we were to look back to see what took place last year, in a supplementary we were told that high catering costs was one of the reasons responsible for having to seek additional funds to cover this expenditure. We have escaped from that on this occasion, but it would appear to us that in the face of all this we have still got to find extra money to cover this Item.

Entertainment in Washington. The sum of \$5,225 E.C. was allocated to meet normal entertainment during the financial year. There was however unforeseen expenditure in connection with the visit of the Governor-General and Lady Scott to Washington, and it is not considered that the funds remaining will be adequate for the Embassy to fulfil its social engagements to the end of the financial year. 8.15 p.m.

"The sum of \$1,500 E.C. is therefore requested." I take it to mean that the visit of the Governor-General to Washington has carried up the entertainment cost of the Embassy by \$1,500 E.C. I believe that the Minister's figures will support my argument.

With regard to Item 66, provision was made in the Capital Estimates 1972-73 for the purchase on mortgage of a property as a residence for the Counsellor in Ottawa. A property has been acquired at a cost of Can. \$57,000 with a down payment of Can. \$15,000.

Mortgage payments and interest are now at the rate of Can. \$411.62 per month from 1st August and the sum of E.C. \$7,030 is required to meet this commitment to the end of the financial year.

This brings into focus, again, this wonderful property investment that this Government has embarked upon abroad. Why did not the: Government decide to buy the property outright and avoid having to pay interest in Canadian dollars? However one may look at it, it is still going to work out at a higher rate than would obtain locally. If we had to borrow money at this end and buy a property outright, I am sure we would have been better off in the long run. I believe that I have covered enough ground on this Resolution, except to say that the question which still remains unanswered arises from Government's lack of policy with regard to expenditure on motor vehicles for these gentlemen abroad. It cannot be denied that the sums requested under these various Items have called forth from the Opposition, and even from a Government Minister, sufficient attention to cause the Leader of the House to take second

thoughts on a matter as serious as this.

It is quite all right, Mr. Chairman, for the Leader of the House to console himself with the fact that he has more Members on his side of the House than we have on the side of the Opposition, and he may rely on his numbers to carry through this Resolution. We believe that the Leader of the House is a type of person who sees in the request from the Opposition an area of reason; he sees an area of inquiring into the taxpayers' interests, and I have every confidence that the information sought, particularly the pointed information by the honourable Member for Bridgetown and the honourable Member for St. Joseph, is important. They have been at pains to point out to the Minister, in some detail, the defects in the information contained in the Addendum, and they have made the point abundantly clear that the Opposition, whilst admitting that there must be some level of representation overseas, will not be supporting a Resolution which seeks to deny Barbadians at home many of the very necessary things and seeks to lavish them on a few individuals who are highly placed abroad.

I am sure that no Minister or no Member of the Government would feel happy under the circumstances to know that his constituents are denied any of these things at the expense of those officers who are abroad. With regard to the truth surrounding this car which broke down on the 8th November, we would like to hear whether it really did take place and exactly where this flooding took place. From what has been said by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, if there is an area of doubt about any of these officers; if we have any reason to doubt them in small things, then we have a greater reason for totally disbelieving them when it comes to the handling of greater things on our behalf in countries abroad. 8.25 p.m.

This is a very serious statement I am making. It means therefore that in our view if careful enough investigations are carried out, if sufficient and close examinations of their functions, operations and their accounting systems are carried out, we may be able to determine whether or not the point has been reached where if there is an area of doubt surrounding any activity in any of the others, the Prime Minister should consider their immediate recall, if this is found necessary. After all we are dealing tonight with items of expenditure, some of which may appear to us small, but the avenues used in having the House of Assembly vote these sums are matters for very serious and careful consideration by all concerned. I am sure that the Leader of the House is as unhappy and unsettled in his mind as any Member on this side of the House. He has heard every single word that has come from the lips of every honourable Member who has spoken on this Resolution.

The Leader of the House, Mr. Chairman, must show himself as we have always looked on him, to be an honourable Member who would not associate himself with anything that does not abound with clarity when it comes to requesting this Honourable House to cast its vote on the question of providing funds for the carrying out of any particular function, and I feel that in the light of all that has gone on, the Minister even at this hour would gladly put before us certain information as he may have in his possession, but if such information is not now available to the Minister, I believe that the Minister would be doing justice to his own conscience if he gave a second thought to proceeding further with this Resolution. I cannot, Mr. Chairman, tell the Leader of the House how to conduct Government's Business as he is quite capable of handling it, but in the light of what has gone on in this House today, since there are still a number of outstanding points left to be answered by the Hon. Minister, I am sure that you, Mr. Chairman, would be happy if these points were cleared up, and then you were given leave to do what the honourable Member for St. Philip sought to have you do prematurely.

I think I have covered everything that ought to be covered in the Resolution, and I am glad that our Leader of the House was not in the flooded car or any of those things in the flooded streets, because I am sure that he too is among the number that does not believe the story about the abandonment of the flooded car.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, we had asked the Leader of the House questions about the car under Item 55. I wonder if we could get a reply on this aspect of it. Can he give us some idea of the breakdown of the car in the middle of the flood and its being abandoned? I would like to know when the car was abandoned. I do not quite understand if the car was left in the road at the time and was then in subsequent use, or whether it was left in the road and had to be towed away and was not in the use of the Government since that day.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The car was abandoned for that particular moment when they could not get through, but it has been in use subsequently. To abandon does not mean it became derelict like some of the old cars you see in the Pine Housing Area and by the side of the road. It was abandoned, that is, the occupants got out because it could not move. They got other transportation, made arrangements with a garage to tow it away to be fixed and it was subsequently used. When you hear it has been used since 8th November, you are correct. On that particular day when they had the floods in New York, it stalled and the occupants got out because they were going to meet somebody, and it was subsequently used. It was not just left there, towed away or dumped in a river.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That is the very point. The Resolution here tries to give one the impression that as a result of the car being abandoned on the 8th November - this was the sixth time it had broken down - and it was no longer used. 8.35 p.m.

If the car was repaired and used, what I would like to find out now is the real purpose of changing the car.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Communications and Works has explained on more than one occasion, in so far as the abandonment of the car is concerned on 8th

November, it was not written off but the occupants had to seek other transportation. The car was subsequently repaired and it broke down again on December 16 in very bad weather, so the money we are seeking now is to pay for these repairs. The position is that this car is a pretty frightful one. The car has broken down seven times in this financial year.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

If a car breaks down seven times in a year and a half, when was the first time it broke down? These are relevant things we want to know, we do not just sit down and vote money like this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am trying to give you the information. The car has broken down seven times already in this financial year, the cost of maintenance, repairs etc. on the first six occasions being in the sum of approximately E.C. \$3,738, and it seems financially inadvisable to retain this vehicle because the maintenance is running at the rate of E.C. \$730 approximately per month.

I want to make this clear. Members know that periodic visits and inspections are carried out both by the Auditor General who goes every year to audit books, by the Chief Establishments Officer, the Financial Secretary and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs. They make periodic visits and carry out inspections of all the relevant matters and make checks as is carried on in the regular service, so it is not that the Missions abroad are not inspected nor their accounts audited, but to listen to the honourable Members you would feel that no check is made at all and that they just do as they like. That is not the case. The suggestion was made, I think, by the honourable Member for the City that a Committee comprising the Leader of the Opposition, in his capacity as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and a representative of the Ministry of Communications and Works should be set up in order for them, to be more satisfied as to what is going on. That is not a bad suggestion, and I will pass it on to the right quarter and have it considered. That will be at least a means of avoiding this lengthy debate if nothing else, so for that reason alone I will pass on that suggestion. I cannot tell you how much a pair of shoes cost.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, if arising from a situation such as we have before us, that on 8th November a chauffeur had to abandon the car and he lost a pair of shoes and a pair of slacks, the Mission must have some bills or some estimate of the cost. Why did they not ask for \$75 or \$100? How did they arrive at \$65? The shoes probably cost \$30 and the slacks \$35. This is the taxpayers' money we are talking about, and I am saying that the Hon. Leader of the House is as worried over the expenditure of External Affairs as any Member on this side, and he has been worried over this long before he was Leader of the House. I am not bringing any tales out of school, we are not asking the Minister for any information that is hard to be got, all we are asking is something that is reasonable.

The Leader of the House tells us that these officers go to these Missions and carry out these periodic checks and so on, but I am not going to sit on this side of the House and believe the Prime Minister or any Minister that any officer of any class or worth leaves Barbados and goes to the United States of America to learn from any officer out there that a car has broken down six times and it is treated as a trivial matter. I am saying that all these matters relating to these motor cars, repairs and what not, each and every one of them should be turned right back in the hands of all of these officers who are requesting these sums of money and that other officers should be sent to investigate every request they make with respect to these motor cars. If we were to find that any of these officers serving abroad are guilty of misconduct at any point, they should be struck off the list forthwith and let us end the taxpayers' bill where he is concerned. What has been going on in the past is that the taxpayers' money to foot these bills has been made available a bit too easily. 8.45 p.m.

It has to stop. We maintain on this side of the House that all is not well at these Missions, and we are saying that further investigation is necessary with respect to these sums required for motorcars.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$74,038 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN; Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES and Mr. A. MORRISON - 7.

NOES:

Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. W. C. B. HINDS - 3.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1972-73 NO.28

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution is to grant the sum of \$81,571 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73 No. 28.

This Resolution, Sir, is an omnibus one and it deals with the Services Commissions, Parliament, and the Cabinet Office. The notes are fairly explanatory and, probably, at this stage we may not have to give very lengthy explanations. In moving the passing of Head 2 - Services Commissions - there are 3 Items: Acting Allowances, Advertisements, and Maintenance of Vehicles.

I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 3 - Parliament - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 3 - Parliament - I do not think there is anything controversial here. With regard to Item 21 - Office Expenses - the amount provided in the current Estimates is the sum of \$1.0,000 of which amount the sum of \$9,461.80 has already been spent leaving a balance of \$538.20. It is anticipated that the expenditure for the months of January to March, 1973, based on the average monthly consumption of electricity and other expenditure, will be in the vicinity of \$2,900.

Furthermore, the Debates Committee of Parliament has decided that there should be improved lighting for the Chamber of the House, and to that end obtained and accepted a quotation from Mr. Lawrence Harris. Since the receipt of the quotation, it has been represented that an additional amount of \$160.00 should be added to the original quotation to take care of rising prices. An additional sum of \$3,322 is therefore being requested to supplement this Item.

With regard to Item 25 - Payment of Substitutes - the Clerk of Parliament has advised that Mr. John Connell, Deputy Clerk of Parliament, has been granted six months' leave of absence on full pay with

effect from 15th January, 1973 and as a result it is necessary to employ a substitute with effect from the 1st February, to 15th July, 1973, in the post of Deputy Clerk at a salary of \$625.00 per month.

The next explanation is that Miss Judy L. Gooding, Messenger/Cleaner, attached to the office of the Leader of the Opposition has been granted maternity leave for the period 19th January to 31st March, 1973, and a substitute will be required during that period to work at the rate of \$39.80 per week, amounting to \$398.00 to the 31st March, 1973. There will be an amount of \$90.00 with respect to the Interim Payment. Of the amount of \$3,000 provided under the vote, there is now a balance of \$1,094.28. A Supplementary of \$924.00 is required to meet these payments.

I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak very briefly, I know that other Members on this side are going to speak on the major item. I am getting a little worried at constantly seeing votes for which the office of the Leader of the Opposition appears to be responsible for incurring some of the expenditure from the revenue when, in fact, as far as I can judge, no money is being spent in that direction at all. I should like honourable Members to know that money has been voted for chairs; money has been voted for air conditioning, and now I see stationery, incidentals, and maintenance of office equipment for the House of Assembly, the Senate and the Leader of the Opposition. I want honourable Members to understand, as far as I can judge, none of it has been or is being spent on that office. The office has no chairs. I drew to the attention of certain honourable Members last night that there is a broken-down arm chair in their with two back legs missing that I can never get repaired nor removed. Apparently, I would be doing something mischievous to Government property, if I put it in the wastepaper basket outside and let it be taken away. It is in the office, and nothing is being done to it. There is no air conditioning; the floor is very difficult to keep clean; the floor needs sanding or carpeting, but nothing like that has been done.

I very sincerely hope that if honourable Members choose to vote that Head 3 stand part, that they are not voting for it in the belief that any of it is being spent on the office of the Leader of the Opposition. I know of no incidentals, stationery or office equipment, and if the persons responsible do not look sharp, the vote for chairs and air conditioning is going to lapse. No effort whatsoever, as far as I can see, has been made to air condition the office. (Asides) I am told by the Clerk of Parliament that a chap is down there working. I was there very often today, and I have not seen anybody down there working. There is something fundamental involved. I do not want to involve the Government in a lot of expenditure, but you cannot air condition an office which has an air vent giving on to High Street which is intended to change the air in the office with an extractor fan and everything without closing the vent. You must close the vent.

Anybody who has lived in Canada, say, for example, will see the madness of trying to heat a room with a wide open vent in it. I would suggest to the Minister of Communications and Works, or whoever is concerned, that this matter be looked into. Certain honourable Members last night suggested to me that I should raise with the Clerk of the House, I suppose it would be, and the Minister of Communications and Works the question of whether or not it would be advisable to buy some of those

admirable chairs which are being being turned out by Husbands Wrought Iron Works. I am getting some of them for myself. Certain Honourable Members suggested that I should ask the Clerk of the Minister of Communications and Works whether it would not be advisable to ask Mr. Husbands to supply chairs to the value of the vote for the chairs. 8.55 p.m.

I do not believe that that vote could be spent at the present rate by March and everybody knows how difficult supplementaries are. That is all I have to say on this. It can be passed so far as I am concerned; it has nothing to do with me.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Sir, dealing with office expenses, there is one point I would like to deal with under Incidentals. I think that the time has come when in all fairness, the Clerk of this House should be given his own telephone.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, he has been given one. I have approved it. I just want to say to the Leader of the Opposition that the Clerk of Parliament is responsible for controlling this vote, and I am sure that if he tells the Clerk what type of furniture he wants, the Clerk would have no objection to it. I gather that the Electrical Department is already looking at the air-conditioning, and I think they must be intelligent enough to know that in air-conditioning a building they would of necessity have to close any vents, and since they are doing it at the moment and it is not actually installed, I think the presence of the vent is no indication that they are going to leave it like that when the installation is complete, because I think they have done a lot of jobs in Government, and I think they are aware of the fact that they have got to tighten it.

I think the Leader of the Opposition must at least give Government credit for the very nice way we have treated the Leader of the Opposition. He is actually quarrelling about putting in stationery without his knowledge. I know that would be a very great help to him.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of elucidation, I have not asked for stationery nor do I see any sign that stationery is going to be put in. I do believe that if I asked the Secretary of Parliament to provide stationery for an official letter as I have asked on two or three occasions, one sheet or five sheets, that she will give me one or five sheets, but I do not believe that the vote for \$3,000 is intended to take care of five sheets of House of Assembly paper.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

In reading the note it says "The amount provided under the current Estimates to meet the cost of stationery, incidentals, maintenance of office equipment and other office requirements for the House of Assembly, the Senate and the office of the Leader of the Opposition has proved inadequate." I think as a lawyer looking at the interpretation of the clause, he could fall under any head. I think he will agree that we have not been niggardly in giving him what he requests, provided his requests are addressed to the proper authorities. I do not agree with the Prime Minister that he is any part of Her Majesty's Government in Barbados. He has been recognised in the Constitution as having certain roles to play in Government in the broad sense, but not in the Government. The Cabinet is the Government, not the Leader of the Opposition, so I hope he does not misinterpret what the Prime Minister says. If Government is a broad generic term, then the Constitution recognises that he has certain important

functions, but the Government of this country resides in the Cabinet and he is no part of that. I just want to clear the Constitutional air. Civil Servants are part of the Government too just as the Leader of the Opposition. In that sense he is recognised as part of the total governmental structure. You are not part of the Government until you become Prime Minister which is not so likely.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am not getting into any quarrel between the Minister of Communications and Works, the would-be Prime Minister and the actual Prime Minister. They can argue as much as they like from the point of view of two bad constitutional lawyers whether I am part of the Government or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Are you dealing with constitutional lawyers now? We are supposed to be dealing with Head 3.

Mr. ADAMS:

The Minister of Communications and Works is dealing with it. I don't want to hear anything about how well the Leader of the Opposition is treated. In Canada the Leader of the Opposition is given a house and an official car, and Canada is a country which notoriously pays its Ministers badly, which

notoriously pays Members of Parliament badly. I doubt they get much more than us, if the truth be told. In Trinidad the Leader of the Opposition gets a substantial salary, all types of magazine and newspaper subscriptions, office, Secretary and I believe travelling as well. So I do not want the public to be misled that the Leader of the Opposition is getting any big salary or is getting any big privileges. They do not give me cent one to chair the Public Accounts Committee, where Chairmen of Boards which do not meet as often as we are supposed to meet in the Public Accounts Committee may very well get salaries. I do not regard the differential of \$100 a month more, because that is all I get more than Private Members of Parliament, as being anything substantial. I am not asking for more, get that quite clear. My father was quite happy when he was Leader of the Opposition to give up some of the differentials, and I am not asking for more; but I do not want the Government to hear how well treated I am.

As honourable Members on this side will say, that is the Opposition's office; it is not my office. I do not carry on a law practice from it. I do not even use the typewriter which the Government has given me for purposes of my law practice. I have it somewhere safely covered up, and I have indeed three or four typewriters of my own. I do not use that typewriter; so please don't let, Mr. Chairman, the impression go abroad that the Leader of the Opposition is so splendidly treated by the Government. If you want to buy me, you have to pay more than that, if this is what the Minister of Communications is suggesting, and believe me he would have to furnish my office very luxuriously indeed to stop me discussing his little political short-comings from time to time while I am in here.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

All I was trying to say is that we have treated him better than the Opposition, which we were at one time, was ever treated by his Government, when it was in power. I did not say he is lavishly treated. I am saying we have shown more consideration for the post he holds than was shown to us when I was in the House in 1956 as a Member of the then Opposition, I know he is not handsomely treated, but I want to let him see that we appreciate his post and treat him better than we were ever treated in our day.

Mr. ADAMS:

We will treat the honourable Member better when he is Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a few years' time.

The question that Head 3 - Parliament -. stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 16 - Cabinet Office - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this item is more or less self-explanatory. The position briefly is that with the Supplementary of \$75,000 which we got a few months back, that really just brought up to date what we voted for conferences and delegations last year. In other words, the vote was reduced by \$75,000 by the Estimates Committee. So what I am saying is that this is the first Supplementary as such that we are coming for, the other two being what we originally voted and the first Supplementary of \$75,000. This Supplementary is for \$40,000 and the reason is given here in the note. It says that between the time of provision of the Supplementary Vote and now, a greater number of conferences in which Barbados should participate have been called than was projected or anticipated, and therefore the total amount available under the vote will be insufficient to meet the Government's commitments to the end of the financial year. 9.05 p.m.

That is the true position, Sir, and honourable Members will recall that the vote for Conferences and Delegations in the current estimates was \$325,000 to meet the cost of passages and other expenditure involved in attendance at conferences and similar meetings abroad. We also hold meetings in Barbados, and it has become necessary to seek a supplementary provision under this Item. By Resolution No. 60/1972 the original vote of \$325,000 was supplemented by the sum of \$75,000, and between the time of that Supplementary and now a greater number of conferences in which Barbados should participate have been called than was projected or anticipated.

As we progress we have to be represented at some of these conferences. It is not that we are always represented but there are many conferences and meetings we do not find it possible to attend, and I think that we are benefiting as a result of attendance at these conferences. There can be no gainsaying the fact that our representation at conferences by the officials who attend - and more officials than Ministers attend these conferences -. results in great benefit to Barbados. I beg to move that Head 16 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

In seconding that, Mr. Chairman, I just want to add to what the Leader has just said. We have come to this House not with trepidation or fear, but the Cabinet is very concerned about this vote and the fact that we have to come back to the House for a further

Supplementary. In November, we particularly asked the Civil Servants to project for the

Government all the conferences which would be held between November and the end of the year.

Based on that, we came to the House for \$75,000 to take care of commitments and to take care of projected conferences for the balance of the financial year. Within the last week or two we have had

submissions to Cabinet for conferences and the excuse given was that invitations came late and they were unable to give Cabinet a proper projection of all the conferences to which we had been invited. We agree it is not satisfactory, and I can tell you that the Prime Minister as Minister of Finance and as a respector of parliamentary democracy had great hesitation in coming for this money. The excuse given by the Civil Servants is that the OAS sends down an invitation to a conference the week before, or suddenly you get the Caribbean Secretariat calling a conference to discuss sugar or the ECM almost overnight, but we can promise the House that in the coming financial year we will project for these conferences and when they arise ex improviso they will not be entertained and we will not allow any officer to go unless we have proper projections by the Ministry. I think the member for Christ Church West will agree that conferences can arise ex improviso. For instance, last week we had to turn down a Youth Conference in Costa Rico because the invitation came and was submitted to Cabinet too late.

The year 1973 is going to be a very crucial year for the economy of Barbados, and any question affecting discussions on sugar or discussions on external representation, or any conference which is going to create opportunities will have to be considered. I just want to let the House know that when this Resolution was considered, the Prime Minister had some very hard words to say about it because the Permanent Secretaries in the Ministries were given an opportunity to forecast our requirements. I want to explain that we are not coming for this money just to provide joy rides as some people seem to think but this has arisen because the Civil Servants could not give a proper forecast which we could have included in the former request for Supplementary Provision. We have come for it because we think that the conferences which it will cover, will be in the interest of Barbados, so I hope that the Opposition will appreciate that we are not here because we have the numbers to get it passed, we are here because after careful consideration we are satisfied that these conferences are vital and necessary for the development of Barbados.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, from time to time since I have been in this House I have been privileged to see the honourable Member in a suppliant mood, and I am sure you will agree with me that when he is in such a mood, he assumes his best preaching attitude almost as though he is at the Methodist Conference itself. However, there are some comments which we must make on this occasion under this Head. I think it was in 1966 at the inception of Independence that we were told that the total cost of external affairs was anticipated not to exceed \$1/2 million. Today, some six years afterwards, we are privileged to see that the cost of attendances at conferences and sending delegations to interhational meetings is just \$50,000 short of that \$Vi million. Indeed time has proved that the Opposition was correct in 1966 in saying that this Government had under-estimated the cost of independence to the country and that they were far from giving the public at that time, the true facts. Again in 1972 we find that twice, once during the estimates in March and again in November, they have under-estimated the cost of conferences and have come to this House twice in a short time to ask for a second Supplementary, the only explanation for this is that the Civil Servants have not done their home work properly.

I believe the honourable Member who has just sat down and myself differ on the concept of ministerial responsibility, but it is not good enough to come into Parliament and hide behind the shield of the Civil Servants' dereliction of duty or indeed the bad performance of their duties. 9.15 p.m.

If the civil servant is not performing well, then the Minister must take the responsibility for it just as he takes the credit where the civil servant is perfoimring properly. This is part of the Parliamentary

process, and I think that the Ministers must be big enough to say that their Departments of Government - not the civil servants - have failed to do their homework properly. That means that the Minister, too, has failed to do his homework properly, because he should be reading those files. He should be so conversant with what is happening in the field of Foreign Affairs and in the field of External Affairs that he should know ahead of time, what is happening. I agree that there are circumstances where there may be emergencies and, obviously, nobody would expect the Minister to have the prophecy of the old prophets. But certainly what we have seen here, shows a lack of proper preparation. That is only one of the criticisms I will level against this Resolution.

There is a much more serious criticism. I feel that in the realm of Foreign Affairs that the

Government is not going about their business properly, either in the interest of this House or in the interest of the country. Too often we have found that important conferences at which matters of great importance and significance have taken place, and the results of those conferences remain in the files at Government Headquarters or in the Minister's breast and this House is not told what has happened at the conferences.

I can cite, although I suppose I should not do this to my friend and representative, the fact that he promised this House sometime ago that he would have brought a "green" paper to the House on the outcome of the conference on shipping which he attended in Guyana. He promised to do that last year. Almost a year has gone, and Members of the House have not yet seen the results of the conference. We have merely heard by hearsay that the boats have been sold. That is not good enough for the House.

I think Barbados is exceptional in that our Prime Minister attends Prime Ministers' Conferences questions of great importance to this country are discussed, and the House does not get a statement made by the Prime Minister on the outcome of the conferences. Other Ministers also do the same thing. Jamaica in the Caribbean has set an example that I urge strongly on the Government. Certainly in the realms of International Economic Affairs, both the Opposition and the Government must walk step in step. There can be no political difference between us when the livelihood of this country and of a large segment of our working force is involved in the negotiations in Brussels with the EEC. There can be no difference between us; we must both jointly consult together, but there is a total lack of consultation between the Government and the Opposition in these matters. Is the Government really interested in having some form of bipartisan approach on these matters, even if we do not have a complete bipartisan Foreign Policy?

I cite, again, the field of West Indian Affairs. This country, through attendances at conferences by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, by the Prime Minister at the Heads of Governments Conferences, is being committed to a Caribbean Common Market. We have not had the decency in this House to being treated with a statement to the House telling us the outcome of these negotiations; outlining our Government's position in the matter, and taking the House into its confidence, even if the Government does not want to have consultations with the Leader of the Opposition and the Shadow Minister of Foreign Affairs and of Industry and Commerce.

If the Government looks at what is happening in progressive countries like Jamaica, it will see that the Jamaican Prime Minister and his Minister of Industry and Commerce have said from the Floor of the House that they are laying a White Paper on the negotiations on the Caribbean Common Market, on the

outcome of the conferences they have attended. They have consulted with the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Shearer, the Shadow Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Lightbourne.

Surely, Barbados, that has been in the forefront of these things with the exception of the Dickinson Bay Agreement, the original CARIFTA pact, should have some sort of business to be able to consult across the Table and to enable the Opposition to be taken into Government's confidence on this matter. There is such a thing as the Official Secrets Act, and any Member of this House would really be childish to breach the Official Secrets Act if the matter is at that stage. I urge very strongly on the Government that there are many people in the country who can make a contribution in discussions beforehand in helping to formulate a common policy in protecting the interests of the country.

My attack on the Government is not that they do not have to attend conferences. My attack is that sometimes they take people who do not make any contribution at a conference and cannot make any contribution, but they leave behind a lot of people who could be much more useful to them. Sometimes they do not canvass the ideas beforehand properly, and sometimes they go to conferences completely unprepared. I would not say that the Ministers are unprepared, because I think that the Ministers at the last minute find themselves being given dossiers to read. I think we should look at these matters carefully and particularly in the realm of West Indian Economic Affairs and the Common Market in this area, and particularly in the realm of our negotiations in the EEC. I go further and say that we should get together with Cuba on these matters.

There is a wonderful opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to remind this House that it was last year in the Estimates on Foreign Affairs that I urged on the Government to look at Cuba carefully for consultations to see where Cuba can be of benefit to us. I believe that it was as a result of that statement that the Government hastened to send a Civil Service Mission to Cuba, and we are now getting the inception of some joint Foreign Policy being worked out in our Cuban relations.

I believe that we should go a bit further with the development of our relationship with Cuba. In the field of sugar today, we should be using conferences and consultations to work out a policy for sugar in the Caribbean. I cannot conceive why the sugar produced in the Caribbean is refined outside of the Caribbean, when we have within the Caribbean the talent and the ability to develop our own sugar resources.

We were a highly industrialised country as industrialisation went in the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, because of the contribution of sugar to the Imperial development. Are we really so bankrupt of ideas that our Government, Barbados, which was the outstanding jewel in the British Crown, propping up the British Empire, worth her more than India because of our development in sugar? Cannot we take the lead in sugar today not only in a confith project which has come second-hand from Cuba? Confith did not come from Canada at all; it came second-hand from Cuba. Cannot we take the lead today in these things in trying to push, in the future, the development of these things?

Mr. Chairman, I am not speaking in the sense of how many conferences and what are the conferences we are going to, but the point I am trying to draw to the attention of honourable Members is that conferences can be useful if they are properly used for the development of worthwhile ideas. It is in this

respect that we must vote for this Supplementary, but next year we do not promise the Government an easy passage of Supplementaries of this nature unless we can see the results of the money we are spending. 9.25 p.m.

We want to see some of the results by way of Ministerial Statements in the House, by way of white papers, by way of joint consultations, by way sometimes particularly on West Indian affairs in the Common Market of carrying the Opposition with you, so that we can at least present a united front to our brothers and sisters in the other territories, and so that we can formulate the best foreign policy for the country of Barbados. If this is what the money is being spent on, then we think the Government is spending it wisely, but if it is being spent to send a few people overseas some of whom do not understand what is in the papers, then there is no point in coming to Parliament. So may I end up by saying to the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central that he has begged well in his proper Ministerial way, ministerial meaning not only as a Minister of Government, but ministerial in his preaching attitude, but next time he must deliver the goods. We want to hear the results and I am looking forward to his promised white paper on shipping as a start in the right direction so that he can set an example to his other colleagues.

The question that Head 16 - Cabinet Office - stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, the Resolution was passed.

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

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

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 next, 13th February, 1973, at 12 noon.

Hon. Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 9.32 p.m.

