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, 27th February, 1973.

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

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C.E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R.St.C WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. W.C.B. HINDS; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. ELLIOTT D. MOTTLEY; Hon. F.G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. A. MORRISON.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER:
the Minutes of this Honourable House for Friday, 23rd July, 197i, Tuesday, 3rd August, 1971, Tuesday, 30th January, 1973, and Tuesday, 6th February, 1973 are before you for confirmation. If there are no objections, the Minutes will be confirmed. There being no objections, the Minutes are hereby confirmed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD and Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON entered the Chamber and took their seats.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay the documents at a later stage.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, I shall be asking leave to amend a Resolution which at present stands on the Order Paper in my name under Private Members Business. I ask for leave to amend that Resolution by substituting another Resolution in its place. The Resolution to which I refer is No. 5 on the Order Paper, under Private Members' Business, and I now beg to substitute the following Resolution

WHEREAS it has been proved beyond doubt that community centres can be very beneficial to the areas served by them;

AND WHEREAS there is a pressing need for the erection of such a centre in the district comprising club Morgan, Bonnetts, Britton's Hill, Clapham and Forde's Road;

AND WHEREAS there is also an urgent need for a proper housing area, a Day Nursery and other social facilities and amenities in the said area;

AND WHEREAS Bourda Grounds also known as Crane's Pasture in the Parish of Christ Church provides a very accessible and suitable site for such facilities and amenities;

BE IT RESOLVED that this House requests the Government to investigate immediately the need for the establishment of such a housing area, and/or community centre, and/or a Day Nursery together with other social amenities and facilities in the Bonnetts, Britton's Hill, Clapham, Club Morgan and Forde's Road area.

I believe that this Resolution will conform to the Rules of this House. I have discussed the amendment with the Clerk and Your Honour, and I ask that this Resolution be allowed to stand on the Order Paper. If it cannot be dealt with today, I hope that it will be dealt with at a later stage.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a preliminary objection to the amended Resolution. The hon. member is asking that it stands on the Order Paper of this Honourable Chamber. In my opinion it offends Section 54(3) of the Constitution which states

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

(a) proceed upon any Bill (including any amendment to a Bill) which, in the opinion of the person

presiding, makes provision for imposing or increasing any tax, for imposing any charge on the Consolidated Fund or any other public fund or altering any such charge otherwise than by reducing it or for compounding or remitting any debt due to Barbados."

I am of the opinion that the passing of this Resolution is tantamount to imposing a charge on the Consolidated Fund, and for that reason I would urge upon Your Honour that this matter be not placed on the Order Paper and that you should rule it out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I do not see that this Resolution, as amended, would infringe the provisions of the Standing Orders or of the Constitution. It merely asks the Government to investigate the need for, and it does no more. I can see no objection to this Resolution, from a Constitutional point of view, or in the light of the Standing Orders of the House. Leave will be" granted to deal with the Resolution, as amended, and to have it placed on the Order Paper.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to lay a Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1973.

On my own behalf, I beg to lay a Statement on Barbados' relations with Cuba.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Annual Report and Financial Statements of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the financial year ended 31st December, 1971.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease of land at Reef Road, Fontabelle, St. Michael, to Mr. Paul B. Altman.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, in absence of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the financing of expenditure included in the Capital Estimates as a purpose to which money borrowed under the authority of the Special Loan Act 1968 may be appropriated and applied.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Finance, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of $62,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part II -Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No. 30 which form the Schedule to the Resoution. 12.15 p.m.

On my own behalf, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to grant the sum of $65,219 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. 32, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 60 asked by the hon. member for Christ Church West is ready.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following

Resolution to approve the expenditure of $59,169 required to supplement the Estimates, 1972-73, Part I - Current, of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following

Resolution to grant the sum of $136,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1972-73, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1972-73, No, 31, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

A Bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to housing and to provide the National Housing Corporation with responsibility for managing the development of areas designated as development areas and for connected purposes.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

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

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works -

Will the Minister, when scheduling his 1973-74 tenantry roads programme, give priority to the following,areas in St. George: Applewaites' Lower & Upper Tenantry, Bourne's Village and Cole Hole?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

Is Government aware that there exists in Workmans, St. George (a) a recreation Park known as Workman's Sport Park?

(b) that this park is used by children in the surrounding area?

Would the Government consider rendering some assistance by improving the grounds and installing other necessary facilities at this Park?

To enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works -

Is the Minister aware that the Communal Bath & Latrine in Flat Rock, St. George given under contract to be constructed has not been completed in the allotted time?

2. Has the contract been extended?

3. What provision is being made to get this bath completed?

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

Would the Minister state if the estate of Belair in George which was offered for sale is now the property of this Government?

If owned by Government, would the Government (1) let it be known to whom the rents are to be paid, and (2) appoint someone to outline each tenant's boundaries to him?

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. C. E, TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on a Bill to amend the District Auctioneers Act, 1904.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, a Bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to housing and to provide the National Housing Corporation with responsibility for managing the development of areas designated as development areas and for connected purposes, was read a first time.

RESOLUTION OF SYMPATHY RE THE LATE ELRIDGE FITZ LLOYD MORRIS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker before the business of the House is commenced, I wish to pay tribute to the passing of the late Elridge Fitz Lloyd Morris, a former member of the Legislative Council and Minister without Portfolio from 1956 to 1961.

The late Mr. Elridge Fitz Lloyd Morris was an outstanding Civil Servant for many long years, and serve with distinction in many Government departments including the Customs Department where he was a pattern for others to follow and also as Auditor General for many years. The late Mr. Morris can

be termed as an able conscientious and knowledgeable Civil Servant who was highly respected by his colleagues, and who played a very prominent role in the formation and establishment of the Civil Service Association. He was highly respected by his colleagues as Auditor General, and in any high post which he held he was the type of person who could be easily approached and suffered from no airs of superiority complex or anything of that sort. He was a humane, decent, proper, polite and intelligent man and the sort of Civil Servant that we find so few of today especially in the hierarchy of the Civil Service. Maybe there are some of the senior ones who are carrying on the high tradition and who emulate the high standard set by Mr. Morris and a few of his colleagues in bygone years.

It is with great regret that men of the calibre of Mr. Morris are not found as frequently as they were a few years ago. He served as Minister of Portfolio from 1956 to 1961. I think he did actually contest a seat in St. Peter, but after the election he was made a Minister without Portfolio in the Legislative Council, so outstanding and useful his services were, and quite apart from the fact that he was unsuccessful in the election, his services were retained in the Government as Minister without Portfolio. Those few things speak for themselves, and as a model Civil Servant and as a pattern for others to follow, I think Mr. Morris stands out with just a few of ;his colleagues who were Auditors General at one time or other.

I certainly regret his passing, and I wish to ask my colleagues to join in the passing of the following Resolution to the late Mr. Elridge Fitz Lloyd Morris.

"RESOLVED that this House place on record its profound sympathy concerning the death of Mr. Elridge Fitz Lloyd Morris, a former Minister without Portfolio and a member of the now defunct Legislative Council of Barbados.

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

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass. 12.25 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the passing of this Resolution, I feel it is but fair that I should associate myself with the remarks so ably made by the Hon. Leader of the House on an occasion such as this. The late Mr. Morris was indeed a model civil servant as the Leader of the House so aptly described him. We can say that he was an impartial man, and one thing we regret is that whilst he served as Minister without portfolio with very considerable distinction in this country his vast knowledge of the public service and its affairs was not drawn upon when the change of Government came and Mr. Morris was no longer a member of the Other Place. However, Sir, we believe that Mr. Morris was one of those persons who always sought the best for Barbados, and he has left behind a record that should be emanated by all who enter the service whether today or in later years.

He unsuccessfully contended a seat in the parish of St. Peter, the constituency which I now have the honour to represent, and although he fought and lost he had a place in the hearts of most of the people of that parish, and they, I am sure, join with the entire community in mourning the loss of so able a man as Mr. Morris. I beg to join in extending sympathy to his relatives who now mourn his loss.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will call on all hon. members to stand and observe a moment's silence.

Members stood in silence for one minute. GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the first Order of the Day.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS

1973

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, the Resolution which is before this Chamber deals with three matters mainly, and there is also a Bill which will have to be moved today, to make allowances for the use of distinctive licence plates by the diplomatic and consular corps, the use of reflective licence plates, an increase to eight feet in the regular width of vehicles on the highway, and greater protection of the public against loaded goods vehicles and vehicles with loose materials such as sand, mould, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I think you have travelled and you must have noticed that in all countries members of the diplomatic and consular corps.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:
On a point of order, I think that is extraneous matter because it comes under the Bill and not in this Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Whether it is in the Bill or not, can I not deal with it now? I did not intend to make another speech on the Bill. Anyway, as I say, the Resolution before this Hon. Chamber revokes Regulations 14, 66 and 84 of the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Regulations, 1952.

Regulation 14 makes provision for vehicles of 7 ft. 6 ins. in width and the new width will now be 8 ft. because the manufacturers are making vehicles of that width and there are a few vehicles which will be imported and which it will be extremely difficult to get within the 7 ft. 6 ins. The amendment to this was given some consideration and thought for the simple reason that our roads are narrow and any increase in the width of vehicles must be a cause of some concern. The main highways with careful driving could certainly accommodate two 8 ft. vehicles.

For a long time now under Regulation 66 we endeavoured to make certain provisions for non-parking during rush hours and certain times of the day, and to that end we marked certain sidewalks and gutters throughout the Island, mainly on the main roads leading into the City, but because the marks were made

near to the gutters every time there was heavy rain, and over a period of time, those marks are gone and it is extremely difficult to know where to park or not to park. My Ministry consequently consulted with the public utility companies and they granted permission for the marks to be placed on utility poles in the areas in which we desire no parking, and it is likely to be less costly and to last much longer. My Minister will put up signs to indicate to the general public and will by publicity let them know what these new marks on public utility poles mean so to enable the travelling and motoring public to have some idea of where they can or cannot park.

The other Regulation is one which is a favourite with the Advocate, because they can get a photographer at every site where barrels, sand or cement fall off a lorry. They have considered this to be something which they should pursue with all vigilance, but what happens in the House of Assembly is secondary. 12.35 p.m.

It is time that some attempt be made to see that the travelling public are not jeopardised by lorries laden with goods, or Banks Beer, or some other commodity. This is not the first time that this law was on the Statute Book; there was a law on the Statute Book covering that aspect of the matter, but it was rather difficult for a policeman to look at a truck and decide that the truck was badly laden. In the circumstances, there were no convictions for committing such offences because of the difficulty of proof. Well, we have amended this Act, and the main provision is that a person, who is in charge of a loaded vehicle or trailer on a road, is deemed to have contravened this Regulation, if the load or any part of it falls from the motor vehicle or trailer. That is the best way in which the draftsman could get around the difficulty and to impress upon owners of lorries, or persons in charge of lorries, that if the load or any part thereof falls off, then they are deemed to be in contravention of this particular section which requires proper loading.

I would like to say, finally, that my Ministry is giving priority - and this is no idle joke - to bringing down to Parliament some time during the middle of this year a new Road Traffic Act. The old Road Traffic Act was made in 1937; it has, in many cases, no relevance to 1973, and, therefore, it is imperative that this country has a new Road Traffic Act. Any Road Traffic Act which still has the maximum penalty of $48,00 (E.C.) for dangerous driving, certainly could not be modern and up to date. I can give the House the assurance that a new Bill with increased penalties will be coming to the House later this year. When you travel as a motorist and you see the reckless manner in which some people drive in this country, then the only thing they will understand is heavy penalties; firm action by Magistrates; endorsement as well as taking away of licences and so on, if we are going to make an impact on the traffic situation and the manner of driving in this country.

My Ministry will do its best to put sidewalks or pavements wherever possible, costly as it is. In order to assist the travelling public, we are carrying out surveys on the main highways to see where we can put sidewalks and paths on which persons can travel. As I have said, the provision under Section 84 deals not only with loads, but also with sand and other things carried by lorries.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in supporting these Regulations, and I think that all of us are grateful to the Minister for doing something about road safety. I would like the Minister to pay attention to this serious problem of vehicles travelling on our roads at night without proper lights indicating their size and length. Sometimes you can see a vehicle coming towards you, and it is difficult to ascertain whether it is a lorry, a motorcar or a motor cycle. Sometimes you see a single light coming towards you, and at the last moment it may turn out to be a car or lorry being driven with one light in front. I feel that all of these heavy-laden vehicles should carry a red light in front and behind indicating the size of the vehicles, so that a driver would be able to estimate how far he should keep from them.

Last night I had the unfortunate experience of seeing a man driving a tractor with a torchlight in one of his hands. Some people think that because a vehicle belongs to the sugar industry they can do as they like with it. Very often you can see cane fires, and you will find vehicles parked on the roads without appropriate lights. In some cases it is impossible to see these vehicles until the very last moment because some roads are dark and so on. Do not let us wait until some tragedy takes place before taking action in this matter.

I agree with the Minister that a few boxes falling off a lorry in Broad Street are not as dangerous as a tractor driven on the road. It is certain death when you run into a tractor. I feel that all of these lorries should be compelled to carry warning lights both at the front and at the back. Regulations should also be made to take care of lorries conveying things which overhang the vehicles. You will find people moving houses on lorries. One Sunday I had the experience of seeing a lorry conveying a house with five men on top; the lorry was driven at about thirty-five or forty miles an hour and bits of lumber were on the road while the lorry was travelling.

Now, the policemen will give conductors and bus drivers trouble when they carry a few extra passengers, but they do not worry the lorry drivers. I do not think a few extra people in a bus trying to get to or from work can be as dangerous as lorries travelling on the road without proper lights. I feel that these lorries and tractors should be properly lighted at night. 12.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister is aware of the fact that there have been so many amendments to these regulations from time to time that we have come face to face with an issue which demands of us that we bring about a complete overhauling of our situation with respect to these regulations, and we must make every effort to bring them into line with what the situation which we have got to cope with on our roads today will demand. I think that a new Road Traffic Act was promised almost as long as a new Education Act, if not longer. When this would be forthcoming to give us an opportunity to mould something to the lasting benefit of the country one really does not know. However, we throw this out in the hope that the Minister would get the feeling of this side of the House and I am sure of hon. members on his side as well as to the situation which confronts us today when we come to deal with the increasing load of traffic on our comparatively narrow highways.

Sir, everyone would support the view of the hon. member for St. Michael West with regard to this danger of having lorries carrying loads that project beyond the platform and wheels by day and by night without the kind of supervision that one would expect. I believe that permission still has to be obtained where persons want to move houses from one place to the other, and I believe that the time during which

such operations should take place ought to be stipulated in the body of the permit that is granted. I believe that the interest of the public would be better served

if we were to demand that such moving take place particularly when large sections of the main highways are to be traversed and that police assistance be alerted for the occasion. One has got to look at matters in their broadest sense at times such as these, because it is a question of the life of persons using the highway.

I must take the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works to task when he refers to the Advocate's favourite pursuit of instances involving vehicles carrying loads which fall off from time to time. What I want to tell the Minister is that in my view the Advocate is now trying to come alive to some of its duties to the community, and had the Advocate been pursuing that type of course in earlier years we might not have found ourselves here today discussing matters relating to such instances at all, because they would have been completely removed from our midst. When we find that the Advocate sends a cameraman or somebody and tries to highlight instances such as those that we have been having in the recent past, the Advocate was doing a definite service, and I would ask the Minister not to adopt that attitude towards not only the Advocate but any newspaper that does that type of work since it is doing the community a good. What the Minister ought to have been shocked at was to find that the Advocate has had to carry out its pursuit for so long before it was able to bring to the attention of the vehicle owners their responsibility to the travelling public, and that you still find instances that the Advocate complains about occurring even today.

As regards the attempt to permit vehicles of 8 feet in width to go on highways, we believe that the Minister has given very good thought to the requests that have been made from time to time and might have had good reason for approaching this House to give its permission. Now we have problems, Mr. Speaker, arising from situations such as these. We already have on our highways large commercial vehicles and mechanical and engineering units, if that is the : way I may refer to some of them, that now carry loads in excess of their 7' 6" width which is rightfully theirs. We believe the time has come where the situation demands that closer supervision by the police is absolutely necessary, and there again the question of stipulating the time when movement of certain vehicles must occupy certain of our highways has got to come into focus once again. We have approached an era where we have got to look at this question of vehicular traffic in its broadest sense. We are telling ourselves that we are inviting our fellow brothers to help the nation to become as industrialised as possible.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat

If we are to build up our export trade and what not, we have got to take into consideration every unit that has to occupy our highways from time to time. Attention will have to be drawn to the donkey cart and the horse cart and we still find manual labour pushing handcarts of lumber along some of the streets in Bridgetown and beyond. We have got to move cautiously. We do not want to deny anybody anywhere from earning a living, but you cannot tell me that we can find it convenient much longer to have traffic jammed a mile long because two or three men by dint of circumstances have to be drawing along any one of our main streets a load on a handcart, and the load in many cases is far too much for them. 12.55 p.m.

We know the attitude of some of these people. They have a right to the road, but some of them glory in

the fact that that right at present gives them the feeling that they have licence not to move as quickly as they really could but to employ delaying tactics to see how much traffic they can hold up. We have got to move cautiously, not to deny anybody the opportunity to earn a living, but if we are to have our traffic moving as swiftly as it could the question of providing additional footpaths for the pedestrians must be pursued with all the financial and national support we can find at our command. This should not be stopped at all.

The Minister made mention of the painting of curb walls with respect to giving notice of parking areas, but it would have been interesting if the Minister had told us exactly how much money was wasted in that yellow painting exercise that had been embarked upon, because I think I drew to the attention of this Hon. House already that it had been done in such a mad,silly manner that the moment the painters went to work the street sweepers came down with their long brooms and swept it off so that it served no useful purpose, it was really money going down the drain. As regards siting these parking notices and signs on utility poles, the Minister has before him the examples presently witnessed from the type of vandalism that has reared its heads where we now have those signs marking the parish boundaries. Only this morning I noticed along the St. James/St. Michael boundary in the Lazaretto Hill that one of those boards has been destroyed and thrown to the ground. In other areas you

find that people roaming the streets at night just seem to take pleasure in destroying these things that have been set up for a good purpose. We are advising the Minister to give very careful consideration to this; it is not a question of saying you are setting up a no-parking sign on a utility pole and somebody should see it, see that a sign is put up and that each and every one has an opportunity to read it. I have seen many signs set up about the place and I would have to be offered a salary to stop and read some of them. I feel that in a matter of road traffic and its conduct that one should be able to read from a respectable distance any notice that is set up by the Ministry of Communications and Works or by the Police.

Another thing the Ministry has to turn its attention to is the setting up of advertising signs around dangerous bends and corners. Frequently you see these advertisements around dangerous bends and corners because the advertising agent has a view to putting his sign where he can acquire or lease land, but he had no regard for the safety of the road users. At least for the first few occasions the sign is going to attract the attention of the motorist, but this is a very dangerous practice. It is true that in any accident resulting from a motorist reading these signs he is expected to abide by the consequences, but you find that the motorist does not always injure himself, it is the innocent passerby who suffers in most cases, and we are to ask the Ministry to direct its attention to these advertising signs that are being set up and which tend to create burdens on our already slow moving traffic process.

The Minister made mention of the fact that there is reckless driving in our midst and has expressed the need for stiffer penalties and the like. Mr. Speaker, what we need in this respect is greater police vigilance. The Police Force is now a motorised unit, although we find that for some reason quite a number of the motor cycles in the Force are not in use, they cannot get anybody to ride them, and I believe the Minister could direct his attention to this. This is the time, during the harvesting season, that you should have your police motor cycle riders patrolling all around the country districts where you are likely to have the reckless type of driving to which the Minister referred and see what can be done to stamp out some of this. We believe that not enough attention is given to the training of the recruits, the young policemen, as to their duties with respect to the control of traffic and the like. Everywhere one

goes one can see motor vehicles with four numerals on the number place on the front, when you look at the back you see a number plate with three numerals and one swinging so that nobody can really determine what the true number of the particular vehicle is. 1.05 p.m.

That is not good enough for a country such as ours that is seeking to make progress.

The Police used to operate what is called a "Flying Squad" years ago that paid special attention to traffic problems. What greater danger does one have to face today than some of these bicycle riders and motor cycle riders? Now, I drive a left-hand-driven car which compels me to drive as closely as possible to the left side of the road. Sometimes I stop at a major road, and, although I have stopped as closely to the left as conditions would permit, I can still see motor cyclists overtaking me on my left endangering the safety of pedestrians on the footpaths. This constitutes dangerous riding, and I find that the Police, during the past few months, have not been paying sufficient attention to this type of offence.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Can you come closer to the Resolution? I have given you a lot of latitude.

Mr. HINDS:

Very good, Mr. Speaker. The point I was trying to make was that cyclists are "bopping" all over the road, and it constitutes dangerous riding on the highway. All of these things are dangerous when we permit a vehicle which is now seven feet six to be substituted by one eight feet. We are increasing the dangers, and we want to warn the Minister about these matters. I beleive that I have covered enough ground, in the circumstances, and I am sure that the Minister will see to it that in future these commercial vehicles are given specific times to make deliveries to stores and so on, so that they will not cause traffic jams as we see from day to day. I ask the Minister to direct his attention to the matters to which I have referred.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that it is necessary to have Regulations governing motor vehicles which are used on our roads, and that some attention should be paid to the condition of these vehicles. I also think the fact that the Minister has seen it fit to bring down new Regulations, particularly relating to the load which vehicles carry and the way in which the load is carried, is very important. On Thursday of last week I almost ran into a number of cases which fell of a truck about one mile from here. It is important that every effort should be made to have Regulations governing the way in which vehicles are loaded in this country.

I would have thought that in coming to the House with Regulations governing the use of motor vehicles, the Minister would have included an aspect which I am about to raise now. I think we will all agree that there is a problem regarding the emission of black smoke from vehicles. If we are concerned about the condition of vehicles on the road, then some attention should be paid in this direction. As a result of a question which I asked in this Chamber some time last year, the Minister promised that the matter would be looked into and that Regulations would be made. I thought that something would have been included in these Regulations. I am sure that all of us will agree that something should be done urgently about this problem. I trust that the Minister will give some kind of indication as to what his Ministry is planning to do in relation to this matter.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one point which I would like to make in this debate. I endorse the sentiments expressed by the speaker on our side in toto. The point I would like to contribute to the debate relates, however, to Regulation 4 of the amendment which introduces the new 84(1) and 84(2), and it relates particularly to 84(2). It seems that in this Section we are, of course, deeming the Regulation to have been contravened, if the load or any part of it falls from the motor vehicle or trailer. To this extent, of course, we are removing from the prosecution any obligation to lead evidence to satisfy a burden of proof.

Mr. Speaker, with Governments taking more and more powers, sometimes in the interest of the country and sometimes not so much in the interest of the country, it has become prevalent for legislators to pass legislation that does not advert to the normal concept or metis rea and at sometimes leaves an accused person at a disadvantage. People who look at the freedom of the individual and who subscribe to the basic principles of the common law are usually very loath to pass this type of legislation.

In the instant case, I can understand the Minister justifying the necessity to place a burden of proof other than on the prosecution. What I would like him to assure us is that this Section does not rule out the possibility of an accused person being able to rebut that presumption by proof. There may be circumstances under which a loaded vehicle or trailer is derailed or deloaded through no fault of the person driving the vehicle and through no act of neglect, criminal neglect or omission, on his part, and he should be given an opportunity, if necessary, to rebut that presumption by bringing positive evidence to show that there has been no lack of care on his part.

Since we have not been supplied with copies of the Regulations and, indeed, Mr. Speaker, the subsidiary legislation of this country including the Motor Traffic Regulations and especially the 1952 Regulations are very difficult to obtain - since we do not have them, it has not been possible for us to pursue properly whether there is that protection in the legislation. I should like the Minister to assure this House that he is not taking away from accused persons their right to bring rebutting evidence to show that they have not been at fault. 1.15 p.m.

It occurs to me looking at the draft as it stands, that it does take away this right, and that it says that not only there is prima facie proof, but that almost it is conclusive proof merely because the trailer has been unloaded. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that I have had, unfortunately during the last 13 years, to have appeared on behalf of the estates of deceased persons in circumstances where these people had been killed by objects falling from travelling vehicles, and of course I support any legislation which equitably will remove these dangers if the person in charge of the vehicle had contravened the normal reasonable standards of good road conduct, but I should not like to support legislation which goes so far to redress the balance that it takes away from an accused person what on average and reasonable principles would be a good defence. I can conceive of circumstances where there is a collision not due to the fault of the driver or where the road is slippery or some other defence which he may have which he might not have as a result of this, and perhaps the Minister with his advisers and with the material before him has had a better opportunity of looking at the point than we have on this side. Certainly I have not got a complete set of the regulations and could not pursue it as a lawyer right through, but I hope he has covered that point adequately to satisfy us.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, there are two points I want to raise on this. First I must apologise for not being present when the Minister introduced the amendment, but first of all looking at paragraphs (a) and (b) I am at a loss to find out why it has been set out in two portions when it could have been set out in one thereby affording greater protection to the general public, because it says "the load is at all times so packed and adjusted that danger is not caused or likely to be caused to other traffic using the road; and (b) the load is so secured and in such a position that danger is not caused or likely to be caused to other traffic by....." (A VOICE)

The Minister is shouting across that one is sand etc., but Mr. Speaker, I would humbly beg the Minister to consider amalgamating the two paragraphs and let it read "the load at all times so packed and adjusted and secured in such a position", for the simple reason that if one is going to exclude a thing like sand or grit, most people know how a man who used to work in a particular area in St. James lost his life. It was alleged that stones fell out of a lorry and were left on the road, and he was going down there early a morning, the car struck a stone and the car ricocheted over the road into the gutter. If you are thinking of sand or of building material, in most other countries people are obliged to cover it with canvas or tarpaulin, but if you leave it like that by saying "the load to be so packed and adjusted", what is wrong with somebody putting 41/2 cubic yards of sand or of building material on a lorry with a four cubic yard side, it appears to be well adjusted when it leaves the quarry but bits and pieces drop out along the road which are likely to cause the same danger which you are trying to avoid in this.

The next point I would like to make is that for the longest time not only members of the Opposition but people who have got to deal with the laws of Barbados have been asking when we are going to get the new laws or a consolidated set of laws. I have heard since 1964 that they would be published at the end of the year. In my estimation, at the end of the year is like saying Jesus Christ is coming, but nobody knows when, because year after year you get the same answer, the laws will be published at the end of the year or within another five months, and nothing is forthcoming. I am going to beg the Government now that with the amount of amendments to previous legislation and legislation which is difficult to acquire if they cannot do it for the general public, if they cannot do it for the Official Gazette, I would hope that they would publish for the sake of parliamentarians the relevant section or Act which they are hoping to amend so that when we receive the Order Paper and the proposals we can compare them with the original laws.

Mr. Speaker, it may sound a big task, but I am sure there are several members of the Government back benches who have not seen or who are unable to follow exactly what we are amending because they cannot lay hands on the relevant laws which are being amended, and as my colleague has stated, the 1952 regulations which this one seeks to amend are scarcely available to the police. Mr. Speaker, you have no doubt gone to courts and seen that what the police have are torn to bits and pieces. There is none available and at least if you are going to amend and do piece meal legislation, you should facilitate those who have to deal with it by re-issuing particularly these Road Traffic Regulations because there have been several amendments to these, and when it comes to other matters which have to be amended, particularly the old laws of Barbados, I would suggest that the particular section or Act be published so that one can compare what the amendment is going to be.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. I shall just take the legal point raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West. On this particular section, as he knows, in Civil Law if a load falls off a lorry and

hits a passerby there is a doctrine in law known as res ipsa loquitur and automatically the burden is thrown on the defendant to satisfy you that it was not negligence so that to introduce it into criminal law is nothing strange. When a man is killed and you have to pay out $10,000, you do not quarrel, but for a criminal sanction, to throw the burden on the accused, a burden which is accepted in some Civil Law, because the moment you prove that you were passing and a Banks lorry hit you in your head - I am not wishing it and I hope to God it never happens - what happens is that your lawyer only has to prove that it happened and right away the burden is on the defence. So if it can happen in civil law to transfer it to criminal is nothing nor taking away the rights of anybody, but I imagine that the question of whether it is rebuttable or irrebuttable presumption would be a matter for the courts. They like they have forgotten law. I have not done it for a long time but it seems I am still better than most of them. In certain laws the court itself has decided whether it is an absolute prohibition or whether you import mens rea so that the court will have to decide on this interpretation. Whether this statute, even although it raises a prima facie case, in the absence of mens rea is an offence or not, would be a matter for the court.

I should imagine that if I were a judge I would be inclined in the case of evidence showing no negligence on the part of the person in charge to rule that he was not guilty of an offence since there was no mens rea in terms of criminal negligence. I cannot give that interpretation, Mr. Speaker, because you will realise that the Courts will have to decide whether it is an absolute prohibition as in the liquor cases, - selling liquor to children under age where the Courts say you are absolutely guilty - or whether it is mens rea as part of it.

I am basically and truly grateful to hon. members who have spoken because they have raised points which are of very great interest and which have been agitating my mind. I am operating, as I said, under chaotic road traffic law; I am operating under a system in which Barbados has grown up with high walls, where people do not give land for road widening and you have to buy it at so much per square foot, where there are a lot of things I would like to see happen. I would like to see all these high walls starting from Hastings knocked down and nobody should be able to build a house with high walls. 1.25 p.m.

I would like to see people who own big frontages offer the Government about 6 ft. to put down side walks, but I am grateful to the hon. members who have spoken and have raised some very interesting points. I should mention that there is a difference between the duties of the police who are the people to enforce the law and those of the Ministry. I can make regulations on pollution, and there is a regulation on the Statute Book; which states that no vehicle should emit black smoke, but it is for the police to enforce this regulation. I hear a lot of talk all the time about the Transport Board buses emitting a lot of black fumes, but I must say that it is not only those buses owned by the Transport Board, you should take a look at the buses owned by the private concessionaires, but it is for the police to enforce the law on this, as well as that for dangerous driving, and I have had meetings with them on this question.

I made a full note today of many of the comments made by members of the Opposition, something which I must confess I do not do very regularly because there is no substance in most of the comments made, but I will do the best I can about the amelioration of the traffic problems and I can only ask the public to cooperate and drive carefully. Those people who have land should offer it to the Government, especially now that they are quarrelling about the land tax, and as soon as they make an offer, that type of development will get priority. We will move these high walls, widen corners and take out dangerous bends, but the question of advertising around dangerous bends is a matter for the Town and Country Planning office. I am grateful however to the members for their comments : and I will do my best to

implement their suggestions.

As far as the laws are concerned, it is very unfortunate that at the time when we consulted the two Commissioners, Professor Roy Marshall and Professor Patchett, we could not see that at this particular time these two gentleman would have been a few thousand miles apart, and the Government is faced now with the question of changing horses in midstream. A lot of the work has been done, but to attempt to change now will probably put it back another four or five years. We do not think it is fair to the lawyers or to the general public that the laws should be in the chaotic state in which they are today, and we shall do our best to clear up this situation.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE MOTOR VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAFFIC (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I think the hon. members are aware that it is a Bill intended to permit consular and diplomatic officers to use the number plates of the; various designations which are universally accepted as a means of identifying their vehicles. As you will know, it will assist considerably if members of the corps will be known by the police and will have no difficulty to park in areas where they are permitted to park, and that many of these unpleasant incidents will not take place. I share the view that in this country a lot of other people should be designated by some sort of sign. I think members of Parliament should have possibly an M.P. sticker and Ministers should have "M", because unless we are prepared to pay members of Parliament the respect that is due to them we will always get the situation where one person thinks that Parliament is a waste of time, and you will always get the situation where Parliament will always be downgraded because we have not indicated to the people that to be elected by them is one of the highest honours that can be paid to their fellow men. The time has got to come soon when some form of recognition of Parliamentarians must be given, otherwise we will have the perpetual situation where people think that Parliament is a joke in Barbados. We have to start eradicating this if we are to get the respect to which we are entitled. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, I should like to make two points. I think it is a fact that the diplomats and the people

who enjoy immunities and privileges in this country have not abused those privileges up to now as has occurred in some other foreign territories, and I think it is also a fact that even if they contravened any of the road traffic regulations in this country they have more or less subjected themselves to the jurisdiction of our courts, and I have found them ever willing to accept civil liability whenever they are involved, and they should be given the recognition which they deserve. There have, of course, as my colleague from St. Joseph has reminded me, been those occasions on which some people have not complied with the jurisdiction of this country, but this number is very few. These people should not be afraid to submit themselves to the jurisdiction of our courts because they will find that in this country we have a system of justice that is unsullied and they need have no fear that they will not get as good, if not better, justice than they get in their own countries.

I should like to join with the Minister in recommending the designation for members of Parliament, because sometimes particularly the Ministers of Government are on official business and it is very difficult to recognise them, even in their own private cars, and it can prove a bit of an embarrassment when they are not given priority, for instance, as on some occasion of getting through traffic to reach their destinations. I have seen this happen on one or two occasions in the case of the Prime Minister, and although I am not certainly recommending a system whereby everything must stop for official cars to go through, I think they should be given some form of recognition so that they are easily recognisable when they are on official duties. 1.35 p.m.

I believe, however, that in our private capacity we must remain like any other citizen of this country; so that is the qualification I would put on the Minister's statement.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister made a point, and I was surprised to see the manner in which he has approached the matter. I know that Ministers have the power to do things.

If he considers that the time has come that Ministers and members of Parliament should have these exemptions, then he should say so and deal with the matter. If he does not feel that way, he need not do it. I have different views from the hon. member of Christ Church West. This cheeseparing, parsimonious way in which some people want to run countries cannot be followed nowadays. If I had to travel on government business, I would not ask any Minister to give me a lift in his car. I have the right to travel in an official manner, if I were going on government business. If you know about running a Government, you will realise that certain things must be done. The Governor-General has a car; the Chief Justice has a car, and Ministers have cars. Where can a Minister take anybody on official business other than giving him a lift. A man going on government business should travel in keeping with the dignity of the post which he holds.

Mr. Speaker, some day you may go abroad on government business, and you would expect to be accorded certain treatment. I hope that the members of the Government understand that. Sometimes the people in the Overseas Offices seem to think that when they accord a member of Parliament certain privileges that they are doing him a personal favour, and the only person they feel that such privileges should be accorded to is a Minister. I think that all of this foolishness should be removed from their heads. People must understand that all Parliamentarians are entitled to certain treatment from the State. There is no point in saying that you are going to pay Parliamentarians. At what point are you going to stop according them what can be regarded as certain privileges? We are isolated from the community so

far as certain duties we have to perform. You do not expect a Parliamentarian to go down the street and behave in a manner that would lower the dignity of a Parliamentarian. You would expect him to behave in a manner befitting the office which he holds. I do not believe in treating people in any special way, but there are times when business requires you to park your motorcar at a certain spot but you may not want to get into any conflict with the Police Department. I hope that the Ministers will do something about the matter not only for themselves, but for the nation as a whole.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the other members who spoke of some sort of recognition for motor vehicles owned by Parliamentarians. I think there is a very sad story of a Speaker of this Chamber whose car was brought into the Public Buildings' Yard, and a policeman took the chauffeur to court. The chauffeur was literally arrested for parking the Speaker's car downstairs. I think that is what resulted in the marking out of specific areas under the tree for the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. Now, if Parliamentarians had some mark on their vehicles this would never have happened. As the hon. member for St. Michael West has just said, they should be given means of recognition.

I should like to raise a point which has worried me for a number of years. I know that we have various treaties with other nations, but I think it is time that the Government looks into the treaty which exists between itself and the Naval Facilities in St. Lucy. Practising lawyers, who have had to deal with that "Sacred Area", know that whenever there is a civil claim existing between the personnel down there it is a most difficult and troublesome matter. First of all, you can get no information whatsoever, and then the Insurance Company which insures 90% of the personnel - a gentleman will phone you and say: "I am offering you $x; take it or leave it, because you cannot sue the man in court." This is a matter which, I think, the Government should look into. You must not only accord Foreign Diplomats, or people with whom you have made treaties, certain immunities in our laws, but you must make sure that when certain offences are committed the natives of the counry do not suffer as a result of the treaty you have entered into with another Government. I feel that this matter falls under the portfolio of the Minister of Communications and Works because he is responsible for road traffic, and something should be done about it. I have dealt with several matters, and I know that other practising lawyers have had several cases. We all know that from the time those persons are involved you are up against a brick wall, or the take-it-or- leave-it attitude, and the poor person can do nothing about the matter. This is something which needs immediate investigation.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to say that the matter raised by the member for St. Joseph does not fall under my portfolio, and it is probably a matter for the Minister of External Affairs. I am nothing to do with accidents; I try to make the roads safe. If he has any problem, he can discuss the matter with the Attorney-General and/or the Minister of External Affairs.

The member for St. Michael West did say that Ministers, if they feel strongly, should do what they think is right. Very often a Minister may feel strongly about a matter, but he prefers to get a general feeling of opinion before he takes action. 1.45 p.m.

It is good to have an expression of opinion and to get the reaction of the members of your party before you take the appropriate action to carry out what you intend.

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

On the motion of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were catted and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LAND AT REED STREET, BRIDGETOWN

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Reed Street, Bridgetown, for the purpose of improving the environs of the School Meals Centre, Hon. P. M. GREAVES Mr. Speaker, about five years ago the Government acquired two properties in Reed Street for the purpose of resiting the food centre which had been at Queens Park. These were the properties of Miller Brothers. Subsequently, one of these properties was taken over by the Ministry of Education and developed as a school meals centre, and plans had been drawn up for the other property for the purpose for which it was so acquired in the first place. This other building, Mr. Speaker, is situated very closely to its boundaries both northern and western and it is not possible to site other facilities.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, immediately the Minister mentioned that the property in question is bounded on the north side and the like and sets out that type of description which has not been given to us, I am drawing to Your Honour's attention that this property as advertised in the Schedule is not in accordance with the requirements of section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949. In other words, since the Minister can tell us that it is.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order. You would have to make your point at some other time, as a point of order concerns the Standing Orders.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

In any event the hon. member is mistaken. I have not given the boundaries of the property. I merely stated Mr. Speaker, that the actual building is situated closely to its own boundaries. I am not giving any boundaries to the north, south, east or west; I am merely stating that the structure stands very closely to its own boundaries, and that therefore it is not possible within the area that is left to site there certain facilities like a changing room or indeed toilet facilities. In fact, the purpose of this Resolution is now to

acquire an additional area of land for the purpose of siting there the facilities I have just mentioned. Everything is agreed to between the Government and the person to whom the land belongs by private treaty, but we have come here because the present owner cannot give a clear title to the property, and therefore it is necessary to use the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act to effect a good title.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, no one on this side would want to object to Government acquiring any property whatsoever for the expansion of the School Meals programme. We on this side believe that in the same way the programme is now being extended to the City area that in the not too distant future Government will also see it possible to extend the programme to more of the rural areas. However, the point I was making just now is that I have set myself the trouble, if I should so call it, to read out this description as given to this property to people who have been living in Reed Street and acquired substantial property there for some twenty years, and not one of these persons by my merely readin| what is contained in the Schedule here could lay hands on this property or give an indication as to where it is. I understood the Minister to say at one stage that the property is to the north and south of its own boundaries, but if the Minister would look to see that in acquiring property in this way he is required to give the fullest description possible of

the property, surely he must know whether the property under reference is bounded north or south or east or west on other lands owned by the Government as the case might be. 1.55 p.m.

It merely says that it is bounded by other lands owned by the Government but it does not tell you whether it is to the north or south or anything like this, and I am submitting that the Minister or whoever is responsible should not set about to acquire land in this way without complying in the fullest sense with what section 5 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1949 requires.

I believe that the property is that of a family known as the Austins. The Minister has nodded assent, and since this is known by the Minister that is the type of information that could be given, not the way the Government has seen fit to do it. Land values is a very vexed subject these days, and this Schedule tells us that the land is 3,040 sq. ft. I wonder what price per square foot.....

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER:
It being 2 o'clock, the sitting is suspended till 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER:
The sitting is now resumed. Question Time will now be taken.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Question to be dealt with is Question No. 60 standing in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church West who is not now in his place.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Reply be now laid in view of the absence of the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER:
In the absence of the hon. member for Christ Church West that Reply will now be laid. That being so, it is now time for Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 1 be the instant Order of the Day.

Mr. BOLDEN:
I beg to second that.

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

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

RESOLUTION RE FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGETARY PROPOSALS, 1972

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Deputy Speaker, notice of this Resolution was given on 30th June, 1972 at which time the Leader of the Opposition spoke. The Resolution reads as follows "That this House takes note of the Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals for 1972 and regrets that the Government has taken no steps to deal with the recent spectacular rise in the cost of living, to raise the Old Age Pension, to give practical effect to its stated policy of crop diversification or to promote a policy of real economic expansion."

From the date stated above it would seem that this matter has been on the Order Paper for quite some time, and it is the desire of this side to have this matter completed as soon as possible. I know that the Leader of the Opposition spoke again on 4th July, 1972 and moved that the Resolution do now pass. Since that day, and on that particular day, the member for St. Peter was speaking when the time for Private Members Business expired. Subsequent to that the debate continued and for one reason or another we were not able to continue this debate, until 13th February, 1973. During this period of time we have witnessed a steady rise in the cost of living, even although at the time when notice was given of this Resolution which complained of the fact that the Budgetary Proposals did not take any steps to deal

with the spectacular rise in the cost of living, since that day we have seen a steady increase and no measure has been taken.....

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

Mr. MOTTLEY:
As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, no measures have been taken by the Government which would do anything to arrest this spectacular rise in the cost of living. 2.50 p.m.

Only a few days ago we heard the Minister of Trade telling the housewives of this country that they must protest against the standards and the rise in the cost of living. I would have thought that the person who was best capable of tackling the rise in the cost of living would have been the Minister of Trade, because the housewives can only protest.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
On a point of order. Sir. As far as my recollection goes from what I

have read, the Minister of Trade, Industry and Commerce referred to the standard of articles which are being sold here and not to the prices.

Mr. SPEAKER:
No point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Leader of the House interrupted me. As I was saying, I think the person best suited to deal with this matter is the Minister of Trade and Industry and also the Minister responsible for the operation of the Price Control Board. Some weeks ago, when negotiations were being undertaken for salary increases, I believe that it was said that the cost of living since 1969 had gone up by 26%, and that was being put forward as an argument for an increase in salaries.

We heard in the Budget Speech that it was the intention of the Minister of Finance not to give any increases to top-bracket civil servants. In less than one year, and even before this Resolution noting the contents of the Budgetary Proposals was completed, we found that those civil servants were given the increase which the Minister of Finance said he did not intend to give them. Having given the House, more or less, the assurance and the undertaking that these salaries were not going to be increased, in less than a year we find that the civil servants received handsome increases.

Nobody is really against anyone getting an increase in salary, but I believe that, commensurate with the increase paid to civil servants, there must be increased productivity on their part. Very often one hears about productivity and one relates it only to the lower-paid people in this society, whereas I think that increased productivity is equally relevant to the people who are highly paid. Top-bracket civil servants as well as Ministers have, from time to time, complained that civil servants are not producing as they should. At the time no mention was made of old age pensioners. You will recall, Sir, that those of us who were here in 1971 to listen to the Budget Speech heard the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance promise to increase, or to review the amount paid to old age pensioners. Two years have passed and nothing has been brought to this House to give effect to the increase.

Again, we have a promise and a statement from the Minister of Finance that he had asked the Ministry of Health to submit proposals for an increase in old age pensions and a revision of the means test in accordance with the Government's declared policy. I believe that will take, probably, another year and another Budget Speech will pass before we hear anything further about the matter. I said at the beginning that this Resolution was on the Order Paper for quite some time. I think we on this side feel that it is almost time to have another Budget again, and we would like to have this matter dealt with. I do not think I can add anything further, Sir.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for the City has said, this Resolution has been hanging around for about eight months. It was some 8 months that I have been waiting for the opportunity to correct a criticism which was made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition back in June, 1972, when he first introduced this Resolution. He said at that time

"I have not heard one word from the Minister of Tourism in the middle of all his trips abroad to explain to the people of Barbados that they now have a new phenomenon on the scene, namely, that the visitors are increasing but they are not spending any more money. Last year the cruise ships' passengers fell by a few, but the ordinary visitors increased nearly twenty per cent but they only spent 4 per cent more money. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker."

I am still quoting the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

"That is the problem, Mr. Speaker, and we must know why. We must get to understand why."

Now, it has taken 8 months before I had the opportunity to explain why, Mr. Speaker. The first explanation is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was jumping ahead a little bit anxious to swing his fist around where he could and, unfortunately, based his statement upon facts which were not substantiated. It was very clearly stated in the Interim Economic Survey, which was issued at that time, in the section headed "Tourism" - "In this section, it has been possible to give only a partial analysis of the performance of the tourist industry during 1971 because of the limited nature of the statistical data. At the time of writing this section a detailed breakdown of visitor arrivals, by country of residence, and by intended length of stay, was available only for the months of January to June, 1971. As such, our analysis has been restricted to a comparison of the performance of the industry during those months of 1971 with a similar period in 1970."

It was quite clearly stated that the figures, which were included in that Interim Economic Survey, were very tentative figures. A week or 10 days before the Interim Economic Survey first came into all of our hands, I immediately queried the validity of the facts and figures which were given in the section under tourism. Unfortunately, it takes a little longer for us to get statistics than it should take, and it makes it extremely difficult for us to plan. However, eventually, we did get the corrected statistics, and they showed that where the number of visitors had increased in 1971 from 156,417 to 189,075, an increase of approximately 20.9 per cent, at the same time the revenue from tourism expenditure had risen from $66.4 million in 1970 to a figure of $77.3 million in 1971. 3 p.m.

This I calculate to be an increase of about 16.4%. This of course still shows a slight reduction in the

value of money received as compared to the number of visitors, but I think this is to be understood when we consider the number of people who are not only coming to Barbados, but travelling around the world now on reduced package tour, kind of charters and things like that. As I understand it, with the number of people in any country who are going to take a foreign vacation, you are surely going to go down and broaden the base of the income levels, and as you do that you reduce the amount of disposable income which those people at those levels may have to spend wherever they happen to go. Still in all I think it will be agreed that an increase of approximately $11 million or 16.4% in revenue to a country is a substantial revenue.

We have no figures for 1972 yet, but I do believe that they will show at least another 15% increase and we will have a situation in 1973 where I would be so bold as to guess that we may well find that for the first time the number of visitors to the Island will approximate the number of inhabitants of the Island. This is of course on an annual basis. This does not include the number of people who visit on cruise ships; this is only people who stay a minimum of twenty-four hours.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
On a point of order, if the hon. Member is reading from a paper, is he going to make it a document of the House?

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I read from Hansard and from the Economic Survey, and I have referred to some other notes.

Mr. BOLDEN:
On a point of order, the Hon. Minister spoke from another piece of paper from which he read figures which I was putting

down here, and I would like that made a document of the House. This situation arose in the last debate when the hon. member went out and came back in the afternoon with figures on a paper and refused to make it a document of the House when we were dealing with tourism.

Mr. SPEAKER:
You have made your point.

Mr. BOLDEN:
If I may say so, I do not understand the Hon. Minister trying to justify his position as Minister of Tourism by reading from papers which the other members of the House have not got the right to see.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Any document which the Minister is referring to or quoting from cannot be read or quoted without being made a document of the House.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, there are two documents from which I read. One was the Official Debates of 13th June, 1972, and the second was the Economic Survey of 1971, which are already documents of the House. I referred to some figures here, but as I understand it, under Standing Order 28(1), a Member may not

read his speech, but he may read extracts from books or papers other than newspapers in support of his argument, and may refresh his memory by reference to notes.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The paper from which you are quoting the figures must be made a document of the House.

Mr. BOLDEN rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:
You have made your point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Speaker, if I may, the hon. member is attempting to quote statistical figures which he said were not available.

Mr. SPEAKER:
You have made your point.

Mr. WALCOTT:
On a point of order, any hon. member has the right to read from his own private notes. There is nothing in the Standing Orders which prevent me from making notes and getting up and using them. That is what is given to every member of this Chamber. Reading from notes is not the same as making a speech from a prepared document, and any Minister can make a statement whenever he likes, and he can make notes and read from them. That is our privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER:
On this occasion I am ruling....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
In the case of a Minister he is granted even a little more latitude than an ordinary member. A Minister can refer to files and read from them in order to be accurate. He cannot make them documents of the House. The majority of what I say in here I read from files because I want to be accurate. If I read from a file, do you mean I have to make it a document of the House. It would make it absurb. It does not make sense.

Mr. WALCOTT:
I will rise and say that the only error the hon. member would have made, and Your Honour even admits that, is that the hon. member cannot even read from Hansard if it is in the same session.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I should like to reassure hon. members that there is nothing secret or furtive about these figures. I would be glad to make them available to all hon. members, and I shall see that they get at least a summary of it from which they could ask for detailed information if they wish. I could not remember

directly some of the figures which I quoted and I saw no reason why I should not refer to them.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let the hon. member continue.

Hon. P. G- MORGAN:
As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the tourist industry at the moment is facing a number of problems and certain changes which are taking place. One of these changes comes from the nature of the transportation world where now we are getting many more people coming on reduced tour charters, and there are many different kinds of incentive fares available which were never there before. This is particularly so from Canada and has now become so to some extent from the United Kingdom. The United States still poses a problem because there are Civil Aeronautic Board restrictions on charter flights which make it difficult for charter groups to come in to Barbados from the United States on inclusive tour charters as they do from Canada. We hope however that our Committee which has been established by the Regional Council of Ministers will be able to take this matter up with the American authorities so that in future we may be able to get more of the large influx of charter business as we do from Canada at the moment.

Now this summer will show, I hope, a considerable increase from the United Kingdom

because of the fact that for the first time these new fares are available. It is not really the first time that they are available, but it is the first time they have been able to promote them, because they did not come into effect and were not known about until April 1 last year which was too late for promotional efforts to be made with regard to promoting business for the summer of 1972. This year considerable effort has been made and a great number of wholesale tour operators and other people have been to the United Kingdom in the hope of promoting business to the Caribbean and to Barbados during this coming summer.

As far as the continent of Europe is concerned, we are doing all we can and indeed I think I can say that we sponsored the idea that the Eastern Caribbean should be promoted as an area. This was agreed to at a meeting held in Barbados in December and it is expected that we should promote all the Islands of the Eastern Caribbean in all our endeavours on the continent of Europe. The main reason for this, of course, is not only budgetary considerations where none of us has very much money to spend in terms of competition, but in addition to that, the fact is, that the names of our islands are not well known amongst the travelling public; they are not even particularly well known amongst the trade on the continent of Europe thus far. However, there is a considerable amount of business to be brought from there and I believe we shall continue to anticipate an increase from the Continent of Europe. I believe that the nature of the industry is going to change even more, and this is something we shall have to watch very carefully.

I think for instance that it would not be very long before inclusive tour charters may well be coming from the United Kingdom for less than £60 round trip. This is going to make a considerable difference and we have to watch carefully the effect on our economy, because it is one thing to have a vast number of people, but at the same time we do want to make sure that we do not get a lot of people and comparatively little revenue. 3.10 p.m.

We are also faced with a new turn of events, I think, in 1973, because I think that later this year in the autumn, that is to say a little before the next winter season, and continuing through the next winter season we shall have the probability that there will be 747 jumbo jets coming on a regular basis, that is to say, possibly on a charter basis if not on a scheduled airline basis. These planes carry between four and five hundred people and will cause us all kinds of other problems which must be taken into consideration now, but which are presently being considered by the various departments of Government which are jointly involved, particularly with airport operations.

Another development which we would hope for in the near future, I think, is the merger of Eastern Airlines and Caribair which has been pending for two and a half years now and which keeps getting postponed and postponed. If this comes about, and I hope it will, I think this will mean a tremendous difference to the Islands in the Eastern Caribbean. To us, because it will mean that we shall be able perhaps to have people travelling from the inland cities of the United States - anywhere as far as Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore and some of the coastal cities like Boston and Atlanta - to Barbados where previously and up to now they have had to change planes either at New York, Miami or Puerto Rico, and access to these inland cities should bring us a considerable amount of increased tourist traffic. If this merger comes about I believe it will be a very salutary thing for us, and in addition and equally important in my view, it will be tremendously helpful to some of the other Islands which are close by and which suffer a great deal from very poor air connections such as St. Vincent, Grenada and St. Lucia.

We have had news recently as was shown in the Press of two substantial developments in the tourist industry, in the fact of the sale of Sam Lord's Castle to the Marriot Hotels of the United States, and the announcement by the Melia Hotels of Spain that they will be building a large hotel at Chancery Lane. The Sam Lord's Castle I understand will show an increase of 300 rooms, and the Melia Hotel 358 rooms are planned. Both of these I believe will start construction in mid 1973, and both will mean a substantial amount of employment in the construction stage, perhaps between 200 and 250 people working on each site at peak periods, and I would assume that there would be approximately 500 employees in each of these substantial hotels, making a total of 1,000 people who will be employed by these hotels by the end of 1975. This is an important factor, not the least of which is that both of these substantial hotels are going to be in areas which have not yet benefitted very much from the development of the tourist industry, they are both large and yet they will not be unsightly because they are in rather remote places, they will not stand out like sore thumbs, and certainly we welcome both of the very reputable companies as part and parcel of our future tourist industry development.

There are a number of other potential developments which one cannot talk too much about at this stage, because we hear so many things that are going to happen and then we do not see them happen, and I prefer to wait until it is definitely brought out publicly by the people themselves that they are going to do this or that, but there are a great number of other substantial developments which are going to take place in the tourist industry during the next few years. Of course all of this can only happen if we are able to maintain all the things which go to give Barbados such a wonderful reputation in tourism in these days. I would say simply that the development of our tourist industry right now depends upon the continued good nature and friendly attitudes of our people, the continued healthy development of the climate, the continued stability of our relationships on both sides of this House, and of course it depends equally importantly upon the continued economic stability in other parts of the world, which is perhaps one of our biggest headaches.

I would like to say one more thing, that bearing in mind all these things this industry can provide a great deal of employment for young men and women in the future, it can provide a great deal of money for the Treasury where unfortunately we do not have mineral resources and that kind of thing. All of these things can come about, but I hope that people in authority and other prominent citizens will bear in mind and pause before making sweeping accusations and condemnations of various kinds, whether from the platform or from the pulpit, if these sweeping accusations are not based entirely on carefully researched facts and on entirely reliable information. If there are offensive, unpleasant or indeed illegal things going on in tourism let them by all means be brought out. Tourism is a very delicate matter, it is a matter of relationships of one people to another, it is a matter of dealing almost in people, and when you deal with people you can be certain of one thing, things are going to go wrong, things will surely go wrong. It is impossible to make laws for all the eventualities, and even if you do, people are frail, but if there are things that go wrong in the development of our tourist industry, I sincerely suggest that it is in the interest of everyone if they are brought to the attention of the appropriate authority, whether that authority be the Ministry of Tourism, the Ministry of Health, the Commissioner of Police or anyone else, with as many facts and figures as can possibly be summoned for the occasion so that appropriate action may be taken.

Too much rocking of the boat is not a good thing in these situations, and so we ask for the cooperation of everyone in the future development of the tourist industry so that criticisms of the lack of economic development will remain as invalid as they are today. 3.20 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister has struggled very hard to justify the Ministry of Tourism, but I have listened carefully and 1 have not yet heard anything which, in my opinion, can satisfy or reduce the fears of the local people involved in tourism in this country. The Hon. Minister has read from figures which, apparently, he has collected from some place.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. There were figures from the Government Statistical Office.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, just now he said that he did not speak from papers. He said earlier that he challenged the Statistical Report which was put out by the Government, and yet he is afraid to produce the same figures as a document of the House so that the world at large can check the figures when the next document is produced!

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member giving way?

Mr: BOLDEN took his seat.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, at no time did I say I was afraid. I offered to make all of the figures available to

members on that side and this side. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, most of these figures have already been published in the daily press.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, this is another instance of figures being prepared - the same thing happened during the debates on the Estimates - and not made a document of the House. That is the attitude of the Hon. Minister. During the last debate when members on this side were crying out for assistance for the people who worked in the big hotels on the West Coast, the Minister ran outside and returned to justify the existence of the tourist industry as run by Sandy Lane and the group. He is now telling us not to rock the boat. He does not want us to rock the boat, because the boat is being skippered by people who have to be represented in a particular way. If he thinks that people are not going to rock the boat, he had better think again. This House has not yet heard what steps the Government are going to take to make sure that the visitors to this country eat more of the things produced in this country in order to lessen the imports of agricultural products and enhance the money-earning capacity of the local inhabitants.

The Minister has talked about not rocking the boat; he has talked about people coming in to run hotels, but what is the good of people coming here to run hotels when the maximum benefit to be derived is the sweat and labour of the natives? You also allow the importation of 90 per cent of the things which are used in the hotels. Has the Minister yet answered the criticism that in most ,of the cold storage facilities in this country the big hotels import 90 per cent of the foodstuff used in the hotels? What must we do? Must we pay high taxation to enable people to enjoy the sun, the sea and the sand? What can we do about tourism? It is not a question of rocking the boat. It is a question of if you are involved in tourism, then the Ministry must be able to show that the inhabitants of this country are getting something more than the slave labour of the tourist industry. I do not think the Minister can get up and say this is not true.

We are now told that Barbadians will be invited to take 50 per cent in the big hotels, but he must tell us about the management. Ask him how many of the local people will ever enjoy some of the top positions. Will he tell the public that the majority of the money made by the hotels in this country comes from the West Indian Islands? We know that tourists come from the West Indian Islands and spend time in Guest Houses. If you will analyse what we get out of the big hotels, you will realise that the natives get nothing but sweat and labour. The Minister says that the facts are published in the newspaper. You should read from day to day the arguments of the people at the bottom who are endeavouring to reach management level in the big hotels. The excuse has always been that the people at the top have to protect their interests by bringing in expatriates to occupy top posts.

Where are the figures to show that there is control over things like beef, cabbages, carrots and other agricultural produce? Look at the things imported for the hotels in this country! Even the tourists are crying out that they would like to eat some of the local food produced in this country. All I have heard about tourism in this country is intended to put the big hotels in what may appear to be a favourable position. If the Minister would go around to the small hotels, he would see the position. Even the management of the small hotels are now saying that the Bonanza Tours are catering only for the big hotels, which are owned by the expatriates, and not for the small hotels in this country.

The Minister has been the head of the Hotel Association, and you can ask him if it is true that those small hotel owners are crying out. They say that they are supposed to pay for the Bonanza Tours, but the

big hotels on the South Coast and the West Coast are getting all of the publicity. He should question that, and then tell the people in Barbados what tourism is doing for them. He is talking about an increase of 16 per cent on figures which have not yet been justified. He is going to say that the Government Statistical Office, which put out figures showing that there was only a 4 per cent rise, is wrong, but his figures are correct. This is just like the figures given in the Estimates.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I pointed out that the Government Statistical Department, or at least the economic people, stated in the beginning that the figures were of a partial and limited nature of statistical data. I am not saying that my figures are correct. These are the corrected figures which I subsequently gave.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Prime Minister came into this House and levied a 4 per cent tax on hotels. What we are getting in Barbados nowadays is ticket tourism. The people come to Barbados by a ticket; they go to Harry's by ticket; they pay taxis by ticket, and that is why the Prime Minister had to levy a 4 per cent tax in order to get some of the money. The Minister of Tourism now wants us to believe that we are making a lot of money out of tourism. Now who is right and who is wrong? The horses are pulling on opposite sides one is representing the West Coast Hotels, and the other one is trying to get money for the country.

The Minister of Communications and Works came to this House a few days ago and a Resolution was passed to stop people bringing cars to this country because a lot of things were included in the ticket tours. Let the Minister tell us who will get the benefits from ticket tours. Certain people have to be protected. You can dp everything by ticket. You can eat, travel and go to Harry's by ticket; you can go to the Pepperpot by ticket, and when you return to the United States you can pay the money. Food will be sent from the United States to Barbados, and all the natives will get from the tourist industry will be sweat and labour.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Divide. 3.30 p.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Horn L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. LOWE; Mr. WALCOTT; Mrs. EASTMOND; His Hon. C. A. E. HOPPIN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. GREAVES and Mr. WEEKES - 13.

AYES:

Mr. MOTTLEY; Mr. HINDS; Mr. FQRDE and Mr. BQLDEN-4.

RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 7 under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church West, be the next order of the day.

Mr. HINDS:
I beg to second that.

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

Mr. FORDE:
Mr. Speaker, I have waited patiently since I first introduced this Resolution into Parliament to move the Resolution and urge strongly on all hon. members of this House that they give their support to it. Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether any member after mature consideration will vote against this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks very simply to ask the Government to set up without delay a National Commission to enquire into and report upon the status of women in Barbados, and to recommend what steps ought to be taken by this House and the Government to prevent any form of discrimination against women on the grounds of sex and to ensure and maintain for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Barbadian society.

The Resolution, Mr. Speaker, particularises various areas to which such a commission is asked to pay special attention. I will not repeat verbatim those areas, but some of the areas which concern us particularly are the areas of employment and the placing and promotion of women in the public and private sector, and the position of women in the civil and criminal laws of this country, especially the laws governing matrimonial property, marriage and divorce.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of this country guarantees in the fundamental rights provisions equal rights for all our citizens, and I am sure that every right thinking Barbadian would want to feel that we moved to the day where our citizens have equal opportunities and certainly are guaranteed by law equal rights in the laws of the country. Unfortunately we have taken our tradition and indeed much of our history from the United Kingdom and we have taken that tradition and that history with its perfections and with its imperfections. One of the most glaring examples of imperfections of the common law has been the manner in which it has discriminated between the rights of women and the rights of men, and I trust that today with United Kingdom and with other progressive countries in the western hemisphere and indeed throughout all the world, we will seek rapidly to remove these imperfections.

Why do I ask this Honourable House, Mr. Speaker, to appoint a National Commission to carry out such an enquiry? I believe first and foremost that there is no well documented material in this country on the rights of women or on the inequalities which confront women in this society. I believe secondly, Mr. Speaker, that in keeping with the progress towards Women's Rights Year, in 1955 our nation should want to be in the forefront of those who can take positive action to carry out the intention of the United Nations and indeed to redress any imbalances which exist in our society. It is for this reason that I am asking for an objective commission which will investigate the facts, report on the situation and

recommend action, and I trust that when such action is recommended that this House and the Government will act promptly in seeing that any definite and progressive measures which have been recommended are put into effect and instantly implemented.

For the benefit of hon. members I should like in general to say that we have made some progress in Barbados towards equalising the rights of the sexes, but this progress has neither been as rapid as we should desire nor indeed as happy as we would have wanted it. If one my look on the psychological front, there is still too much and too firmly held the view that women should be relegated to a secondary role in this society. This view no doubt is one of the undertones from the 17th Century view on women in Europe in particular. I think, Mr. Speaker, you yourself and this House is familiar with the classic example of that type of attitude which is manifested in the writings of that great and outstanding man William Shakespeare when in the Taming of the Shrew he had Petruchio refer to women in these terms:

"I will be master of what is mine own She is my goods, my chattels, she is my house, my household stuff, my field, my barn, my horse, my ox, my ass, my anything And here she stands, touch her whoever dare I'll bring mine action on the proudest he that stops my way in Padua."

Mr. Speaker, I think that many of us may still consider our women to some extent as our household stuff, and I believe that the changing attitudes which evolved after the Second World War has convinced us or should have convinced us that women today are capable of participating in the full economic life of the country, and undertaking as rapidly as anybody else all of the work which is being put forward in a technological age. I think Barbados in this respect in fact, although not in deed and in law has recognised that women are capable of producing on as high a level as men can in this society. I think Barbados also should be able to recognise today that women are as capable as anyone else of manning the reins of Government and indeed carrying out all public duties on as good a basis as men are; and if we recognise this, we should be able to legislate where there are inequalities.

Hon. Members will of course say that we have made progress. Indeed prior to 1951 if I might look on the political field the position was that women like men had the right to vote and to participate in public life, and the only limitation there appears to have been was in the field of jury service. That inequality has now been removed. 3.40 p.m.

Despite the fact that the legal machinery exists one still finds today that there are very few women participating in the public life of this country. Mr. Speaker, this House is graced with having something like 4.16 per cent of its membership taken up by the presence of the hon. and charming member for St. Michael North East. The Other Place on the other hand has something like 9.5 per cent of its membership taken up by the female sex. Two members of the Other Place happen to be female, but this is the situation where more than one half of our country happens to be female, and I think we must concede that there is under-representation in this field.

Mr. Speaker, on public boards in this country one finds that out of a number of something like 167 public boards, according to my reckoning, there are only 18 women represented on these boards, and indeed there is no Chairlady or Chairwoman, whichever you like to call it, who happens to belong to the female sex. The Child Care Board is outstanding in that, I think, seven of its members are women, but that is the only board where one finds this degree of representation. In the public service one finds some of the strangest rules. You find that if a woman gets married while she is in the service she is entitled if

she wants to resign to do so and get a gratuity, but if she is in the service and married and wants to go before the statutory age, 50, she is not entitled to a gratuity, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no justification for this illogical provision.

Mr. Speaker, one finds also in public life, in the political parties of this country, that although there are women's leagues in existence that the top positions are something that women must still aspire to in the future. I am not laying the causes or the reasons for this at the door of either of the political parties, I am laying them at the door of both parties and indeed at the door of the society as a whole, because it is us men who have made women feel to some extent that they have only a secondary role to play. Further, I think that we must start afresh in educating in the homes our families to look towards women in as important a way as they look towards their menfolk. Too often you hear families wishing for an heir, very seldom do you hear families wishing for an heiress, and this is symptomatic of the type of attitude which we give to the value of women in our society. I believe that the political parties; as well as the, country as a whole, should try and encourage the progress of women up the political ladder in this country, and speaking for myself I certainly look forward to the day when in the not too distant future the Prime Minister of this country will be a woman. I certainly also look forward to the day when within the Cabinet in her own right will be a lady member. I believe the time has long since past when we should be satisfied to say that women can do it, why do they not do it. This is one of the aspects of the matter that should be investigated by a national commission; how we can encourage women to come out more and more on the political platform. Perhaps one of the things we can do ourselves is to try to raise the level of debate not only on the political platform but in this House, so that they may feel they can come forward without any fear in their hearts or minds about their private lives.

In the economic field, Mr. Speaker, we have again under the Constitution said that we will use the resources of our country so that all people should be entitled to an equitable distribution of these resources, and that the material resources of the community are given to all men who shall labour in equal shares as far as possible. I know that as lawyers we say that wherever we read the male we should include the female, but I think it is symptomatic that those of us who were at that constitutional conference, at which there were no women, never adverted to the fact that it would have been easy to say all persons, that today despite the efforts of the Worker's Union from the time of its formation up to the present, there is still an inequality in the way we treat our men and women in this society.

Mr. Speaker, I think that hon. members may be interested to see on the basis of the preliminary statistics put out as public property by the Statistical Office that there is an imbalance between the number of women who reach top management or middle management positions as compared with the number of men. For instance, in the administrative and managerial grade, in a working force of men of something like 51,057 we have about 1,033 people or 2.2% reaching administrative and managerial levels, whereas in a working force of 31,000 women we have something like 125 or .35%. On the other hand, if we compare this with the service industries, we will find that we have 10,466 women, 31.66% of the working force of women, as compared with 5,618 men, 9% of the working force of men. So that it seems that women predominate in the service and clerical sectors of the economy, whereas at the top management level in proportion to their numbers they do not have opportunities to progress as fast. Mr. Speaker, if you compare at other educational levels, I am sure the Hon. Minister of Education will be interested to see that the female population, for instance, those who have school leaving certificates five years and over, as compared with the working female population 11.26% as against 14.8% of men, and those with school leaving certificates, the women are as good as the men, 5% to the men's 5%. In the

G.C.E. 'O' Level, one to two subjects, the women 2.6% to the men 1.66%; G.C.E. 'O' Level, three to four subjects, the women 3.3% to the men 2.5%; G.C.E. Advanced Level, one Advanced and five 'O' Levels, the women 4.12% as against the men 3.03%; G.C.E., two A levels, the women .44% as against the men .62%, and the diploma stage, the women 1.1% as against the men 1.06%. It is in the degree stage that the men have the advantage of 1.7% as against the women .6%.

These figures have been achieved by women, despite the fact that the educational system, certainly until recently and even ast existing times, had the imbalance where women had less opportunity to go to the higher levels than the men had, and I urge from this that this could show hon. members that women have the capacity at the educational level to perform as well as, if not better than, their counterparts, the men, but if you compare their performance in the educational field as against their performance in the working population, you will find that they are not progressing as fast as the men are allowed to progress.

Mr. Speaker, these statistics and more can be brought out by any national commission to show that we must take progressive measures to redress the balance. I believe in giving Jack his jacket in most instances, and I will say here that recently in the public sector attempts have been made to equalise the pay between men and women, so I think that from 1st April this year in all categories of work in this country men and women for doing like work will, be given equal pay. 3.50 p.m.

On the other hand, we find in the Public Service at the present time that the highest substantive post a woman achieves, except on the professional side, happens to be at the level of Assistant Secretary. We must make progress much more rapidly, because I think women in the Public Service constitute something like forty per cent. I am not absolutely certain about the accuracy of that figure, but certainly about forty per cent of the working force. Although we recognise that it was only in the last 10 years that the restriction on the number of women to be employed by the Public Service was removed, yet I feel that more can be done and we should be making every effort to make women progress more rapidly up the Public Service ladder.

The public sector, Mr. Speaker, gives me grave cause for concern. I have done on my own a survey of the private sector, particularly those sectors that are not unionised and represented by the union, and I am afraid to say that the progress being allowed for women has been very limited. It is still true to say that there are very few women in this country, other than in private companies or who own their own businesses, who are promoted to managerial level or to supervisory level. I had a check up to a few weeks ago, and I can only name one particular public firm who had promoted a lady up to the position of managerial level. More recently Barclays Bank has done likewise.

Let me urge on private employers that, where they promote the ladies, they must not only give them equal pay but equal allowances, and they must stop discriminating against them on the grounds of their sex by denying them the allowances that men in similar positions will get. It seems to me that we should move in this country to legislate for equal pay for equal rights. To do that we will have to have a Standards Employment Act where certain standards would be laid down so that they would be able to grade the level of work that is to be done.

There will always be some categories of the private sector that are underrepresented or not represented at all by the union. I believe that the union, in keeping with its pledge to the I.L.O. and to its

constitution, will press wherever possible to equalise these rights. Indeed, it should press wherever possible. In most of the collective agreements that I have been able to look at, negotiated in the last 5 years, the union has insisted on equal rights in this respect, if the union has so insisted and there are still categories where we are not achieving this, then I think the Government should be willing to legislate. I was, indeed, disappointed that the Government recently was forced to sign and ratify an International Convention, but to do so subject to a reservation in that it said in its reservation to the Convention that it could not guarantee that in the private sector equal pay should be given for equal rights. I think the Government must do more; it must make sure that it guarantees these fundamental rights to women.

Mr. Speaker, I will speak as quickly as I can on this Resolution, because I am sure that other hojn. members would like to speak on it. In the field of law, I am appalled at the slow manner in which the law has responded on this subject. Let me give hon. members some of the examples in which there is still discrimination. In our divorce law, Mr. Speaker, if a male commits adultery with a female, the husband of the female has an action for damages. If, on the other hand, he commits adultery with a female, the wife of the male has no action for damages in those circumstances as against the woman. This is really an archaic provision. It came down, as hon. members will know, from the action for criminal compensation where in those days the language most euphonious was used. It was said that when you committed adultery, you conversed by way of criminal conversation, and it was based on the concept of the proprietary right which a man has in his wife. I think it is all wrong, Mr. Speaker, that this should be so.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, if my wife is injured and I lose her services, I can sue for an action of loss of consortium. If, on the other hand, I am injured and she loses my services, no matter how good my services may be to her, she has no corresponding action in suing in an action for loss of services. Again, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that we have always considered women as being our proprietary right, for instance, if any hon. member harbours and entices my wife away, I have an action against him for doing such an act. If, on the other hand, I harbour or entice any hon. member's wife away, Mr. Speaker, my wife has no action in those circumstances. I believe we should equalise the position. I know these are humorous examples, but when we come to much more serious examples like proprietary rights, we find that the common law insisted that a woman on marriage brought all of her property and it became the rights of the man, unless a Deed of Settlement was made. In 1906 we tried to alleviate this harsh rule, and we did allow a woman to have, to some extent, her private property. But if a woman lives with her man, either in marriage or in common law marriage, all her life, gives him faithful service and saves some of the money he is earning and acquires a matrimonial property, even in those circumstances, as our law stands, she is not entitled to ask for a share of that property.

Mr. Speaker, there are many instances in the divorce field where I can almost convince members in this area alone that there is need for proper legislation. I will cite only one other example. I refer to succession to property. A woman can live all of her life with a man and give faithful service to him, but he can in his last days on his dying bed completely cut her and the children out of his will, leaving not even a cent. Some people think you must leave a penny or 24 cents. He can leave her nothing, and she is entitled to nothing. She can become a charge on the State. I do not believe that the laws are equitable in this respect, and it is for this reason that I am asking very strongly that we should have some inquiry into the position.

In the field of children's rights, automatically a child is born the custody is conferred on the husband.

If the wife wants to acquire custody, to have any say in her children's rights if there is a dispute, then she has to proceed under the Infants Act. She must pay money to the court, retain a lawyer, expense herself further and so on in order to have some say in the upbringing of her child. In all of the United Nations publications, in all of the Reports of the Commission on the Status of Women, and even the I.L.O. publications have adverted to these instances and urged very strongly that the laws in countries should be changed to accord with the proper situation. I feel that these are only some of the areas that we should advert to.

Now, in the field of income tax, we have, until last year or two years ago, had the position where husband and wife were taxed together. We have not separated the incomes of husband and wife so far as earned income is concerned, but we still continue the concept of treating them as one unit for the purpose of an earned income. 4 p.m.

I have already spoken on one occasion and adverted to the position where two people are retired and they depend on their savings. Maybe their severance pay is invested and they are depending on the income from that to keep themselves. Simply because they continue to be married, that income as earned income is taxed together. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is justifiable if we believe in the equality of sexes for us to maintain this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not finish this introduction to my Resolution and moving it for the House's acceptance without adverting to the role which the National Organization of Women and other organisations can play in this country. Part of the blame for the situation must squarely be put on the shoulders of the women themselves in some instances. In some instances they themselves have not done enough to make sure that they progress fast enough. I think those of us who have watched the National Organisation of Women sometimes wonder whether its business happens to be merely tell-tale tattle and prattle, or whether it is serious about the business of women, and sometimes one is loathe in putting forward a case of this nature to get up and justify their existence. I am hoping that they get a bit of guts about them in relation to their own business and be much more progressive. I understand that they may in due course be asking the Minister for a vote, and I hope that before the Minister of Community Development makes a vote to N.O.W. - he has made a vote I believe -he would ensure that they are performing and performing properly.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of business to be done. National organisations must get out among the mass of people and shoulder their responsibilities and they must stop conceiving their duties as being at cocktail parties, rushing to Governor General's residence or the Prime Minister's residence and carrying tales. We have a crying need in this country for the middle and upper classes to level themselves and do some of the work that is called for among the working classes of this country. The type of attitude that we must decry is the attitude where the middle classes in the past used to shun joining the Workers' Union. You still get it sometimes because they do not want to mix with the working classes, and we feel that national

organisations should re-educate people to the need to have equality in all of its spheres, and I give to them two priorities: priority No. 1, the equalisation of women's rights; all women, not merely women of a particular class; priority No 2, 2, the removal of the class barrier in this country, because wherever discrimination exists I feel very strongly about it, be it on the grounds of colour, class or creed or caste, that we should be dedicated to eradicating it from our society.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure in the absence of many women from this House, but With those present being firmly belonging to the class I think that deserves the best, to move this Resolution, to commend it to the House and ask hon. members to take it seriously and to vote in its favour, and I will urge that if it is accepted that the Government should make sure that women are placed on the commission as well as men. There are outstanding women in this country who are not looking for positions but who are quite capable of chairing as well as participating actively in this commission and making it work. Today, Mr. Speaker has been a happy day in my life to have sanctioned women's rights.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the passing of this Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Mover of this Resolution has certainly regaled women folk in all their finery, if I should put it that way. I believe that no hon. member of this House would seek to deny women their rightful place in the society, and I believe for that reason that there will be hardly a dissenting voice when the time comes for the question to be put. However, Sir, I have not given myself to do any sort of research on this matter, but there comes before my mind certain every day occurrences relating to the daily lives of men and women, because for one to seek to place women in their rightful areas, it must be bound up relevantly with that of the men.

There is still, Mr, Speaker, a law which requires a man to provide a marital home for the woman. There is, as all of us know, a certain amount of responsibility attached thereto. The Hon. Mover of the Resolution made reference to situations in the divorce courts, one situation which I believe would give men equal status with women. It is a situation where a woman can, if she has cause, bring a divorce action against her husband and he has got to put up security for her cost. If he brings an action against her, he has to look for his own cost and hers; so there are some areas where we might find a national commission doing justice to both sexes. There are some areas where I believe if this national commission were set up we may come out with justice having been done to all concerned.

As I listened to the hon. member for Christ Church West I have been wondering if the hon. member is in his right place. That is not in reference to the sexes because we all know him so well, but the type of lecture he was giving this House I felt would be better taken if he were before a law school at the U.W.I, or a class of law students somewhere else. Mr. Speaker, it is true we are the law makers; it is true that we can learn and will learn as we go on from time to time as we hear those' who are more familiar with the law and those who have steeped themselves for one reason or other in the law can tell us.

This Resolution is merely, as I understand it, to request the Government to set up this national commission, and I lend it my support, and commit it to the careful consideration and attention of all hon. members. I believe I can say that if the commission were to be set up it would be an assurance that our men folk would not suffer, and let us hope that if something is done they will be relieved in some measure by women who are able to maintain themselves. 4.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, you know as well as I do that there are cases where the wife is better able to maintain the husband, but it is somewhat unlike us that however old and maybe decrepit a man might be he still feels that he must accept his responsibility, and we hope that these various organisations that we have, such as the National Organisation of Women and others, will come forward and give the assistance they can and

help to encourage men to encourage the women to accept some of this responsibility as time goes on. I beg to second the passing of this resolution.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this resolution before us has some relationship to a resolution which was adopted by the United Nations some time ago calling on member Governments to set up Commissions of Enquiry, and I believe Barbados participated in such a discussion, and these resolutions have some binding, to some extent, on Barbados. What comes to my mind very strongly is that when a resolution of this nature was adopted by the United Nations the discussion centred around the conditions and circumstances surrounding women in certain countries Africa and Asia. I myself have lived for a very long time in Africa and Asia, and while not wanting to name any country in particular, I have to admit that conditions there need some sort of improvement by some sort of enquiry, but when we come to Barbados I would like to point out that the conditions in Barbados bear very little relationship to the conditions surrounding women in those countries, and although the women in some of those countries are very severely handicapped by traditional, social and religious practices, we find in some other countries, for example, India and Sri Lanka, women in spite of these handicaps have been able to come up to the top. In both of these countries women are Prime Ministers. It is a bit surprising to me that in Barbados where we boast of the highest literacy rate in the world, and where in my opinion and also may be in the opinion of many others, these handicaps if they do exist do not encumber women to any extent, we do not find women reaching these heights of achievement within the society.

To sit back and accept the accusation or the contention that they do not reach these heights is due to the fact that there is discrimination against them by the male sex and that that alone is responsible I think would be making fun of the whole matter. The hon. member for Christ Church West in winding up his speech made remarks about the National Organisation of Women. I feel very strongly that the position of women in Barbados today, although it may not be as good as they would like it to be, I feel it is so because the women of Barbados have not exerted themselves sufficiently upon this society. At this stage one has to wonder if it is right for Government to be called upon to set up a Commission of Enquiry. What can be achieved by a Commission of Enquiry? The hon. member for Christ Church West has pointed out very clearly the disadvantages of women, and I have no reason at all to doubt him, in fact I tend to sympathise with his arguments about the conditions of women, and I would like to assure him and any other hon. member that I am very sympathetic to the position of women but what I am concerned with is the actual setting up of this Commission. What are we going to achieve by the setting up of a Commission which the women of Barbados themselves cannot achieve? I tend to come to the conclusion that to set up a Commission of Enquiry is just to pass the buck. You set up a Commission of Enquiry, you sit back and wait for them to submit a report in which they make recommendations, that takes time, and then you take a longer time to set about putting into effect all of the recommendations made in this report.

I strongly believe that the women of Barbados, who already outnumber the men, can take it in their hands, and if they do so they are likely to find very much to their surprise that the Government is quite prepared to come out and assist them in resolving many of the problems which they now claim they have. If the women of Barbados are going to sit back and feel that everything is going to be done for them, it is very likely that even the setting up of a Commission and giving a report with recommendations, that when these are put into operation the situation in the Barbadian society is not going to change because the Barbadian women themselves will not be exerting themselves upon the

society. It is all right to pass words, but then you know very often the problem which arises in seeing the implementation of these laws. In Barbados like in many other countries you find that the position of the women has been circumstanced by traditional practices, religious beliefs and social behaviour. You find even in the Barbadian home that parents give their male children more encouragement and freedom and they restrict the female children. They always tend to believe that their female children have to be protected, and as a result, the female children are brought up to be strongly inhibited, whereas the male child is given a free hand. He can go out and do a lot of things, in fact very often indirectly the male child in the Barbadian home seems to be encouraged to go out and sow his wild oats on any other person's female child, but you find a tendency to restrict the female child rather than allowing her to develop fully and take the greatest advantage of the society in which she finds herself.

When one thinks in terms of the position of the women one cannot attempt for one moment to lay any blame on politicians, either from this Party or the other Party, about the position of women in this country. The position of women is one which society has developed from the day it started in this country, and a lot of the origins of our society go all the way back to slavery. I would like to see the women of Barbados taking a more active role in the affairs of this country; already in this Party we have a Parliamentary Secretary who I believe, given the necessary encouragement, may one day be sitting in the Cabinet, and that day is not too far off in my opinion. I am not saying for one moment that this is the opinion of the Prime Minister, and I would like to see many other women in many other areas, but I would also like to point out that you just cannot take women and put them there, they must demonstrate that they are capable of holding these positions, and not only capable, they must also demonstrate that they have this desire to command these positions. One of the things we are observing in Barbados is that although the female members of the Barbadian society have their education, and many of them have qualifications, you find that they are not demanding this consideration, neither are they impressing upon the society that they have this strong desire to command these positions. It is for them to come forward and do something about this.

When you look at the character of some of the organisations of women in Barbados, one of the things that strike me very forcibly is that they seem to represent too often a certain section of the Barbadian society. When you look at the various women's organisations you see the same names cropping up; if you are not President in this one you are Vice-President in another, or Secretary or Treasurer in yet another. The same names keep cropping up in these organisations, and when you try to relate these organisations to the broad masses of Barbadian women you find there is no relationship. Very often these people who dominate these organisations have nothing in common with the broad masses of Barbadian women, and this may be one of the reasons why women in this society have been unable to exert any measurable influence on the way this society is going. 4.20 pan.

Now, there are many things in Barbados which I would accept are not going in favour of women. Let us take some of the industrial places where women have to work. What are the facilities being provided for these women? As we know women have certain problems during the month that men do not have. How do these National Organisation of Women or some other Organisation function in relation to the needs of these people? Very often in the past, and up to quite recently, I have heard complaints about employers trying to take advantage of female workers by sexually exploiting them. It is alleged that some people are submitting to such treatment in order to keep their jobs. What is the National

Organisation of Women doing about these conditions? What is the National Organisation of Women doing to protect these female workers?

Mr. Speaker, one could go on repeating the number of problems which the women at the lower level have to contend with. You have these Organisations which claim that they are representing the interests of women, and they do nothing even to air things in public. When it comes to the Resolution itself, I would believe that an organisation representing women would be in the forefront advocating such an inquiry or Commission of Inquiry to be set up. Strangely enough, we find the horn member for Christ Church West being the champion of this Resolution calling for a Commission of Inquiry, and one has to wonder in what way is he going to be rewarded. Is he going to be nominated to be the Honorary President of some of these organisations?

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I will not change sex.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, when one goes a step further and talks about equal rights, one of the countries where you find a lot of talk, in recent months about equal rights is the United States of America. The United States went as far as introducing an amendment referred to as "The Equal Rights Amendment", to their Constitution to guarantee equal rights for women. Now that the amendment has been put into force in the United States, we find that some of the women have started an anti Equal Rights Amendment campaign. They have suddenly realised that many of the legal laws which had protected the position of women in their homes and many of the social advances which they had in the past were taken away by the amendment. They now find that they are worst off than before.

When one talks about equal rights, as the hon. member for St. Peter has pointed out, even a man can stand up and ask for equal rights. There are a lot of encumbrances in the society, both social and legal, which operate to the disadvantage of a man. A man can stand up and declare where he stands. He cannot sit back and find later on that he has been pushed into a position and made a lot of concessions, and instead of getting an equalisation of the sexes he has created a super sex.

We can have discussions about the position of women and men, but what I am really concerned with is the need for setting up a Commission of Inquiry. I have not seen or heard from the hon. member for Christ Church West that there is such a need. I do not deny that some of the things to which he has referred exist, because some of these things have been brought to my notice. Is it really necessary to set up a Commission of Inquiry to correct these things? I see absolutely no need for the setting up of a Commission of Inquiry to correct these things. The hon. member has given a long list of the disadvantages, the discrepancies, the encumbrances and so on in relation to women. He seems to know them quite well. Are you going to set up a Commission of Inquiry to come back and tell us what he has told us? Do we want to set up a Commission of Inquiry to tell us what we know already, or what the organisations of women could tell the Government and suggest the manner in which corrective procedures could be made? Is this just a sop to be thrown to the women? Are you merely going to set up a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the status of women in Barbados to placate the women for a short time, hoping that during the time they are placated they will forget the matter, or something else will occur which will push the matter into the background? I do not think that the women should be treated in that matter.

The hon. member has pointed out that a Commission of Inquiry will take, at least, a year to investigate the matter, and then a longer time will be taken in deliberating on their Report and their recommendations. I would like to see the organisations of women in this country exerting themselves in this society where many of the problems exist and see that something is done about them immediately. A lot can be done about some of the problems which the hon. member has mentioned without having to call upon the Government to take action, whether it be to set up a Commission of Inquiry or pass laws to make employers or other people do certain things in the interests of women. The women have a role to play, and I think they should get up and exert themselves. If the women in this country begin to exert themselves, Mr. Speaker, I have every reason to believe that this society would be better off. The women should exert themselves and command respect in this society rather than sitting by and allowing things to drift and merely comment or make demands upon the male members of the society.

The women have a role to play, and if they want equality of rights, what other way is there of showing that they are serious about their equality, or the demand for equality, than by getting up and influencing the way in which the society is going? They have not been doing that, and the hon. member himself has admitted that these organisations have failed in that respect. If a situation persists today, it is not due to the political parties allowing it to persist. Maybe the political parties have been too occupied with other matters and were unable to pay attention to a question of this nature. If it has persisted, it has been due to the fact that the women in this country, educated as they are, qualified as they are, have done absolutely nothing about the matter. Too often we get the impression in Barbados that women, especially in the higher level of society, are more concerned with gossiping and spreading mischievous comments about other people in the society.

Another thing that strikes me very forcibly, too, is that women in this country seem to have very little sympathy for another woman. This is another reason why these organisations of women have failed to influence the Barbadian society as they ought to have influenced it. My contention here is not against what the hon. member has stated, but it is what useful purpose will be served by the setting up of a Commission of Inquiry. I am not convinced of the need for the setting up of a Commission of Inquiry. I am convinced that, if the women get up and exert themselves in the society, they will achieve a lot more in a short period of time than if they sit back and rely on a Commission of Inquiry.

While I share the hon. member's concern for the upliftment of our sisters in the Barbadian society - I strongly believe that with their full participation in the Barbadian society the society must of necessity be a better one - I cannot share the call for the setting up of at Commission of Inquiry into the status of women in this country. I want the women of this country to get up, exert themselves, and they will be surprised to find that the members of this Government will be very, very keen to assist them along the way to the rectification of many of the encumbrances in the Barbadian society.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I am not too hard on the hon. member for Christ Church, because I believe that, as a new member of the House, from time to time every new bird must fly, and all fledgelings, too. I believe in a society where you have more women than men, it is a most popular thing for a man to champion a woman's cause. It is a popular thing to be on the side of women. 4.30 p.m.

All of us in this House I believe owe our seats to the same women because that percentage runs evenly

throughout all the constituencies, therefore you are talking to all of us. There is one thing that is true and it is that if we are living on this planet women and men would share a lot of inequalities; so there is no point in preaching to us the good things and the bad things about women. We know them and we have been practising even longer than you have; so it would not require us to know about these problems. What I do say, and I agree with the Hon. Minister of Health, is that there are no problems in Barbados in the real sense with women, and I am not going to highlight this organisation that you call the National Organisation of Women. Too many of these organisations in Barbados find a very politely gullible Government and the Government gives them things. You have the Y.W.C.A. and N.O.W. and other organisations,

and now you have dropped off honours they want all these things, but they are really now looking for another social gathering. They are not really interested in the broad masses of the community; they are interested in other things, and they want to create a class society themselves; so they cannot help.

These people are not going to help the problem you are talking about with women, because they are not in the main stream of the society. Ask them to go up to Nelson Street where some the prostitutes are and try to get some of them to turn away from prostitution, and they would believe it is beneath them, that prostitution is something innate, that they were born so, so let them remain where they are. I do not have any uses for these people. The inequalities of the law are what the lawyers make, and that is why we are so hard on the lawyers. The hon. member shook his head and said "no". The lawyers give you all bogus theories at law about why inequalities should exist. The hon. member for St. Peter mentioned one. You have another that all of a married man's children are his whether they are or not, because the law says that all your wife's children are yours and not hers. On the converse the common law situation is that all the children of the women you are living with are hers and not yours; so you get the legal situation changing around.

Let us examine the position of women. Women in Barbados are not suffering really any disabilities. I have in my hand a document and I think the hon. member for Christ Church West has it also. He read a lot of figures, but statistics can fool you. If you go by statistics when you are not clear about the issues you are talking about, you can be fooled. If you deal with the basic things that happen in this community, you will see how women are treated. The headmistress of Queens College is not treated any differently from the headmaster at an equivalent school, or the headmistress of St. Michael's Girls' School is not treated any differently from a headmaster at an equivalent school. The hon. member has before him a Civil List that was sent out by the Clerk of this Chamber, and in Barbados all of the women who join the public service can enter the Civil Establishment on equal terms with the men.

Now there are some basic things with women. A woman looks forward to being married in a different way from a man, and therefore one of the problems with educated young women is that they have learnt to read and write. There are more women with G.C.E. at "O" level than men, but the problem is that more of them drop out of the labour force in a given period because at that same stage when they go into the labour force they become married, get children and have to take care of them, and drop out temporarily to come back again; therefore all the women with academic qualifications are not seeking an academic career when they leave school. The main thing in their life is to go in search of a husband. That is natural and normal. It is going to be a most abnormal woman if she has brains and is good looking who is not looking for a husband, otherwise we would not be here. This is normal and I do not have to argue that point. There is no problem about inequalities or that women are in an inferior position

as a result of their not reaching top positions.

Now the hon. member made some remark about the Union, the organisation that I am a member of. We told the Government not two or three years ago, but many years ago that we did not believe in the difference of pay between teachers. Years ago I said that with a man holding the same qualifications as a woman, the woman should get the same salary, and we agreed to it in Primary Schools and from there on we said there should be no distinction whatsoever. There were differences with Clerks in the City where they were giving a female one thing and a male another, but we cut that out and said there was going to be a minimum wage for everybody. If there is going to be a distinction there must be a distinction not based on sex, but on what work you have to do. In certain areas where a woman cannot do heavy manual work like a man, you could not classify her in the same category as a man. In cases where you call a man a general worker, obviously a woman cannot lift weight like a man and therefore you could not ask for her to get the same pay because that would not be equal pay for equal work since she cannot do any equal portion of work.

I am not going to raise the narrow argument that was raised at the United Nations because it has been stated already that the argument at the United Nations was a completely different argument. That was dealing with a universal matter. Those of us who have a knowledge of Africa as a nation know that they make cultural distinctions for their women. When you begin to talk about the status of women you are not talking about the status of women as it relates to New York or to a particular area as the hon. member is asking us to have it relate to Barbados; so if you are asking for a commission of enquiry into the status of women, you must be specific. You cannot have a commission of enquiry into the status of women. What do you mean; that they do not get married? What are you relating to? A woman has a wide phase of life. Are you thinking of the status of women as it relates to law or to divorce? You cannot have a commission of enquiry into every aspect of a woman's life, therefore you have to be specific. Some men would be glad to get relief. There are some poor men who - have to endure these yokes around their necks because they cannot afford the fees for the Divorce Court. Why is it that if a man is seeking a divorce, he has to pay the cost for his wife? If she wants it he also has to pay twice. If you are talking about the status of women, why should she not pay if she wants a divorce? I do not see in some cases why a woman should not pay alimony to a man, because if he was trying all along and then she wants to get rid of him and go about her business, why shouldn't she pay? You have to think in terms of what kind of status you are talking about as it relates to women and in what respect.

The hon. member said that women are not rising to positions in the private or the public sector. A number of women enter employment in the private sector. I find that some of them can rise in the public sector, but it is again the type of employment that some people like. 4.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It now being 4.45 Private Members' Business is now ended and we do revert to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER:

When the sitting was suspended we were dealing with Item No. 2 and the hon. member for St. Peter was addressing the House.

RESOLUTION TO ACQUIRE LAND AT REED STREET, BRIDGETOWN

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I think I had asked the Minister to let us on this side of the House see the plan for this plot of land. I remember at the time of the suspension that I had enquired of the Minister as to the price per square foot Government had negotiated for and was prepared to pay for this 3,040 sq. ft. of land as well, and I would like to hear if you have given any consideration to the point which I raised earlier, because I think it is at this stage that Your Honour must give some indication as to what is the true position regarding a matter such as this. My point is that Government should be seen to set an example. We have heard the Prime Minister make mention time and again of the methods being employed in getting a court title to people's lands, how much he deplores the present setup, and we feel that Parliament is used in this case to get a title for this land in much the same way as the court title to which the Prime Minister referred.

Since the Minister is in a position to tell us the name of the owner of the land, the Minister is in a position to tell us that the land abuts and bounds on the north such and such a property, and these details were not included in the Schedule for all to see, and the Minister is not entitled to proceed with this Resolution as it stands at the moment. We are not saying that Government should not acquire the land, we feel that the time will come when the School Meals centre will have to be resited, but enough information was not made available to the public by advertisements in the Official Gazette and in the newspapers as the law requires, and I would like Your Honour to give consideration to these points raised. I am sure that Your Honour will agree with what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is not for me to give consideration to these things, it is within the Minister's purview.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, the hon. member is appealing to Your Honour for a ruling, but I think the member should read the Act and see what it says.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Act says what must be done, and as I have already stated, the Act says that the fullest possible description should be given in matters of this sort, it should be publicised in the Official Gazette and in the newspaper so that the plot of land under reference can be identified by any interested party. I am submitting that the description given here and the information given by the Minister could not be described as an attempt to fully describe the plot under reference for the benefit of the public. I believe that the Minister does not see us as trying in any way to obstruct this measure, we are just trying to see that the Government is on the right foot, and I am sure that the Minister will at least let us see the plot while he is considering the points we have raised.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I completely disagree with the hon. member for St. Peter who maintains that the Schedule to this resolution is not in accordance with the Act. I also disagree with the hon. member when he says that it has not been published as required, in the newspapers and in the Official Gazette.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation, what I said was that what is contained in the Schedule here cannot be considered as complying with the terms of the Act. If this is lacking in information, what was published in the newspaper and in the Official Gazette was also lacking in information.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

What is described here in the Schedule to this resolution is in fact a reproduction of what appeared in the Official Gazette on 9th, 13th and 16th November, 1972, as well as in the daily newspaper on 9th, 10th and 11th November, 1972, because the Act clearly states that it should be published in three consecutive editions of a daily newspaper, so as far as that is concerned the Act has been complied with. It is a matter now of opinion as to whether the description as given in the resolution is sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the resolution, and the Act states that the land which is to be acquired should be defined precisely. It has been defined to enable the hon. member who spoke on this to find the property and the property owner, so as far as that is concerned the hon. member.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, as regards the ownership of the property that was confirmed by the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I have not yet called the name of the person in this Chamber. None of the records in this Chamber has indicated that I called the name of the owner, the only person who called the name was the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

I called the name of the Austins and the Minister confirmed this. Mr. Speaker, the Minister is showing himself up a bit too often.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, he has just confirmed what I said, that it was he who called the name and I nodded. I am showing myself to be a Minister and he is showing himself to be forgetful about what he has said. 4.50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member found the property, and he found the property owner from the description given in the Gazette. I went to the Library just now and I brought out an Advocate newspaper. In this newspaper, Mr.Speaker, there is a piece of land that is being advertised for sale under the rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature. This also requires the property to be sold to be defined precisely. Here the description given is lands butting and bounding on lands of Elsie Fields on lands in the Estate of James Barnwell, deceased, on lands now or late of Verona Bowen and on a road 16 feet

wide or however else the same may about and bound with the appurtenances.

Mr. Speaker, what is bothering the hon. member for St. Peter is that the words "North, South, East and West" have not been used in this. What I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, as you will know, is that this is not always done in conveyances, or deeds, or wills. The fact is that what we have done is in keeping with the practice. As far as his argument is concerned, it does not hold water. All we are trying to do is to acquire the property. The hon. member says that he is in agreement with the acquisition and it can go through. We are trying to acquire an area of land so that we can accommodate the Salvation Army and a Club. We want a sufficiently wide area to accommodate the facilities for siting the Food Centre there and removing it from where it should never be, in Queen's Park. That is all we are trying to do.

I said that I did not have a plan, but on searching I found a plan. I found the plan between other papers. (Asides.) The School Meals Centre is already set up at Reed Street. The Resolution wants to extend an area so that the Food Centre at Queen's Park can be relocated in Reed Street. The Salvation Army will be given one section of the building; the Food Centre will be given another section, and it will be run by the Salvation Army.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir. Since the Minister has told us of Government's intention to move the Food Centre from Queen's Park to Reed Street, will hon. members, who have already spoken, have an opportunity to debate Government's decision to move it? What we are drawing to Your Honour's attention is that there is nothing in the Resolution about moving the Food Centre from Queen's Park to Reed Street. That is not mentioned in this Addendum.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am afraid that the Minister is replying, and I shall allow him to continue so to do.

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

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution to compulsorily acquire an area of land of 3,040 square feet be recommitted. My reason for doing so is.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS:

One of my reasons is this, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is nothing at present before the House. The Resolution has been passed, Sir.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, who is really in the Chair?

Mr. SPEAKER:
That question is completely unnecessary.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, during the debate on this Resolution, the Hon. Minister of Lands.....

Mr. SPEAKER:
Let me interrupt the hon. member. I can find nothing in Standing Order No. 50 to allow the hon. member to recommit the Resolution which is passed.

Mr. HINDS:
Is there anything to debar me, sir?

Mr. SPEAKER:
I can find nothing to allow you to do that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Refer to Mays.

Mr. SPEAKER:
I am persuaded and I am bound by the Standing Orders. Mays does not bind me. Will the hon. member kindly take his seat.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the instant Order of the Day.

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

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

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VESTING OF PROPERTY AND TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER:
Order No. 3 is the instant Order of the Day and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:
Mr. Speaker, by the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1954, all lands of Government or of the Grown are vested in the Minister responsible for Lands. 5 p.m.

The Minister responsible for lands therefore is responsible for the control and use of that land. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, some problems have arisen as to the right of persons to use Government

lands. Claims have been advanced that some persons may have an express licence, and claims have been advanced that some persons may have an implied licence to use these lands, and from time to time the police have found themselves in difficulty in being able to deal effectively with the using of Government lands. It is a common law right, Mr. Speaker, for the person in whom the land is vested, in this case thes Minister responsible for lands, to give instructions to persons using the lands in a way in which they should not be used, to cease to do so, but Government does not really want to be put in such a position if it can be helped. Clearly if it becomes necessary we will have to use that power.

What this Bill now seeks, Mr. Speaker, is power to make regulations under the Act so that persons can know clearly when we make those regulations the proper manner in which this property may be used, and neither the user nor the police nor any other authority will be at a loss as to the manner in which this property should be used. This in a nutshell, Mr. Speaker. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has a right to speak. If he will observe silence, he can in due course speak and ask for information which will be given in reply.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

This, Mr. Speaker, in a nutshell is what the Bill is all about. In other words, for persons who may be licencees and unable to use Government property in a certain way, the Regulations can set down under what conditions such persons may then become trespassers. We want to spell out for the public's information how they may use certain Government properties. Already some Acts do this. For instance the Parks and Beaches Act sets out how beaches or parks and so on may be used. There are other Acts that set'out how other forms of property may be used, but in order that the public may know clearly what the position is, we now seek power to make regulations under the existing Act.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill is a lot more intricate than the mover of it would observe. Paragraph (2) of this Bill seeks to amend Section 5 (1) (a) of the Executive Committee (Vesting of Property and Transfer of Functions) Act, 1964. By that section "From and after the appointed day the Minister, with the approval of the Legislature of this Island, may sell, lease or let, exchange, grant, assign or surrender any lands! vested in the Crown in right of its government of this Island; (b) grant a licence to use any such lands for any purpose or for such purposes as are mentioned in the license; and (c) grant by way of sale, lease, letting or licence any easement, profit or right in respect of any such lands." It does appear from paragraph (2) of this Bill that it is the intention of the Government to remove from the ambit of the approval of the Legislature the right to sell, lease or let or exchange any lands, because as I understand the law at the moment, if the Minister wants to sell or lease or let or exchange, grant, assign or surrender any lands vested in the Crown, he. can only do this by coming here to Parliament, and with the necessary Resolution, seek the approval of this body.

When this Bill is amended for the purpose of (a) prohibiting the use or occupation of any such lands,

(b) specifying the conditions under which such lands may be used or occupied, and (c) for matters incidental or relating to such use or occupation, it does have the effect of removing completely any power whatsoever from the Minister, of selling the land or doing anything which he could have done with the land under subsection (1) which is being deleted by the amendment contained in Clause 2 of the Bill. I do not know whether it is intended under the regulations to give the Minister power to be able to sell, lease, surrender or let the land without having to get the prior approval of Parliament, because if this is what is intended by this amendment, then certainly we on this side of the House will not support this Bill, because we are not in favour of taking away from Parliament the power which was vested in it to ensure that no land whatsoever belonging to the people of this country can be sold, leased, surrendered or exchanged without the prior approval of Parliament. It appears to me that the amendment in Clause 2 which deletes the necessity to have the prior approval of Parliament is one which we on this side of the House cannot support.

I do not know whether it is the intention of the Government in bringing the new Clause 5 (a) to give to the Minister the right to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of property vested in the Government. What we find is that apart from the Minister talking in his introductory remarks about the police being unable to get certain people off land, I do not know whether he was referring to specific instances, and one would have hoped that if he was in fact referring to those instances that he would have given the House the information, and if he was, I should be happy if when he replies he would give the House the instances to which he referred. 5.10 p.m.

The Minister talks about granting licences etc., but the very power he talks about of granting licences to the people to occupy Government lands on certain conditions are the very powers that are retained in Clauses (b) and (c) that are now renumbered (a) and (b), and he can only do this with the approval of Parliament, but why is it the Government has seen fit at this stage to seek to remove the approval of Parliament before land belonging to the Crown and to the people of this country can be divested by the Government?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I am thankful to the hon. member for pointing out to us the effect that this Bill would have if passed in the way in which it is now before Parliament. It was never intended to remove the Parliamentary powers of sanctioning any sales or any dispensation of land in any way, as a matter of fact if this section were to be deleted neither Parliament nor the Minister would have any power to deal with any Government property, and I am very grateful to the hon. member for drawing this to our attention. This was never the intention of the Government, and I am seeking the leave of the House to defer consideration of this matter.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I believe I am the person who should make that motion, Sir, and I now move that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Before that is taken, I would also like the Hon. Minister to look at what is page 2 of the proposed

amendment to the Bill and notice that.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member cannot speak at this stage, the motion has already been seconded.

Mr. BOLDEN:

It is not at an end, Mr. Speaker, because I am entitled to speak now even on the motion to withdraw. The Hon. Leader of the House has adopted the attitude that people must not speak in Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is entitled to speak on the motion.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is ignorance, because if the Leader of the House would only listen to hear what I am saying,.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the hon. member make his point.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the Minister. If the Minister would look at what is page 2, Arrangement of Sections, he will see that it sets out to amend the Trade Union Act. The Hon. Leader of the House does not understand what is going on.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is quite unnecessary.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Act which appears there is the 1964-12 Act, look at the printing and see that it is wrong. If you are going to further consider the Bill it is right that you put this in order because you will still have to amend this at a later date.

The question that further consideration of this Bill be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should have asked at an earlier stage for leave to deal with the next Resolution which was circulated earlier today. If there is any opposition to it we will hold it until next week, but it is an ordinary supplementary for the Port Department. It is a Resolution that the House approve under Section 10 of the Barbados Harbours Act, 1960 the expenditure required to supplement the Estimates 1972-73 Part I Current of the Port Department.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking permission to deal with this Resolution. If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objections, leave is granted.

ANNEXED ESTIMATES - PORT DEPARTMENT

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with Items 30, 33, 37, 41, 43 and 55A, and is seeking a supplementary under various Heads.

Under Item 30 the sum of $10,000 is required to pay higher contributions as a direct result of interim increased salaries and wages and the proclamation of the Severance Payments Act.

When the amount was put in the Annexed Estimates for the Port, it will be appreciated that that element of increase could not have been foreseen or considered and consequently the amount which is there is not sufficient to meet the increased needs.

Under Item 33 - Communications, it says that the sum of $5,000 is required to meet the increased rates for telephones which came into effect from 1st January, 1973. This is partly due to the increased telephone rates, and of course they will have to go up again from 1st April, but be that as it may I did on another subject deal with an agreement entered into between Cable and Wireless and the Government, and I hope the Opposition will forgive me for not having that Resolution here, but I promise that when the Estimates and Communications of that nature are being discussed I will have the agreement for their benefit. I hope you will not make too much of this element in this small amount, but you will be certainly justified at the time of the Estimates when this matter comes up. I have not got the information here and if you ask questions I will not be able to answer them right now but I will guarantee that I will obviate a lot of argument at the time of Estimates. I hope that members will appreciate the need for this increase, and I promise on that aspect to let them have all the necessary information on the licence to Cable and Wireless which has resulted in a natural increase.

Then of course, under Item 37, the sum of $12,000 is requested to meet the payments of bills incurred under this Item during the financial year 1971-72. I think hon. members who have had any dealings with Government will know that the financial year often ends without all the bills being in, with the result that a lot of the money from the following year is used to pay bills from the year before and invariably leads to a shortfall.

Similarly under Item 41 the sum of $1,000 is required to maintain buildings until 31st March, 1973 as a result of the increased cost of building materials and paints.

Under Item 43 the sum of $2,000 is required as a result of the replacement of the breakwater cable and the provision of new main lines.

With respect to Item 55A, as a result of the new interim payment to employees generally in the Government, the sum of $29,169 is required to make interim payment of salaries and wages to the staff of the Port Department for the period 1st December 1972 to 31st March 1973 as under:

Personal Emoluments $12,169.00

Unestabished Staff 9,000.00

Static Facilities 8,000.00 5.20 p.m.

By Circular No. 12/1972 dated 23rd November, 1972, the Chief Establishments Officer informed Ministries and Departments that the Cabinet had agreed to make an interim payment to all public servants with effect from 1st April, 1972 pending a general revision of salaries/wages with effect from 1st April, 1973. Interim payments commenced from 1st December, 1972, while provision will be made in the 1973-74 Departmental Estimates to meet payments of arrears due in respect of the period April to November, 197 2.

I should just like to express my gratitude to hon. members of the Opposition for permitting the Government to be able to deal with this matter at such short notice. I do not think Government Business has suffered, but if you do not get through this Resolution now, it will naturally mean that National Insurance contributions will be held up, interim pay will be held up, and so on, because the financial year ends in another four weeks. I am very grateful to the Opposition for the indulgence which they have permitted. I should like to assure the member for St. Joseph that the information which I had promised some time ago would be forthcoming at the discussions on the Estimates.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House must pay very special attention to what the Hon. Minister has said, because he has almost gone on his knees begging. He has moved his pulpit, so to speak, Sir, in an effort to persuade us not to be hard on the Government on this occasion. He has promised us that all the information which will be sought when the Estimates are being discussed will be forthcoming most readily. We believe that we can take the Minister at his word on this occasion. However, there are one or two of these items that must be closely scrutinised.

There can be no doubt that Item 30 -National Insurance - $10,000.00 must be agreed to. However, we find on every occasion when a Resolution of this sort is brought before the House that the Government makes it convenient to bring the Resolution at the very last moment and one never has time to do any sort of research into the matter. This has happened on several occasions since 1966 when I became a member of this House.

Under Item 33 - Communications - $5,000,I am sure that while the Minister has told us he does not have a copy of the agreement between Cable and Wireless and the Government, it would appear to us that the Government is spending more money than it has spent before the agreement was signed. From what we have seen so far, and in the light of the numerous requests for money that has come before this Honourable House resulting from the signing of this agreement, it seems as if Messrs, Cable and Wireless have definitely come out better as a result of the deal. The sooner the Minister can bring the agreement before this Honourable House, the better it will be for all concerned. If we can see the agreement and give it the type of examination it really deserves, it might assist the Minister in the long

run.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, I should just like to explain to the hon. member that of the amount of $5,000, $684.27 is the Cable and Wireless element of it.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr, Speaker, the Minister tells us that of.the amount of $5,000, $684.27 belongs to Cable and Wireless, but he does not tell us what Cable and Wireless has to pay for the licence.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
Mr. Speaker, $15,000.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time.

Mr. HINDS:
Mr. Speaker, it can be seen what is likely to happen and how the rights of the people of this country can be given away. However, we believe that as time goes on, if the Minister keeps his word, we might be able to do justice to the situation.

With regard to Item 37 - Maintenance of Equipment - $12,000, the Minister does not tell us anything about the state of the equipment. He merely says that $12,000 is needed for equipment. I am sure that the Minister knows that we deserve better treatment than this, if he wants us to be kind and charitable in dealing with Resolutions of this sort.

With regard to Item 41 - Maintenance of Buildings, the sum of $1,000.00 is required to maintain buildings until 31st March, 1973 as a result of the increased cost of building materials and paints. That is the point I was trying to make. The increase in the cost of building materials and paints did not come about yesterday or late last night. I am sure the Government had this information in its possession for some time. I believe that the Minister of Communications and Works is the Chairman of the Committee that makes decisions with respect to the sums requested by the various departments of Government and how these sums should be allocated. 5.30 p.m.

I believe that the Minister would be fully charged with the responsibility for knowing all the details incidental to this type of expenditure and the increase as claimed here regarding building materials and paints. At Item 43 the sum of $2,000 is required as a result of the replacement of the breakwater cable and the provision of new main lines. Here again, Mr. Speaker, we are to wonder exactly whose responsibility it really is for the replacement of these breakwater cables and lines. We appreciate the fact that it is the Port we are dealing with, but it would be good if we could be told what has caused the necessity for replacement of the cable. These are not situations which crop up at a flash. Wear and tear must set in from time to time to bring about conditions which would warrant the expenditure of $2,000 between now and the end of the financial year.

We believe that there is little that could be said against the interim payment to the employees of the Port Department. We believe that they are entitled to their interim payments, and we are very sorry

indeed that the whole public service and all Government workers had to suffer to the extent that they have so far in having to wait for Government to deal with it in this cheeseparing manner and be fed with the type of long spoon. You tell them they are going to get the increase and you fix a date so far away that they have to live on in the hope that the day will surely come. However, Sir, we are all agreed that these people must get their pay and retroactive pay from 1st April, 1972 must indeed be forthcoming.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be very long on this. The Hon. Minister said that at the time of the Estimates he will be able to supply us with a report in relation to the agreement between Cable & Wireless and the Government, but the Hon. Minister who brags so much about his legal ability would know fully well that if he gives us that report at the time of the Estimates we will not be able to do any work on it. This report was promised, I believe, nearly three months ago. He said he did not have it with him. I' do not want to condemn him for not having it with him, but at least he should supply us with the report so that we can go into it because it looks rather peculiar that a company like Cable & Wireless which never used to pay certain taxes and rates before and for which the Government got certain privileges, should enter into an agreement in which the Government in my opinion comes out to be the loser. I would like to see this report and study its implications particularly when ever so often you come to the House and ask for additional money to meet your indebtedness to this company. I hope that the Minister will make it possible to give us the report far in advance of the date when we come to debate the Annual Estimates.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is with interest that I note that as soon as we come to discuss the question of the Harbour, the members for St. Lucy and St. Michael West left the Chamber. That is only by the way. However, on the question of communications, one of the things that I think the Government must come to grips with sooner or later is the question of its internal and external communications, because week after week we get supplementary estimates for additional sums of money to be paid in respect of communications whether it is for external communications by Cable & Wireless, or in the case of local communications to the Telephone Company. I said in here on a previous occasion that the time is approaching when the Government must seriously take a look at owning the entire communications system in Barbados, because I do not think that the people of this country can go on paying increased rates whether for the Port Department or any other Department of Government to a foreign company. The time has come when the Government must seriously look at owning all communications local and external. The time is now that it must acquire controlling interest if not outright interest in the communications network in Barbados.

We have been hearing from time to time much talk about the operation of the Port. We have been told from time to time that it is going to be nationalised, and that legislation will be brought down where the Port would be considered an essential service and therefore the employees would not be able to go on strike. All we have been hearing is fair promises and seeing no actual results. One of the things that was mentioned quite recently is the question of pilfering etc. at the Port. I have urged upon the Government before to investigate the possibility of establishing a special Port Department Police who would be given sole responsibility for the security not only at the Bridgetown Harbour but also at all other ports of entry in Barbados. I again would like to suggest and urge upon Government to investigate this possibility, because of the amount of pilfering that goes on not only at the Deep Water Harbour but also at Seawell Airport. I think the Minister has had on recent occasions to go into print on this question when a

statement was made by the President of the Manufacturer's Association in Jamaica on the question of how much money was being lost in pilfering in the ports, and I seriously urge the Minister to investigate this matter and to make recommendations to the House as soon as possible concerning this matter, and we look forward to hearing when the Government is going to nationalise the Port.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, before the Hon. Minister replies as I think he is very anxious to do, I should like to make a few points which I hope will contribute to the debate on this matter, and I hope they will be points of substance. The first point I take is a follow through from what the hon. member for Bridgetown has said. I think we must make up our minds in this country as to what we are going to do with an essential service such as the Port is. The time has long since passed when we must move on from the arrangements which were made at the time of the opening of the Deep Water Harbour when we were then finding our way and rather tentative in the attitudes which we were going to take. I believe that this House should be treated with some amount of respect and confidence and certainly one should like to see the Government taking the Opposition into its confidence on matters of such national importance as our main Port. 5.40 p.m.

There has been a report made to the Government by consultants from Canada and elsewhere, and up to this time I believe we have not officially seen or been apprised of the contents of that document. I do not know how long it will take the Ministry and the Cabinet to read that document, but I believe that there are other people in this country who have seen the document, had a chance of looking at it unofficially with the consent probably of the Government, but members of Parliament like myself who should have a responsibility to the country do not even know what is contained in that document. As for the Leader of the Opposition, his chances of seeing that document are minimal, because people in this country persist in believing that there cannot be consultation without any political rivalry on such important matters. I would plead very strongly with the Government as I have pleaded in many areas not to shut out consultation with the other side on matters of this nature. Obviously a governing party must govern, we are not denying that, but part of the science of government is consultation, and certainly in the area of the Port there should be consultation. We feel on our side regardless of whether we have the full facts or not that the situation has arrived where perhaps it is no longer necessary to have a halfway house at the port, or if there is to be participation by the private sector, then it must be on a wider scale than it has been. It is not good enough to restrict the ownership of shares at the Port only to a few people and a few firms in this country without involving the mass of the country in total ownership of it.

That is a point that we feel very strongly on, regardless of whether the Government does it in this five-year period or not and take the credit for it at the next election. We do not mind, once it is done because it is a point on which we feel very strongly, and once it is going to contribute to the future of Barbados we would like to see this done.

It is in the same way that we speak under the Item - Communications. As the hon. member for St. Peter has said, from time to time almost every time we come in here on supplementary estimates we are finding a vote for the increased costs of cables and telegrams and to Cable and Wireless. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the fees and the monies that we are getting by way of taxation on the profits of Cable and Wireless and of the Telephone Company will pay for the cost of public telephones so that this House will have a balancing out in the account at the end of the year. Certainly this House has not yet seen that agreement, and I doubt whether we get back enough from this operation. I should like the

Minister when he is making further negotiations on this point to make sure that the cost of public communications, external communications, will be recouped by the licence fees when he is revising the agreement, if it is not so at present, which he gets from Cable and Wireless. I should like to draw to the Government's attention that the principal - and I believe the only -shareholder in Cable and Wireless is the British Government. How long are we going after independence to have the British Government run our external communications? This is not good enough; certainly I do not understand any talk in relation to Cable and Wireless about 51%. I understand the talk in relation to Cable and Wireless and other forms of communication in this country- owning its own means of communication, and I will tell the Minister that any proper accounting or economic study will show that the income to be generated in external and internal communications which we pay back to them in going outside the country is sufficient to pay over ten years for the cost of compulsory acquisition.

The Opposition cannot introduce any motion in this Parliament for compulsory acquiring these means at all. It is not within our portfolio to bring anything that is a charge on the revenue of this country, so we are urging the Government to look at it. We are quite sure that if you study the profits of Cable and Wireless which are siphoned off in England and the amount that we are paying them every week to pay for overseas telecommunications, you will find that within that company itself there are sufficient assets to pay for the compulsory acquisition of it, and that we can join together with other Caribbean countries in having a proper umbrella for telecommunications with this area. We are saying this without any fear, the country must recognise that this is a step which must be taken in some respect, not in the total economy perhaps, because I believe the Prime Minister is a believer in a mixed economy, and I believe he justifies this on grounds that we are not generating enough capital formation here ourselves and that we rely on foreign capital, but certainly in these vital areas we must educate our people to own the public utilities as much as possible, wherever possible, and I do not like having to vote every week for money to pay Cable and Wireless when I believe we can effect a saving ourselves if we were running it ourselves and were the full owners of the Company.

We will have to vote for this Resolution, there is no doubt about it, we are going to give the Government as much assistance in pushing it through as possible, but we hope the Government will see how cooperative the Opposition is and how much a part of the Government they are in governing the country in this respect, and we hope they will remember it because sometimes we are made to feel as though we are outcasts. We are graciously going to consent to this so that you can pay the interim pay, pay Cable and Wireless, pay for the maintenance of buildings and everything, but we want you to remember that we do not want to hear a year from now that we are still to see the agreement and that no positive, action is being taken on these points.

Hop. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am very grateful to the Opposition, but I am always amazed at these ad hoc socialists. The member for St. Michael West said that Barbados is a crisis society. When the telephone rates go up they want that taken over, when something else happens and there is a vote for Cable and Wireless they want that taken over, and in their own Manifesto which they went to the people with in 1971 not one word of taking over the Harbour, not one word of taking over Cable and Wireless, not one word of the public owning the public utilities was mentioned, but as things crop up now they are trying to convince people that they have an ounce of socialism in their bodies. As a matter of fact, it is even amazing to find that the Opposition want bi-partisan approach to matters like the Deep Water Harbour and the Port, when on page 16 on their Manifesto it is stated that the Barbados Labour Party is proud

that, in spite of the opposition of the present Prime Minister, it built the Deep Water Harbour, the greatest project ever undertaken in the Island. When they built the Harbour they did not have any bi-partisan action with any Opposition, and as for the member for St. Peter suggesting that we are frittering away the profits of the people for Cable and Wireless, up to 1967 when the Minister of Finance imposed taxes under the Act of your Government, Cable and Wireless could have acquired land compulsorily under the 1939 Act, they were exempt from taxes local and parochial,.....

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of explanation, I think the Hon. Minister must not mislead the House, the Act was dated 1921 and predated our Government.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Not the Act before me, unless I cannot read. This is the Cable and Wireless (West Indies) Limited Act, 1939-4. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that they were in power up to 1961 and until 1967 the 1939 Act was in power. Section 5 subsection (3) of that Act states that the Company shall be exempt from all taxation parochial or governmental, and the next section gives power to the Company to hold land and to compulsory purchase.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. member was one of the stalwarts in the Barbados Labour Party during the relevant period and had all the time to point that out to the people.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I left in 1954, so you had from 1954 to do something about it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Will the hon. member take his seat, no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I was never in the House with the Labour Party.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Let the Hon. Minister continue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Continuing, Sir, under section 5, all cables, wires, instruments and apparatus and all materials imported for the construction or working of the telegraphs or for use in the office or offices of the Company, or for the erection or repair of necessary buildings or structures of the Company shall be exempt from import duties. 5.50 p.m.

How can they come now and give the public the wrong impression? All of their vehicles were free from tax; they did not have to pay a penny for all of the cars and other vehicles they had. The Minister of Finance is the first person to amend and repeal all of these Sections which gave to Cable & Wireless

the privileges they enjoyed. Do not come in here and pretend that you have now gone extremely left! Let us get our facts straight.

I have told the Opposition in this House, and the Prime Minister has supported it, that we are now in the process of negotiating 51% of shares in Cable & Wireless in the same way as Jamaica, Trinidad, and Guyana have done. (Mr. MOTTLEY: "After I said so.") After you said what! It is just like someone talking of separating husband and wife, in three weeks it happens, and one takes credit for it. Do you think a Minister of Finance could suddenly agree to that and work out the permutations because you got a wire of what was happening? As a matter of fact, Cable & Wireless made the offer to Government months before the hon. member knew about it. This very year the Government is going to open discussions with Cable & Wireless to acquire the 51% of shares. Guyana had Independence before us - it is a co-operative Republic, a Socialist Government - and it has not taken over Cable & Wireless yet. Jamaica did it last year; Trinidad took over Textel last year, and it does not mean that Barbados is far behind. They had Independence in 1962, and Barbados had it in 1966. Guyana has not yet taken over Cable & Wireless, and we might do it before Guyana.

This idea of fooling people about taking over Cable & Wireless lock, stock and barrel is a joke. Where is the Barbadian expertise to do it? Where is the Barbadian know-how at this present moment? Cable & Wireless have always been a company and they have been running international communications for hundreds of ears. If you can go into partnership with them in the initial stages, you are likely to get a better and a more expertise operation. The Opposition would be the first to come in here and say that we are throwing away money as we have done in C.B.C. and in the B.M.C. Because the Government wants to take a controlling interest, they will go around the country trying to fool people that the Government is throwing away money. Is that what they want to see?

Mr. Speaker, the Government is obviously going to use the expertise of a company that has an international reputation for running external communications and taking a controlling interest. We are not going to rush in for any 100% because it sounds good to some people and they might think that you are talking sense. You are not talking sense; you are fooling people. Similarly, with the Telephone Company, nowhere in their manifesto is there any suggestion - even though we had a rate case before the 1971 Elections - that if they had won the elections they would have taken over the Telephone Company.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would ask the Hon. Minister not to stray so far from the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the telephones. There is an element dealing with the telephones because the cost has gone up from the 1st January. In deference to you, Sir, I will get on with the matter. I do not like this pseudo-socialism thrown out, because it has a political content, to fool people in this country. As I said a few nights ago on the Radio, we want a new breed of politicians who are going to tell the people of this country the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God, rather than, for political advantage, running around the country fooling the people on a lot of subjects.

Now, to deal with what the hon. member for St. Peter said about the Maintenance of Equipment - $12,000, I wish to point out that the amount has nothing to do with equipment. This is the $12,000 that

was put in the Estimates for keeping the equipment. We are not buying any equipment; we are not servicing any equipment. This money was paid out for bills for the year before, and we have to recoup it. It is not for the purchase of any equipment that could have been foreseen. We are adding in $12,000 to meet a debt. The money would have been enough, if we did not have to meet debts for the last financial year.

With regard to Item 43 - Electrical Installations - we had to replace the breakwater cables. You cannot predict when a breakwater cable is going. You cannot predict when a house is going to be burnt down because of a short circuit. How can somebody tell you that the breakwater cable will be going tomorrow and you should insert money in the Estimates to get another one? When the Police tells a man that his house was burnt down because of a short circuit, does the man know about the short circuit? When you are dealing with things like electricity and and telephones, they are subject to immediate accidents, an involvement which no human mind can predict. We had to replace the cable and make new lines. These things were difficult to foresee, and the provision is necessary to cover them.

The hon. member dealt with the Maintenance of Buildings. I have been the Chairman of the Estimates Committee. Now he is going to castigate me, because in April last year I was not in a position to forecast that paints and materials would go up in December. I am no magician. That is the whole purpose of supplementary estimates.

Supplementary Estimates are based on the fact that throughout the financial year either costs go up, which could not have been foreseen, or materials go up, and therefore to accuse me of dealing with Estimates in December year before and being unable to forecast materials to the tune of $1,000 cannot be termed a miscalculation. It has to be almost accurate if you only need $1,000. That is certainly not a correct assessment of the position. Materials go up every day; the prices of food go up every day, so how can you predict what will be the cost of things from time to time?

Mr. Speaker, I would not have spoken like this if they did not try to bring in psuedo-socialism across the Table. Of course, they are really playing to the Gallery.

Mr. SPEAKER:
Please stick to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
On the question of the nationalisation of the Harbour, the Government has said that, as a matter of policy, it is prepared to take over the Harbour. A Committee is working on the mechanism of it, but you cannot take it over overnight. There are economic considerations which have to be dealt with, and you have to decide on the best method of operating it. The Government has already committed itself to this, but it cannot be done overnight. I think the hon. member for Christ Church West would know that. The Committee is sitting to work out the final implications of the legislation which is to come before the House.

Mr. Speaker, we can talk of taking over a number of things. There are in this country a lot of things that sound nice to human ears. The money that this Government has can be used for a million-and-one priorities at this stage other than taking over the Telephone Company. As a socialist, I must have a sense of priority. As a Government, we must have a sense of priority. While it might sound good to take up

$15 million or $27 million to pay the Telephone Company, what about housing, improvement of roads, improvement of lights, improvement in water, hot meals for school children and so on? With a limited financial commitment and a limited financial position, where would your priorities be as a socialist? Would you pay $27 million for the Telephone Company, or would you try and build houses? There are principles involved. While we are thinking about socialism, a Socialist Government, within the context of its economic position, must have a clear sense of its priorities.

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. 6 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:
Mr. Speaker, there is another Resolution for the sum of $36,000 which has just been circulated, I admit, but of which notice was given earlier today, and at that time I was not aware of the fact that we wanted to deal with it in all its stages. I think after consultation, hon. members will agree that it is urgent in that it deals with the purchase of a Radiotherapy Unit and the continuing of the cemetery and crematorium. I am therefore asking for leave to deal with it today.

Mr. MOTTLEY:
We on this side of the House do not object to dealing with this provided the Minister can give us a full statement on Item 18 - National Cemetery and Crematorium.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
I should like to point out to the hon. member that I am not in a position to give any full statement on the National Crematorium. However I am prepared to do that at a later date and I hope that my inability to give a full statement at this stage would not preclude discussion on this Resolution now.

Mr. SPEAKER:
The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages, and if there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE 1972-73 No. 31

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
Mr. Speaker, the need for the Resolution is set out in the Addendum and I do not want to prolong the sitting of the House any longer by going into any long deliberations on this.

I should like to draw hon. member's attention to the Addendum where it is pointed out that in relation to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that the initial cost set out for the development of the Radiotherapy Unit is now insufficient, and we have to increase it by $36,000, and hence we have to come to the House to get the Resolution passed for the $36,000.

In the case of the National Cemetery and Crematorium, again we find it is necessary to supplement

this item.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS:
On a point of order, do financial Resolutions not have to go to Committee of Supply? Does not the House have to go into Committee of Supply to move that Items 1 and 18 stand part and then the Resolution be moved for second and third reading? Was the Port Department Resolution discussed in the House? My impression is that the Port Department has to go to the Committee. That has been passed. I know it is always done in Committee. Nonetheless, capital and current accounts are convenient ways of the Estimates Committee doing its business, but a vote of sums from the Consolidated Fund has to be dealt with in Committee of Supply.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
I should like to thank the Hon. Leader of the Opposition for his observation.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

Head 103 - Health and Welfare - was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS:
Mr. Chairman, I want to know when the Canadian dollar was revalued. I am not aware that the value of the Canadian dollar and the value of the Eastern Caribbean dollar have varied inter se by more than a few cents for some years now. That is only a minor point. I would like to know what civil servant can tell us that on such and such a date the Canadian dollar was revalued vis-a-vis our dollar, and this is a fundamental point, because the reason for coming for this money is stated to be a revaluation of the Canadian dollar. The file must have in the cost in E.C. dollars when the original estimate was arrived at and the estimated cost when the vote has to be paid. It is not a small point. I believe I have heard

discussion in Committee before now on this radiotherapy unit, and I believe this was revoted into the current estimates that are now themselves expiring.

Sir, I would really ask the Minister to give us the quoted cost originally and tell us when the Canadian dollar was revalued. I can always remember now for years the Canadian dollar standing between $1.97 and $1.99 purchasing and $2.01 to $2.03 selling. I think there may have been a time when it went up a little bit some time ago, but it has gone back down now, and if it is paid for now it is at the standard rate. There was a time when there was a little fluctuation, about a month ago, when the American dollar passed the Canadian dollar and the Canadian dollar went up a little bit. Civil Servants who do not understand the national exchange and the money market must not put in anything about needing a supplementary estimate of $36,000 on a vote of $230,000, in other words, something like 15% when the Canadian dollar has not risen vis-a-vis the E.C. dollar by 15% perhaps ever in its history. The Minister must tell us when the original quotation was made and what has happened because there can not be in my submission any increase such as thi based upon revaluation.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I should like to ell the hon. member that the original cost was $230,000 which included the cost of acquisition of the Cobalt unit and the construction of the building. Reading from my file for the benefit of the hon. member, this goes back to 31st December, 1971, which is pretty far back.

Mr. ADAMS:

Is the Minister saying that since 31st December, 1971, the Canadian dollar has risen 15% ?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I am not saying that by any chance. I am just seeking to give you the information you required, and that is, that the original estimate was $230,000 and that was in 1971.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, let us get down to some business. The Addendum says that as a result of the revaluation of the Canadian dollar, the cost of the unit plus the specially designed door is now E.C.$193,000. It does not say what it was before. The sum of $36,000 which is the supplement sought, is more than 15% of $193,000; so I want to know when the Canadian dollar rose 15% because the Addendum says it is as a result of revaluation of the Canadian dollar. 6.10 p.m.

The Addendum says that it is as a result of the revaluation of the Canadian dollar, so how can you supplement $193,000 by $36,000 when the Canadian dollar has not risen, certainly since the date given, 31st December, 1971? The Minister should be master of his brief, he has been Minister long enough and he should read every note in it. I will have to call on the hon. member for St. Michael South West to say what really happened.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I think there is an error in the Addendum to the Resolution. I think it should have read the devaluation of the Eastern Caribbean dollar in relation to the Canadian dollar, because in June 1972 there was an effective devaluation of the pound when it was put to float, and as a result the Eastern Caribbean dollar which is tied to the pound also went down in value.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the Minister must not mislead the House, the dollars were devalued. Everybody remembers that in the middle of last year the American dollar was only worth $1.80, and when the pound floated it went back to the old $2.00. It had gone down, and at the time at which he is talking, it went back to the parity to which we have been accustomed for the past five years now.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, that is not absolutely correct. The fact is that in August 1971 the dollar was put to float and in December 1971 it was devalued. Then came this upset at that time and the parity.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, the hon. member is misleading the House.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am not misleading the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADAMS:

It is the American dollar that was devalued, not the Canadian dollar.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

That is what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the American dollar was devalued in December, 1971.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to bring it to the notice of the Minister that the Addendum states that it was the Canadian dollar which was revalued.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I am well aware of this, Mr. Chairman, but I am making a point here. There was this devaluation of the American dollar in December 1971 which then upset the parities between the pound and the dollar. The pound was put under fresh pressure, and in June 1972 the pound was put to float and there was again another devaluation of the pound bringing with it a concomitant devaluation of the Eastern Caribbean dollar in relation to the other currencies which were not devalued. Therefore, in relation to the Canadian dollar, that was not devalued. This is actually what has happened. What happened then is that this imbalance, if you may so call it, between the parities has not yet been re-established, so it means now that since June last year we have to pay more for things we buy in Canada than we had paid before June of last year, because that differential has not yet been made good. As a matter of fact, I think it is worse now than it was in June last year because the pound is floating and unfortunately it is not floating upward. The fact is that in June last year we did not have to make this payment, but now that we have to make this payment we have to make good that difference.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I would like to point out that when the sum of $230,000 was estimated in 1971 it was intended for the purpose of purchasing a Cobalt Unit and building a building to house the Cobalt Unit. Roughly it was estimated that out of that sum of $230,000 about $193,000 would be for the purchasing of the unit. Further, during the course of this financial year $61,649 was spent on the construction of the special building for the Cobalt unit, and since the arrival of this unit payments amounting to $157,000 have

been made. There is still some money remaining due to contractors, and also a sum of money of about $36,000 due to the Central Purchasing Department for the final payment on the unit. Putting all this together, we find that we need roughly $36,000, or to be exact $25,739.09, to complete commitments under this Item. I hope that will satisfy the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS:

If you please, Sir, I listened with great interest to the false economic analysis of the hon. member for St. Michael North West. I do not have to dwell upon its falsity since I can deal with it upon the basis of its irrelevance, since this money has been voted for several years now and the movement of the Canadian dollar during last year is of no relevance at all. This amount has been estimated for I believe, since 1969 and has been in the Estimates for several years. (Asides). Do not deny it, in the Estimates for 1972-73 it is already set out as a revote. Also, the hon. member is flying against common sense if he asks hon. members in here to believe that for the few weeks in 1972 - that is the only time for several years that the Canadian dollar has been other than between 1.97 and 2.01 - the few weeks of last year is the only time it fell to 1.90, and the hon. member is flying in the face of common sense as well as in the printed Estimates and asking anybody in here to believe that the re-valuation on the Canadian dollar could have made a difference in this, that it was ordered and estimated for in those few days when the Canadian dollar was $1.90. It has been at $2.00 I suppose for five years now since the devaluation of 1967 with only occasional movements.

The true answer is that it is not the devaluation that is causing the supplement here, the true answer is that it is the building costs, the installation costs and general rises in the ancillary aspects of the Resolution, namely the difference between the $193,000 and the original $275,000. It started at $275,000, $45,000 was spent in the last financial year, they have now exhausted the remaining $230,000 and they need another $36,000, but some civil servant has thought it right to put down that it is due to the revaluation of the Canadian dollar. I would guarantee that at the time when this Cobalt Unit was ordered there was no more than a difference of 2% or 3% in the value of the Canadian dollar, but the real increase is due to installation costs, and I know the hon. member for St. Michael South Central agrees with me, otherwise he would have got up by now to contradict me. I am sure of that.

We want the hospital to have a Cobalt Unit, we have often spoken in here on this, but we also want the hospital to have a Permanent Secretary who draws proper Addenda and a Minister who understands his brief and who can deal with saving the people's money in these small respects. The Minister is not only a Minister, he is a technical expert too, according to his acolytes, and I am prepared to give him that as well. Certainly I cannot accuse him of being a friend of the doctors at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I can accuse him of having a certain expertise, and he should know this.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with Item 18 - National Cemetery and Crematorium. Here again the Addendum as set out leaves quite a lot to be desired. The Minister says he does not want to say very much about the crematorium at this stage, but I believe I pass there every day in the week, and I am particularly disturbed about what is going at the crematorium. 6.20 p.m.

In the first place, the Addendum does not tell us anything about landscaping. It cannot come after, and that is a point which I want to draw the Government's attention to at the moment. Wherever there is a Crematorium, the landscaping must be done before you start putting the remains of human bodies in that

area. I want the Minister of Communications and Works to understand that. Anybody who has travelled around the world and has seen crematoriums will know that once you start operating in the area you cannot go back and do landscaping to add to its aesthetic value. I should like to know something about this matter.

I now want to talk about the roads. It seems to me that there is one policy for the Government and another policy for Governmental agencies or bodies. I remember dealing with one or two developments in which the Town Planners turned down the plans because they said that the methods of town planning avoid, as far as possible, cross roads. Quite recently the Town Planning Department seem to have shifted their attitude on this matter where the Government is concerned. Go up by the Courtesy and the same Cable & Wireless and see the position. The Town Planners have effectively put a cross road up there. Go to the National Crematorium now and you will see that the Town Planners have, again, created a cross road at Warrens Corner.

Mr. Chairman, you only have to imagine the funeral of somebody in the middle -class society on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon. If you are travelling from the Jackson area or travelling from Warrens to Bridgetown, then the traffic will be at a standstill. To begin with, the road is not wide enough to permit traffic lights. Here is a vast area acquired by the Government and the road leading from the cemetery is plumb in line with the road leading from Warrens. I cannot understand what the Town Planning Department are doing. In one week there is a decision, and in another week there is another decision. I see nothing about the guard walk to separate the cemetery from the main highway. I am wondering if they are going to fall into the same trap as they have fallen into at the Community College. The Town Planning Department said that all high walls should be removed. The Prime Minister came into this House and said that he does not want to see any more high walls. The wall at the Community College fell down, and it was built back to the same height. If it were anybody else's building that could not be done.

Mr. Chairman, I can give you an instance of a house in Black Rock. The operator of that building knocked down the wall with a motor car and he was not allowed to rebuild it to the same height. However, the Community College wall was rebuilt to the same height.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I should like to draw to the hon. member's attention that we are now discussing the Crematorium, and absolutely nothing about walls in Black Rock or walls in Two Mile Hill. Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to your Ruling if you will look at the Resolution you will see that it deals with major road works and pathways, drainage and the laying out of burial plots. If I made a comment on what is involved in the cemetery and on Government's policy, I would say that I am entitled to draw references in relation to the behaviour of the Town Planning authority in relation to the cemetery, its roads, its cross roads and so on.

Mr. Chairman, we are all talking about money in these days. Would you imagine in this day and age the Government is proceeding to build -. I do not know if it is the chapel or the office block, but they are using big two-foot block stones. Now, concrete blocks can give as beautiful a finish and as strong a wall

as the two - foot block, I think it will be one-third the cost of the two-foot block wall. The Minister of Communications and Works gets up in this House time and time again and talks about a Colonial mentality, but as Minister in charge of the building on that site there is a Colonial mentality up there where the people are building with two-foot blocks, because it is said that Government buildings were made from two-foot block stones.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to hear something about these matters. We have spent $100,000 already; another $100,000 is required, admittedly, to put away the dead, and I do not want to hear of another supplemental Resolution for another $100,000 to do things which should not have been done. I should like the Minister to tell me why we are creating more cross roads. What is going to happen in respect of traffic in the area? What provision has been made for landscaping the area? These are things that we should know. The Addendum does not tell us anything, and we do not know what is going on. All we are doing is to vote money although it appears to be going down the drain.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:
The question is that....

Mr. MOTTLEY:
Mr. Chairman, Item 18 states that owing to the urgent need for additional burial space in St. Michael, work on new Cemetery facilities at Lodge Hill had to be rephased to include, inter alia, a chapel, office block, major road works and pathways, drainage and the laying out of burial plots. If this has to be rephased, I should like to know from the Minister what was the original first phase. You now need an additional $100,000 to build a chapel, office block, major road works and pathways, and so on. I should also like to find out what is the contract price for the entire building.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
There was no contract price. The work was done by the Ministry of Communications and Works. 6.30 p.m.

I would like to say something to him on that aspect of it, and it is that it is better to have started at the right and drifted to the left than to have started on the left and drifted over to the right. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: You read that in a magazine.) When I read it I thought immediately about the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Anyhow, Sir, what I would like to know is the estimated cost of the crematorium, and how much money has been spent so far and what work has been done.

Mr. BOLDEN:
Mr. Chairman, before the Hon. Minister replies, there is one point I should like to query. Why is it that the furnace has been put near the road and the Church at the back? (Asides) What is the building nearest the road and what is the building at the back?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:
I should imagine that if this is so, the furnace near the road is to warn passers-by of the dangers of Hades if they do not do good.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:
Mr. Chairman, in reply to hon. members, I should like to point out especially to the hon. member for

St. Joseph that some of the questions which he has raised were also raised at Cabinet. We were concerned about having the buildings so close to the road because of the problem of parking and traffic on the road. Obviously we are concerned about the way in which the Town Planning Office is functioning. I do not want him to feel that we do not share his concern, but the situation is that some of these things have already been started. The building of the cemetery and crematorium had been put in three phases and we thought we would have been able to do it that way, but it has been pointed out recently that there is very little land space left at Westbury, and therefore we have to start doing a lot more than we had intended to do in the first phase. The first phase was concerned with the construction of the chapel and the office blocks. In addition to that we also have to make provision for land for burying people. (A VOICE) There are no burners because the crematorium is supposed to be one of the late phases and that should be in the back. (A VOICE) Let me say what I am saying. We find that apart from having to put up the office block and the chapel we are being pressed to lay out lots for burial; so this calls for increased expenditure which was not intended to be in the first phase. In addition to that we also have to provide parking space because if you are going to have lots up there and people are going to bring their dead to be buried there, then you have to provide parking space whereby the cars would not be permitted to remain on the highway and add to the congestion of traffic there.

Due to the fact that land at Westbury Cemetery is rapidly being exhausted, we have had to do a lot of at the National Cemetery and Crematorium in that area. As you know a lot of increases have occurred in the last year in respect of wages and material, and also due to the fact that we are rephasing, we find that we will either have to stop work on the cemetery now and lay off a substantial amount of the workers, or if we are not to do that, this supplementary becomes necessary to allow us to continue the work at the same pace right to the end of the financial year. I should like to assure hon. members on the other side that I will bring a statement for their benefit on the National Cemetery and Crematorium not later than when we are doing the Estimates.

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

On the motion of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUS SON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, the Resolution was 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, 6th March, 1973, at 12. o'clock noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 6.40 p.m.