

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, 5th March, 1974

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. C E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport).

Prayers were read.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

STATEMENTS AND ACCOUNTS FROM THE ACCOUNTANT GENERAL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Statements and Accounts for the month of September, 1972 have been received from the Accountant General and will be circulated in due course to Members.

MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Minutes of the House for the 12th and 19th February, 1974 respectively are before you for confirmation. There being no objection, these Minutes are hereby duly confirmed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to give Government Notices and lay the documents at a later stage of today's Sitting.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted.

Mr. J. B. SPRINGER entered the Chamber and took his seat.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 NO. 38

The Resolution for the sum of \$36, 800 was called.

Head 3 — Parliament — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this Resolution speaks for itself. It affects each and every Member of this Parliament and Committee. It deals with Refreshments, Office Expenses and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for which funds are needed in order to pay for the over the last few months. If there are any questions which are material or relevant, I will try to answer them.

I beg to move that Head 3 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address my attention to all three of the Items under Head 3. First of all, Refreshments for Members of the House. \$9, 000 in the Estimates month to supplement a vote of \$18, 000 is very substantial indeed and I would ask the Leader of the House to set out the details as to how this came about.

There is a vote for 50 persons to be fed on every occasion the House meets, but the House has not met as much during this financial year as has been the case in the former financial years. The House normally meets every week, and for the last twelve months it has been meeting at intervals of two weeks or less and on very few occasions we reached dinner time, but there are wider areas which arise. It is a pity that from time to time we in this House have to deal with such mundane matters as the feeding of Members and talk of a lot of small things, but it does affect all of us who eat in the dining room.

First I want to deal with the matter of what time the meals are served. There are certain Members of this House who have bad stomachs and who cannot wait until 2, 00 o'clock for lunch. I have had the experience where my wife joined me for lunch in the dining room, with the permission of the Speaker, the Prime Minister was also present at that time, and we were told that Mr. Speaker said that nobody was to eat before he came out of the House. The Prime Minister perhaps more placid on that day than I was, went away without eating and I had to go and take up two plates of food in order that my wife and myself could have lunch. I know that some hon. Members, including the Member for St. Michael West and the Member for the City, have bad stomachs, which do not permit them to eat at that time, and indeed some Members have been advised by their doctors to eat at set times.

It has never happened before, as far as I know, that any rule has been in force that no Member can eat until the Speaker has eaten, and it is detrimental to the service in there to have all the Members coming out at the same time, because it is obviously easier for the waiters to spread a meal over a period of three quarters of an hour than to have to serve all the Members at the same time. Many of the complaints which have been received recently about bad service in the dining room result directly from the fact that all the Members are now enforced to constrain themselves to eat on the dot of the suspension or adjournment of the House. I think it is foolish and should be stopped.

There is another matter, Mr. Chairman. There should be a refrigerator and some sort of adequate heating apparatus in the lunch room. Many complaints have been made that there are no facilities to keep the drinks cold or the food hot. There is yet another complaint which has now been visited upon the caterers. I understand that they pay \$7.50 for the provision of a dinner and \$5 or \$6 for a lunch. I venture to suggest that you will go to the Pelican Restaurant and search in vain for any dinner menu which costs \$7. 12.15 p.m.

It is sometimes embarrassing. I have the best possible relations with all the persons concerned in the catering scheme; yet I suggest that the House of Assembly is not getting the best service in the circumstances, and it ought to be possible to provide better food, and a more varied diet, for honourable Members. I do not know what the Minister of Health can tell us, but his advice should be sought by the caterers regarding the diet provided for honourable Members.

I am sorry that Members of my Party are not here to make comments on this. I understand that the honourable Member for St. Joseph has had a situation of going to the dining room and asking for a drink, but that some postman went behind the bar and got a drink. I am sorry that the Member is not here, and I hope that I am relating the situation correctly. I have heard nowadays more about inconvenience of service to honourable Members than I have heard during all the rest of my time in Parliament put together.

I now want to deal with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I do not think it would be correct for me to have much say on that; but the point is that while we on this side do not approve of Item 20, Refreshments, we are placed in somewhat of a quandary because we approve the Supplementary under Item 31, Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

I am going to take the Government and the Cabinet to task and say that it shows a lack of imagination in not accepting proposals put up by the CPA for Barbados as the site for a regional CPA conference in 1974.

Barbados is the great tourist centre of the Eastern Caribbean, and we should have welcomed the opportunity, even at some cost to ourselves, of bringing hundreds of persons here in view of the benefit which Barbados would have gained from hosting a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference occasionally.

I think that it is the duty of all of us when we see out West Indian brothers going astray to help them. Even though the Deputy Prime Minister may have a different attitude towards Grenada than his leader, most of us will agree that Grenada is not at the moment the best advertisement for tourism and that it would be a good thing if we could bring Members of the Gairy Government here to see Parliament at work and to see that we have no need to get arms from Czechoslovakia.

The fact that Barbados has allowed by default possibilities of such conferences being held here is a disgrace, and the Government should be ashamed that it is prepared to supplement the vote for catering by \$9, 000, and the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association by \$3, 800. It shows a lack of priorities in dealing with these matters.

The expenditure of \$9, 000 is extremely little to pay for what Barbados gets out of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, taking into account what Members of this Place and the Other Place of what were formerly called the British Empire gained by exchanging experiences which we share in common.

We support that Supplementary. I do not know what will be in the Estimates, but we will be perfectly prepared to support a handsome and adequate grant for the CPA now that one or two little matters have been cleared up, including the question of political partisanship.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with some of the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition; but I would like to remind the honourable Member that he is a Member of the Standing Orders Committee which is at present sitting, and one of the matters being considered by the Committee is allowing more time and a revised luncheon period, and the time at which the House should sit.

It has been suggested that the House sit at 10.30 a.m. instead of 12 noon and that the luncheon period should be revised accordingly — 1 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock and that the appropriate luncheon time should be, say, an hour and a half to allow Members, generally speaking, to have an opportunity of having their lunch here or elsewhere.

The fact is, Sir, that heretofore the House has been sitting at 12 o'clock mainly, to some extent, to accommodate practising barristers, and this has come down from the old days when Members of the House were not being adequately compensated for their services as such. That was so because from time immemorial barristers have been Members of Parliament.

Under the new dispensation, when the House will be sitting at 10.30 a.m., if that is agreed to, you could have an appropriate time for lunch, and the House could have time to do its business properly. I think that the suggestion to sit at 10.30 a.m. came from one of the deputy leaders of the Opposition.

As far as the question of the catering contract is concerned, the question of providing a stove and refrigerator, these points have already been taken care of in the Estimates.

As far as the CPA goes and the holding of regional conferences, the honourable Member himself has made out over the last year or two that the Treasury is short of money. Now he seems to be running in another direction. He now seems to think that a half million dollars should be spent on a Regional Conference of the CPA here. At one time we have no money, and now we have money to spend recklessly.

We do not need to have any regional CPA conference here. That entails a great deal of expenditure. How can we, with an empty Treasury....

Mr. ADAMS:

Will the Hon. Minister tell us when there was last a regional CPA Conference held in Barbados? Not since I was a Member of the House. It is Barbados' turn now.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, on this question of Item 20, Refreshments, I hold a completely different view from the Leader of the Opposition. 12.25 p.m.

I feel it is a positive waste of public money to ask the Legislature from year to year to vote money out of the public Treasury for refreshments for Members of the House of Assembly and the Other Place. I would say it is a public disgrace. If Members of the House of Assembly are in such impecunious circumstances that they cannot pay for lunch once a week when they come to the House of Assembly they should not be Members. After all they only have to come to the House of Assembly one day a week, and the \$18, 000 that the Treasury is asked to pay for this, is a positive waste of money. As I see it, this money should go to some charitable organisation.

The Ministers are paid, and the Members of the House of Assembly are paid and I do not see why they cannot pay for lunch for themselves. There are these facilities in other Chambers but I do not see why it should be free in here. I was in this Chamber from the time when Members were not paid, and from the time Members were paid, I was opposed to the principle of paying Members and then providing them

with refreshments. If there is anything about the servants of the House, feeding them should not be a condition of their coming to work, and the House of Assembly is not to accommodate caterers no matter who is the caterer. The House of Assembly should accommodate commonsense.

I do not see how any Member of the House of Assembly has any justification in 1974 to say that there is any justification for providing them with three meals a day. I think the time has come when it should be eliminated and a decent catering service placed at your disposal, and if you want to buy lunch, go ahead. If the Government's employees or the number of employees in Barbados start asking for this service I believe I would hear a lot of the people who are enjoying this service protesting most vociferously about what the people are asking for, and I do not see how Members of the legislature in a community like this should be receiving this service without paying. We are not residing far from the House of Assembly, we are no distance from where we live and we can get back to our homes in minutes, and I do not see any justification for this. I do not see why it is that we should be paying for this refreshment every year when there are other things which we cannot do, or which we complain that we cannot do. This is not a necessity for people who are in such circumstances that they have accounts in the various banks in this country.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on this Resolution. I am inclined to agree with the honourable Member but I think the public should know the position in here. I want to go on record as saying that in the 23 years since I was first elected to this Chamber — there was a hiatus of 17 or 18 months — that I have never taken part in any debate or discussion relating to emoluments or prerequisites for Members of the House. I want to make that clear because there are too many people in public life today who are prepared to talk about the sleepless nights they spend campaigning, and that people in the Other Place do not have to face the electorate, and how many demands have been made upon their slender resources, and all that kind of thing when there is a salaries review. It has been argued, of course, by the so-called liberals that Members should be paid for representing the people.

Now before Ministerial Government was introduced, I belonged to the Party which was supposed to represent the masses in this country; they went under the general label of labour — they were supposed to be socialists. 12.35 p.m.

As a matter of fact, he went further in telling the Leader of the Conservative Party, indignantly, that he did not come in here on behalf of the working-class people when he entered this House under the sponsorship of the Conservatives of this Island. I was present in this House when that took place. I belonged to that Party, and I have no apologies to make for having belonged to that organisation. I was an infant, because I did not know the meaning of good and evil until I joined that Party. I learnt the difference between good and evil, what is right and- what is not right when I became a member of that Party. Having learnt my lesson, having matured politically, I was able to understand the chicanery of politics and what deceit is all about, and no one can put anything over me. Even at the time when there were signs that some people were not supporting the programmes of labour and were joining other political parties in other parts of the world, I am glad that I was exposed to that experience.

I want to say that at the time the rationale of payment to Members of the House was that the working-class man should be able to dress respectably. Look at us now? In those days the Labour Party would not allow any of us to enter the House without a tie on. The \$100 a month was to buy ties, but we do not use

ties at the moment. When I suggested that we enter the Chamber in 1951 in working-class clothes, all the members of the Executive Committee and the Leader of my Party turned up in "scissors-tailed" coats, cravats, spats and so on.

Now, after the last Election, I set the standard for appearing in here in something more suitable to our climate and not far removed from what the working-class man wants. We do not need "scissors-tailed" coats and so on. We do not need certain things because we do not belong to the Salvation Army. At the time we were being paid \$100 a month to buy clothes made by C. B.

Rice and Company. We were given refreshments. We used to get tea, and the caterer was so impoverished that I refused to go into the Dining-Room and eat off a board table without a saucer. Just imagine legislators being given biscuits and cheese to eat off a board table without even a saucer! I remonstrated and told them that I had not reached the stage where I had to eat off a board table without a cup and saucer. I threatened to write to the Press and tell them how Members of the Legislature were eating like pigs, they still do — some of them — not on this side. (Asides.) The Legislature has two Houses. (Asides.) Whoever the cap fits let him draw the string, but the next time I enter the Dining-Room I will ask them to take their feet out of the trough. I promise to do that today. I will go to them and say: "Please take your feet out of the trough! Please take your feet out of the trough! Please take your feet out of the trough!" (Asides.) I promise hon. Members on the other side that I will identify them today. I will go before their faces and say to them "Take their feet out of the trough!" (Asides.) I will identify them in the Dining-Room. I will go up to them and say "Take your feet out of the trough!"

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There must be some limit for insulting Members in this House! The Member has spoken about persons who have bad table manners. He says that he is going to identify the honourable Members. He says that he will go to them and say "Take your feet out of the trough! Take your feet out of the trough! Take your feet out of the trough!" There are three Members sitting on this side of the House. There is no greater hog than the honourable Member, if that is what he is telling us. What type of debate is the honourable Member setting when he talks about people putting their feet in troughs? I am satisfied that the honourable Member has used insulting language about Members on this side of the House. He is reflecting on our table manners. He has made it clear that he is referring to three Members on this side of the House. I submit that this is offensive language.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I will withdraw that part about table manners, but the general deportment in the Dining-Room is reprehensible and everybody knows it. After the Election in 1966, Members of my Party refused or declined to eat in there because of the company that we would have to sit with and partake of meals. I know that a lot of things were said during the election. I should like to inform the Member for St. Peter that he would be doing the Government a favour if he would move the deletion of the whole vote for the Item — Refreshments.

In 1961-62 approximately \$4, 000 was provided for refreshments. Some time after that the matter was discussed again, in the same terms mentioned by the honourable Member for St. Michael West. When I suggested that honourable Members should pay for their meals, you could only find about three Members in the Dining-Room. 12.45 p.m.

You can hardly find a seat inside the dining-room nowadays, but when we asked Members to pay-for their own meals, the caterer could not cope with the lack of demand, because most of the food went untouched, and the average number of persons who turned up for meals was three out of twenty-four, to the extent that some stupid order — a matter which I promised to raise some time ago — has been issued and I make no apologies for it that the reporters at the Table of the House and the employees of the Legislature could not get their meals until after honourable Members and their friends had eaten. This led us to the position in this year of grace, 1974, that when we had a full lunch period, we then had to give an additional lunch period to the staff of Parliament because of this -instruction. I do not want to qualify it, because I do not want to be offensive. I want to say that only in the most unlightened homes in Barbados, will you find the domestic staff eating after all the members of the household. The way that I was brought up was that the people who prepared for me, were entitled to select theirs first, and then if we felt like eating, it was a matter for us, but there was no question about somebody waiting to see if anything was left over. I would like the Members of this House and the Debates Committee to know that I do not approve of any instruction to the caterer that staff should eat after the Members.

That brings me back to the main point. We have had marathon Sittings in here, and I want the honourable Member for St. Michael West to understand that this is the reason for re-introducing it. We could not get a caterer to supply meals for the Staff of the House because of the low volume, and therefore the vote was re-introduced, and we immediately had a full dining-room again. Now what kind of behaviour is that being set by Members of the House? There were three people including myself who used to eat and pay for our meals, and if we had friends, we paid for their meals as well. This would mean that there are Members on my side of the House who were guilty and culpable in this respect as well, and I agree with the honourable Member for St. Michael West that if we are supposed to be leaders in a society, we should set some kind of standard. There is too much of this idea of freeness, of something for nothing. I know a gentleman who up to yesterday, did not attend a function, because he rang up and found out that they were not serving refreshments at a serious academic function, and therefore he sent an excuse that he could not find himself constrained to be in that place at the same time; and he was a former Member of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like to inform the honourable Member that he has only three minutes longer to complete his speech.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not need three minutes. What I am saying is that we have only re-introduced this out of deference to the people who are working here, not for Members. As far as I am concerned, the Members can go wherever they used to go when they had to pay for their meals. It is now five or six years that I have not been a frequent visitor to the dining-room. It is only after the last election, that I go occasionally because I have established the principle that I wanted to establish, but I must emphasise, Mr. Chairman, that the employees of this House are entitled to some consideration, because the periods are too short for them to get back to their places of abode in order to be adequately refreshed, but any proposal to delete this vote in respect of the Members of the House would meet my unqualified support.

I would like to say that I would like to see a proper restaurant where you can invite people; the other side can have their own restaurant if they want to. We do not know if they would pay any caterer to cater to them if the question of payment was involved. As a matter of fact, I am not so sure what would

happen on my side because by the law of averages we have more Members, so the defaulters could be far greater in our case; but they all suffer from the same Barbadian defects when it comes to the expenditure of money or increased salaries. There is no difference between Members on this side and that side when it comes to salary revision or to food. They are the things on which they and we are *ad idem* excluding your humble servant from this exercise, and I have to use the collective term, but anyone who wants to reduce it will have my support, but for the time being, we are committed.

The Question that Head 3 — Parliament — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 16 - CABINET OFFICE - WAS CALLED

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16 - Cabinet Office - stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$36, 800 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION RE THE LEAVE PASSAGES (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper stands in the name of the Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Order entitled "The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1974".

This Order has been duly signed by the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for Establishments, and it seeks mainly to make certain adjustments; to substitute "six weeks" for the words "two months" and to

substitute the words "4 weeks" for the words "six weeks".

The position is simply that under the present Leave Passage Regulations, it would be expedient at this time to make these adjustments so as to facilitate the various Civil Servants in Government when they want to go abroad, and bring it more in line with present-day requirements, where certain defects have been observed in the past. 12.55 p.m.

It is all being done to facilitate the leave arrangements in so far as Government; officials are concerned. If there are any questions I will quite willingly answer them.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some comments on this question of Leave Passages, because I think that the time has come for us to have a very close look at Leave Passages, the implications of Leave Passages and what the country as a whole is deriving from the expenditure which runs into thousands of dollars per annum on Leave Passages for people who are employed in the Government Service.

If we were to examine the rationale, as I believe it to be, it would seem as if it is an incentive to senior civil servants for service which they have given to the country over a particular period, and it is something which was held over from colonial days when civil servants came out from Britain and this arrangement was made to enable them to go back home to visit their families and to keep in touch. One of the first things one would like to really question is whether there is need in our present situation for offering this kind of incentive to employees in the Government Service who reach a particular salary level, because the qualification for Leave Passages is determined by the salary level of the people who benefit from it.

When one further examines where the money which is expended on Leave Passages goes, one must ask oneself the question, what benefit as a nation, one is deriving from this great expenditure. The money is spent on going overseas, the people who benefit are the airlines and the people involved in the travel business. I think therefore that the time has come when we must take a very serious look at this and review the situation. I would like to suggest that a number of possibilities exist.

It is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, for us to be thinking in terms of having to retain some kind of incentive, and I am not convinced that this is necessarily so, but let us assume that we have to retain some kind of incentive for the people who at present are benefiting from Leave Passages, because as I said before, I am sure I am right when I say that Leave Passages are considered to be an incentive for people in a certain category in the Civil Service. If we have to retain some kind of incentive, I would like to suggest that we consider changing the kind of incentive which is being given. It would seem to me that one of the best ways this could be done would be to offer, instead of paid Leave Passages, the equivalent in Government Bonds where Government would invest the equivalent in Treasury Bills over a period of years, and this would be more or less compulsory savings. This is one of the ways in which this can be approached. This does not mean that I feel people should not travel out of Barbados and see

what is going on in other countries. As a matter of fact, I think that travel is a very important aspect of the education of any person. The kind of things which you can learn from travelling, mixing and association with other people, who live in bigger countries with different cultural settings is an eye opener for a lot of us who have had the opportunity to travel.

People would still be entitled to get their leave, and then if they want to travel overseas, this is something which they can do on their own, because when you consider it, the people who qualify invariably are people who to a large extent can afford to go overseas on a visit.

The other point surrounding this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, relates to the question of some people who even although they qualify are unable to take advantage of the Leave Passages because the arrangement is, as far as I understand it, that the money is provided for the visit up to a particular point, and there are people who still are not able to take advantage of this, although they qualify, so here it is you have one section of people who can afford to take advantage of the Leave Passages and another section although they qualify cannot take advantage of them because of the kind of financial problems or maybe the kind of situation which exists at that particular time. Again, some kind of accommodation would have to be made for these people.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, which I think should be made is that I consider that the provision of Leave Passages, if this has got to be provided, should be regarded as a kind of opportunity — it is a reward for service, all right — but I think that more can be had out of this kind of arrangement. When the time comes, and assuming that we still have this system in operation and people get the Government to pay their Leave Passages to go overseas, some kind of arrangement may be made for them to do some kind of Attachment Course or some kind of Observation Course for a short while in the field in which they are involved, because in the final analysis, all this expertise gained is what I consider to be making a contribution to national development, and there is no doubt about it, in Barbados there are people who are extremely narrow in their concepts, and particularly in the Government Service, there are people who are particularly narrow and ill-informed or uninformed about what is going on, and what are the possibilities in a number of areas in the Ministries in which they work, and this would be a golden opportunity to take advantage of getting to know in an organised way, what is going on in a particular area in any country.

I would go further and suggest that sometimes you have a situation where the officer might go overseas on a course and then soon after he returns he qualifies for Leave Passages and there he goes again. We should have an arrangement which would enable people when they have just returned from an overseas visit to give somebody else an opportunity to go out. What I am saying is that this is an excellent opportunity for us to utilise the facilities which can only be of benefit to the nation if properly planned. I said at the outset that I am not sure that the Leave Passages arrangement is the best arrangement. As a matter of fact, it has been said by a number of people, and in this Chamber on more than one occasion and by a number of people who have had an opportunity to examine this system closely to determine whether it should exist or whether it should be scrapped, and they have suggested that it should be scrapped. What I am suggesting is that we should have a very serious look at this matter and really determine what benefits can be derived and let us see what best use can come out of the particular arrangement. 1.05 p.m.

What I am suggesting is that we should be thinking in terms of having a committee sitting and

examining the cost and the returns that we get from this expenditure, and devising ways and means of putting up alternative suggestions so that the nation as a whole can benefit from this expenditure.

Mr. Speaker, this Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1974, also talks in terms of reducing the time which people can spend overseas. The comments that I am making now are being made in the light of what is existing at present, and are nothing to do with the suggestions that I have put over earlier on.

It seems to me that six weeks is still a long time, and I am asking if you have to spend six weeks, if you take Leave Passage and go overseas. I am wondering, in the present situation, where people may not be able to spend that length of time overseas, or may not want to, why we cannot consider reducing it further so that people will be able to go away for three weeks.

This, Sir, will of course tie in with the suggestion which I made earlier about having a look at the whole operation of these Leave Passages arrangements. I would hope that the time would come, and that the time will not be far off when the Government can get an opportunity to sit down and give a serious look at these arrangements with the alternatives, and see if the suggestions that I have made along the line could not be worked out.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I would not like to appear to differ from my colleague on this. I have been the man, who for many years has been saying that Leave Passages should be drastically changed. It seems that the Government is gradually coming to this idea. I do not know if they are faced with it now, but the Government is taking a step in this direction.

I do not think that there is any justification for Leave Passages. If there was any justification for it 25 years ago when the Barbados Government did not lend its officers the kind of money it lends them now for training and providing facilities at home for training, one could say that it is justified today. But today, a lot of money is spent locally on training and you cannot justify it.

This scheme came about because many years ago Barbados was recruiting teachers from the U.K., and as a result of bringing a man from overseas, you paid his passage to carry him back home to where he lived. That was the facility which you offered him, and the local man was placed at a disadvantage; and to equate a local man teaching at the same school with the overseas man, it was decided that the local man should be treated in the same way.

It was against that background of apparent discrimination that this scheme was born. To carry this to its logical conclusion, I would have to ask the Government of Barbados to pay our local cane cutters the equivalent of what cane cutters are being paid, to be brought from St. Vincent. You have to pay their passages and put them in a house, and therefore it costs you for each cane cutter brought from St. Vincent so much more, and therefore the local cane cutter should get the equivalent.

I am recruited by the Barbados Workers' Union. I do not see why the Barbados Workers' Union should have to give me a condition that when I go on leave I should be given Leave Passage to go to England. I do not live there. I cannot say that my grandfather came from there or that I should be given Leave Passage to go back to Africa.

I am saying as a Trade Unionist that there is no justification as a condition of employment that you must pay a man's passage to send him away when he goes on leave. In the Public Service you did it because you were forced into the situation.

What I am saying is that I think it was fair to give a man Leave Passage if you brought him here from overseas. That is a fair condition of employment, to give him an opportunity to go back where he came from; but when you give Leave Passage to a Barbadian when he is recruited here, where are you sending him? Back to Barbados? Even Barbadians recruited from overseas are being given the same condition as if they were born overseas.

I find that there is a certain amount of unreasonableness in people of certain income groups. It is these same Civil Servants that will sit down and tell a Minister not to pay an ordinary man for working overtime on Saturdays; but you pay more in Leave Passages than all the overtime put together. Some people are working for 60 cents an hour, but a man working for \$7, 000 and over can get Leave Passage. Those are the sort of iniquities that you get from these people.

Do you know something? You go to England and visit a man's place in Earl's Court. Some of them are so foolish that they leave a good and decent home in Barbados to go and spend leave there. I want to look for one of them. I went on a cold day. I had on a pair of pants and the cold came through my pants when I sat on his bed. Imagine if a woman had sat on his bed. You had to form fours to get inside there, and if you got up out of the bed you had to kick down the table. Some of them leave here and go to England and live in misery slapping cold because they do not have enough money to buy the proper food and live in proper surroundings. They live in the cold. Some of them come back here with pneumonia because the places they lived in were too cold.

People are leaving good and comfortable homes in Barbados and going overseas to live in conditions that you, Sir, would not send a first class good breed dog. You put in 12 cents in one of these little things to get heat and before you can say Jack Robinson it is out again. These are the peculiar conditions for which they prefer to take money from the Government and go overseas.

We have had independence in 1966 and I think that the Government should celebrate its seventh anniversary of independence by the abolition completely of Leave Passages and let Civil Servants understand that we will give them a better substitute by way of training to serve the island well and not Leave Passages. It is stupidity. 1.15 p.m.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution stands in my name and certain comments were made on it by the honourable Member who has just sat down. As one who is in charge of Establishments I would like to say that throughout the Colonial Empire it has been felt that the rigours of the climate in Africa and in certain parts of the Caribbean were such that it required as a matter of survival that Officers who work for a certain period of time in these territories would have to go back to spend some time at their homes. Now in the University of the West Indies it is happening every year. Of course, I will be making my recommendations to the Legislature, and my recommendations may not be for a continuance of this leave in its present form for the present staff because I think that this is one of the most reactionary institutions that we have ever devised in post-war days and it is turning out a lot of misfits — people who do not know what they are; and the thing about it is that some are being elected to the Legislature,

unfortunately. We do not know whether they are Barbadians or else. I would add.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Prime Minister should make such reference to any Member of this House. This is an offensive remark.

Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not making any derogatory remarks. I am saying that a lot of people have been away at the Government expense and have come back here not knowing what they are. I did not go away at the Government's expense nor did I come back at the Government's expense, and what I am saying is that the Government of Barbados would not be paying for any Leave Passages, and the Government of Barbados is not supporting 20% house allowance for the staff of the University of the West Indies.

The trouble is that we are still in the Caribbean suffering from the residual effects of Colonialism, and you can take a man out of the colony but you cannot take the colony out of a man. The position is that we have taken the United Kingdom out of these colonies but we have not taken the colonies out of the United Kingdom. That is what has happened to us.

I am a Minister in charge of Establishments and regardless of whether these Trade Unions have any say in it, whether it be the West Indian Group of University Teachers or whether it be the National Union of Public Workers — whoever they are — or the Barbados Workers' Union, there are those who insist that a person enters the service under certain conditions of employment; that may be so, but the point made and stressed, revision after revision of salary, is that they must have Leave Passages to the United Kingdom. What is the justification for it? As I said before, the justification seems to be that there were members of the United Kingdom service who were engaged in the colonial service and who had to get back home with their families to recuperate with their families, but Barbados is never in this category. It was the Labour Government in Barbados which introduced these Leave Passages. Leave Passages were enjoyed by Trinidad and Jamaica; different places altogether. Ten years in the life of a Parliament does not mean anything. I have been in here longer than that. The point is that the experience of the people of Trinidad in this respect started in the 1950's; not in the 1850's and they have a nominated element in their legislature. Up to the 1950's they did not know about representative institutions, and that is why they are always confused. They did not even understand what it is to have a majority decision made in a Legislative Chamber, until about 15 or 16 years ago. Now certain institutions are raising the question of providing aid for Grenada. Do you think I would waste the Barbados taxpayers' money to send any money to Grenada? 1.25 p.m.

Sir, it is the direct fault of the Trinidad Government, and it is time that people speak straight to others. It is an act of impertinence for any Minister of Finance to send a civil servant or Government Minister down there to discuss matters with the Grenada Government at the behest of Derrick Knight. In Trinidad the people like that sort of thing.

In Barbados when we talk about being nationalistic, we are told that if we do not give Leave Passages, we are making officers inferior to the English expatriates. When Sir Arthur Lewis was at the University of the West Indies, he said that the staff of the University should be nationalistic and should not expect the same salary as those from overseas, and they said that Sir Arthur Lewis was discriminating. We have to discriminate because we want to set the standards, and we are not concerned about what other people

are doing. We are starting from a long way back, and this is a luxury which we cannot afford.

Every time a salary revision comes up and we talk about reducing Leave Passages, we are told that it will be an abrogation of the terms of employment. Let me tell you something about the colonialism that we have to contend with so far as Government Officers are concerned. Some years ago, the Commonwealth Relations Office, or the Colonial Office, decided that they would have a Scheme which is also bound up in this Leave Passage proposal, and they called it an "Overseas Service Aid Scheme". The idea was that, where a "Colonial" Government was finding it difficult to recruit personnel at the salaries which were stipulated in the Civil Establishment, the British Government would top up the salaries by 30% more, in the case of Barbados, and give prerequisites such as Leave Passages, passages back to England for the children of officers and so on, but that was supposed to be short-lived. I say this because I know that some people will take it as the thin edge of the wedge to get it also.

Now, I sent the matter to the Civil Service Association for their comments on the Overseas Service Aid Scheme. As far as we are concerned in Barbados, we did not need that, but the Civil Service Association endorsed the Scheme up to the hilt to pay expatriates this money. We already had people working in Barbados and we did not have to pay them any inducement to come here. However, once officers were recruited from overseas, they were eligible for the extra money. There are still three or four such officers in Barbados drawing this additional money today. I could not understand that. I signed the Agreement with the United Kingdom since the Civil Service Association had accepted the Scheme. At the time I think that there were 33 officers listed including the Officer administering the Government of the Colony, and then I got a howl of protest from the Civil Service Association that the Government of Barbados had no right to sign this Agreement.

Sir, I immediately produced the letter from the Civil Service Association where they endorsed the Scheme. The secret was that the hierarchy of the Civil Service Association thought they would all come under the Scheme. The Commonwealth Relations Office, as it is now called, decided that the Scheme applied to persons who were not Barbadians and who were recruited overseas.

Some people who wanted to be trade unionists are now sheltering under the provisions of the Trade Unions Act. They are trade unionists from the fact that they are self-seeking money grabbers. There is a difference between trade unions who are established to improve the conditions of employment of the working-class people and other trade unions. The Employers' Confederation is a trade union. The Druggist Association is a trade union.

I was confronted in Jamaica by a statement by teachers at the University that I was acting contrary to the principles of academia. now academia is some mythical word that they have invented. They say that my proposals were contrary to the established principles of academia and unionism. I do not know whether the honourable Member for St. Michael West or the honourable Member for St. Lucy is infected with academia. I hope that they are immunised against that form of academia. That is a kind of disease that we do not want here.

Barbados is a country in the Caribbean in which you can find very few survivors of our African heritage. Sometimes it takes people from outside to come here and search for survivors, but the survivors of colonialism are all around us in the Public Service of this Island. This is one of the survivors, and we must come to grips with reality and realise that we should not be sending people out

of the country every 18 months to sit down in dreary boarding houses. This is a waste of money. You should have two or three weeks vacation, but you should only go out of this country at the expense of the Government on long leave if you are going on some compulsory course of training. 1.35 p.m.

I was in this House for ten years and apart from doing work in one or two of the Lesser Antilles and Greater Antilles, I had no interest in going to the United Kingdom. I never went on a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association jaunt in the ten or eleven years before I assumed the office which I now hold. I was not interested. To prove what? as they say! That by going to England you are better than somebody else, or you are trying to assimilate some atmosphere there that the ordinary workers are not endowed with in Barbados? We have to decolonialise the whole public service in Barbados. We have a decolonialisation programme to carry out and everyday I see proposals which in their wildest flights of extravagance, a colonial Government would not have put forward, and these proposals are coming from out public service sector all the time. I would just like to inform the honourable Member that if I had unilaterally abolished Leave Passages, they would have run to him, and told the officers of his organisation that they must have solidarity. Some of them do not know what the issue is, but you hear them saying they are going on a solidarity strike. The NUPW always talk about this solidarity, but I do not see any of them on May Day when it comes to joining the festivities of the agricultural workers, but there is solidarity when their Leave Passages are being interfered with, and the honourable Member would come in here and make a different speech altogether from the One he made today, because he would be here with his other hat as a Trade Unionist and say he is appearing on behalf of other workers. These are rights that needed abolishing a long time ago.

I was asking a friend of mine whether a certain Department of Government was really necessary. This friend of mine was working in the that Department at the wharf which has been abolished, and his reply to me was "all of we needed going home a long time ago including myself!" All these people in the public service need to stay at home a little longer and not to waste the taxpayers' money on these foolish trips that they make invariably to the United Kingdom. I do not mind them going to the Caribbean, but I am in the unfortunate position that I came and found it and I am in no position to change it unilaterally, but I can make my position known in this House. I am not apologising but I have a function to perform as Minister in charge of Establishments; so having made my position clear, I am not supporter of neocolonialism or colonialism in any of its forms, and this is one of those most unfortunate matters.

Mr. MOTTLEY rose.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member has lost his right to speak since the Hon. Minister has replied on behalf of the Government.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

But he did not introduce the Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House introduced it and said the final remarks would be made by the Prime Minister.

The Question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without

division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, at this stage I crave Your Honour's indulgence to present the various documents for which I asked leave to give at a later stage.

Mr. SPEAKER:

By permission of the House, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted. DOCUMENTS LAID

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following

(1) The Development Plan 1973-77.

(2) The Draft Estimates 1974-75, including the Draft Estimates of the Port Department, and the Schedules of Personal Emoluments for 1974-75.

(3) The Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for ten months ended 31st January, 1974.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following

(1) The Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police of Barbados for the year 1969.

(2) The Annual Report of the Commissioner of Police of Barbados for the year 1970.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

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

The Resolution to approve the lease of land at the Dock Site, Bridgetown, to Central Foundry Ltd.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following

The Resolution to authorise the Minister responsible for finance to borrow by the issue of Treasury Bills sums not exceeding 20 million dollars and such sums as may be required to pay off at maturity Bills already lawfully issued and outstanding.

I am asking for leave to deal with this Resolution in all its stages at a later stage of today's Sitting.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

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

The Resolution to grant the sum of \$30, 000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part II -Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1973-74, No. 40, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following

(1) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$788, 917 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74 No. 41, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

(2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$69, 675 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates, 1973-74, No. 42, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works I beg to give notice of the following:

The Resolution to approve the expenditure of \$384, 950 required to supplement the Estimates, 1973-74, Part I - Current, of the Port Department as shown in the Schedule to this Resolution.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of the following:

(1) The Resolution to approve the annual Estimates of the Port Department for the year 1974-75.

(2) The Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1974.

(3) A Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917.

(4) A Bill to grant a sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and to appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending on 31st March 1975.

On behalf of the Minister of Communications, I beg to give notice of the following:

A Bill to amend the Stamp Act, 1916. 1.45 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 106 and 142 are ready.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works I beg to inform you that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 188 and 234 are now ready.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. C ADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that Oral Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 191 and 212 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter are now ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 187, 207, 208, 218, 219 and 220 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter are now ready.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 222 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter is ready.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Gambling Act, 1917 be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to grant a sum of money from the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the service of the Island for the year ending 31st March, 1975 be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Stamp Act, 1916 be now read a first time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House gave notice earlier that I would wish to proceed with the

Resolution under the Act to increase the number of Treasury Bills from the present level of \$25 million and that this would be done in all its stages today.

We are seeking to increase the amount of Treasury Bills by another \$20 million. I would like to explain that now that the Central Bank has come into.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Leave has not yet been asked for.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I was under the impression that the Leader of the House had asked for leave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that the Leader of the House had given notice of his intention to ask for leave but the question was not put to the House. The Leader intimated this. Am I to understand that the Leader is now seeking leave?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

At the time. I gave notice of the Resolution, I said that I was asking for leave.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That was your intimation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that this Resolution be dealt with in all its stages.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, where it may seem that the increase of the Public Debt of Barbados by nearly half is merely a formality to some people yet to honourable Members on this side of the House it does not seem that the increase of the authorisation of Treasury Bills from \$25 million to \$45 million is a matter that could be dealt with in five minutes before the House reaches the statutory hour of adjournment. Indeed everybody on this side would like to study this Resolution particularly because of the way it is worded. We may very well not vote against leave being granted to deal with it in all its stages, and I would remind you of the Standing Orders not to allow any motion to be put unless Your Honour has been given notice and is satisfied that it is in order. I need not remind Your Honour about this, but while we might be prepared to deal with this we cannot deal with it now, we would like the chance to study it over the brief luncheon hour which the present rules gives us and to contemplate the matter. I seems sometimes that things of \$4, 000, of \$5, 000 could be dealt with in half an hour, but here we are dealing with \$20 million and are being asked to deal with it in five minutes.

We would like the chance to study the document which has just been put in our hands. We would prefer to have it stand down and brought up again when the House resumes its business.

1.55 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. Speaker suspended the Sitting accordingly.

QUESTION TIME On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is now Question Time. Question No. 106 standing in the name of the honourable Member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

To enquire of the Appropriate Minister -

1. Is the Minister aware that the legislation dealing with the Landlord and Tenant Act is in need of being brought up to date?

2. Will the Minister take steps to have this legislation brought up to date?

Hon.P.M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

1. No representations have been received by my Ministry that would suggest that the Act is in need of revision.

2. My Ministry will however carry out a detailed examination of the Act to see if it meets present day requirements.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Would the Minister state how far the Ministry has got in carrying out these investigations?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

"Mr. Speaker, work has already commenced and we are having a look at the Act. It is not easy to say in the early stages how far the work has progressed.

Mr. FORDE:

Will the Minister state, in view of the fact that the Act is dated 1897 what urgency at the moment is being given to this matter, and how soon he thinks this legislation will be available?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I have not said that there will be any new legislation on this at all. I am merely saying that there is no new legislation at this stage, but we are prepared to do something about it.

Mr. FORDE:

Do I understand the Minister to be saying, or will the Minister tell us if he started this investigation subsequent to the 19th June, 1972?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Those are about four questions.

Mr. FORDE:

It is one question because it was a continuation of a sentence.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, my Ministry always assumes that there is some urgency unless we have representatives made to the contrary. When we have representations made, it is at that stage that the Ministry sets in motion an examination of the instruments under which we are working. I cannot repeat what I have said earlier. Since the matter has been raised by honourable Members on the Other Side, my Ministry is prepared to look at the Act.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Will the Minister state whether people who have more than five tenants will be able to raise the rents of these tenants in view of the new Landlord and Tenant Act?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not an appropriate question.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Is the Minister aware that this Act passed in 1897 was for the protection of the landlord? Will the Minister take steps to ensure that legislation is brought forward to give protection to the tenants?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

My Ministry is examining the Act, and it will do all that is required in order to bring this Act up to date. There is nothing more that I can say on this.

Mr. FORDE:

Will the Minister state whether the proposed review of the legislation will include control of rents in Barbados?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I cannot say that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Will the Minister give the undertaking that the review will include a review of the question of rent control, if necessary?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I cannot give any undertaking. My Ministry is looking at the Act in relation to what we have to do, and where there is any hardship my Ministry will take every step to remove any such hardship.

3.05 p.m.

QUESTION RE PROPER HOUSING FOR RESIDENTS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 142, asked by the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: 1. Is the Minister aware of the need to provide proper housing for the residents in the City of Bridgetown especially in the areas of Chapman Lane, Bull's Alley, Cat's Castle, Hutson Alley, Greenfield, Lightfoot Lane, Church Village and Nelson Street? 2. Would the Minister state (a) what steps, if any, does the Government propose to take to alleviate the situation (b) how soon does the Government intend to take such steps? 3. Would the Minister state whether there is any funds provided in the Estimates for the year 1973—74 to improve the housing of the residents of the City of Bridgetown?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

1. I am aware of the need to improve housing in the City of Bridgetown and the rest of the nation.
2. The National Housing Corporation provides a variety of services by way of loans to lower income groups, as well as welfare housing assistance to needy persons to enable those persons to up-grade their homes.
3. The Corporation is also seeking to acquire land in St. Michael for the relocation of houses currently sited on lands susceptible to flooding."

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister tell us if the National Housing Corporation has ever found itself with funds to carry out these commitments made upon it?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

There are funds available to the National Housing Corporation primarily from its own income as well as from the Treasury. These are funds used to finance the many services of the Corporation. I hope this

answers the Member's question. Funds are available for services but always in amounts we would like.

QUESTION RE SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 188 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: In view of the present energy crisis, and the necessity to save water, will the Minister state what steps have been taken in respect of swimming pools which use water from our Island's main source of supply? 2. How many swimming pools are there in Barbados? 3. How many use water from our pipe — borne system? 4. What (in terms of gallons) is the average daily consumption of each swimming pool? 5. How does consumption by these pools compare with the average daily domestic supply consumed by householders?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to give the Reply which is as follows

"(1) No specific action has been taken in respect of swimming pools in connection with the present energy crisis.

(2) The total number of swimming pools in the Island is not readily available.

(3) There are approximately sixty (60) pools which are supplied with water by the Waterworks Department.

(4) The average total daily consumption of these pools is 6, 000 gallons.

(5) Consumption by these pools when compared with the average daily supply consumed by householders is insignificant."

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, when the Minister tells me 6, 000 gallons, I wonder whether he means 6, 000 gallons a pool or if they all contain 6, 000 gallons.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a proper supplementary.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

This is a report from the Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department. He states that the Waterworks Department makes the supply, and a swimming pool is supplied by meter at the rate of 80 cents per thousand gallons. There are approximately 60 swimming pools in Barbados which are supplied

with water by the Waterworks Department. The average daily consumption of these pools is 6, 000 gallons, which when compared with the average of 80 million gallons per day used by householders for domestic purposes, is insignificant. That is the point, Sir.

Mr. HINDS:

If the Minister is saying that there are 6, 000 gallons for 60 pools, is each swimming pool.....I am addressing the Chair on this.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have the right to put a supplementary. You may not like the answer the Minister has given.

Mr. HINDS:

Is the Minister saying that 60 swimming pools are consuming a mere 6, 000 gallons of water a day?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is already answered.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The average total daily consumption is 6, 000 gallons; they are not filled every day. They fill certain pools once a week. So the answer from the expert is, the average daily consumption of these pools is 6, 000 gallons which when compared with the average of 80 million gallons per day used by householders for domestic purposes, is insignificant.

Mr. HINDS:

Does the Minister believe what he reads?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a proper supplementary either.

Mr. BOLDEN:

What is the average Size and depth of these pools?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Obviously the Minister does not have this Reply.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

This is a very ingenious question but asked at the wrong time.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It is a wrong supplementary.

QUESTION RE EQUIPMENT TO HANDLE CONTAINERISED CARGO

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 234, asked by the honourable Member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The question reads as follows

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that (a) The Bridgetown Port has spent approximately half of one million dollars to install all the necessary equipment to handle containerised cargo; (b) That the said equipment is not being put to use at the port. Will the Minister tell this Honourable House and country (1) The reason for the delay in putting this expensive equipment into operation; (2) How soon will the equipment be put in use; (3) What is the Government's decision in respect of use of this service at the Port?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to this Question asked by the honourable Member is as follows

"During the financial year 1972-73 Port Contractors (B'dos) Limited bought equipment capable of handling containerised cargo at a cost of approximately \$268, 000 (c.i.f.). In the same period 13 fork trucks were also purchased for approximately \$210, 000. Eight of them were replacements.

2. The equipment was put into use without undue delay." 3.15 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Will the Hon. Minister state in what form the equipment was put into use.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The equipment purchased is used for handling all containerised cargo arriving at or leaving this Port, and there has been no delay in putting the equipment into service.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Is the Minister aware that every container which arrives in this Island has to be broken down before the goods can be landed?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should give him some more information.

Mr. SPEAKER:

On the supplementary,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is an agreement between the Port Contractors and the Union for the rates of pay for container handling and so on. The honourable Member seems to know a great deal about what goes on at the Port.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear what the Honourable Minister said. I heard some — thing about an agreement, and that the hon. Member knows about what is going on at the Port. I should like you to. ask the Ho . Leader of the House to mpeat the statement which he has made. . , r r

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 191 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter.

BURIAL GROUNDS AT ST. PHILIP-THE-LESS ANGLICAN CHURCH

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker,

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that the two burial grounds at St. Philip-the-Less Anglican Church at Boscobelle in the Parish of St. Peter have reached saturation point and there is no more space where in to dig graves to bury the dead? Will the Minister take steps to relieve this situation immediately by urging Government to acquire such lands or make such other provision as may be found necessary under the circumstances?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

The two burial grounds at St. Philip-the-Less Anglican Church are not now, nor have they ever been, under the administration of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board or any Government Ministry or agency.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Will the Minister state whether or not they have reached saturation point and, if so, whether there is any need for his Ministry to provide alternative arrangements?

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether his Ministry has found out if there is a need for the provision of burial grounds in the area served by St. Philip-the-Less Anglican Church in Boscobelle?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I am not in receipt of that information, and I am not in a position to comment on that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I prefer not to ask this Minister any further questions.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am asking Your Honour's leave in order to get this matter explained. As far as I can see, this question is addressed to the appropriate Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is not a supplementary.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am asking the leave of the House to get some guidance on this question. This question is addressed to the appropriate Minister. The Minister has just said that he is not in a position to comment on it. What is the position?

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that since 1969 representations have been made to the Government and to the appropriate Ministry about the lack of burial space in this part of St. Peter?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

The Minister is not so aware.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 212 asked by the honourable Member for St. Peter.

RE THE HOSPITALISATION OF NURSES AT THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 212

To enquire of the Minister of Health and Welfare: How many Nurses attached to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were hospitalized in the sick bay for Nurses at that Institution during the year 1973? 2. How many were warded in the General Wards during the year? How many were warded in the Pay Ward? 3. If sick Nurses were detained in the General wards, who ordered such detention? 4. On what date did a sick Nurse quit the General ward without being discharged by a Medical Doctor ?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to the question is as follows

1. 77 Nurses, Sir,
2. 16 - General Wards; 77 - Pay Wards, Rooms in the (Private) Pay Wards comprise the Nurses' Sick Bay.
3. Treatment of a patient is the Clinical responsibility of the attending doctor, and at all times a doctor exercises this responsibility in an unabridged manner,

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 187 asked by the honourable Member.

RE THE VACANCIES AT ERDISTON TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGE

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 187

To enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport: Are there any teaching vacancies at Erdiston Teachers' Training College? If so, in what area? 2. Were these posts advertised? 3. Were applications received from suitably qualified persons? 4. If the answer to No.

3 is in the affirmative, will the Minister state why such persons have not been appointed?

I ask that the answer be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the leave of the House, the answer will be laid. Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 207 in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

RE THE LOWER FIRST FORMS IN GRAMMAR SCHOOLS

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, Question No. 207

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: What is Government's policy relating to Lower first forms in Grammar Schools? 2. Do all Grammar Schools now carry a Lower first form? 3. If the answer to No. 2 above is in the negative, are children at schools without a Lower first form at any sort of a disadvantage? 4. If the answer to No. 3 above is in the negative, is the progress of children at Schools with a Lower first form being retarded in any respect?

I should like the Reply to this Question to be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

With the leave of the House, Reply to Question No. 207 will be laid.

Reply to Question No. 208 asked by the same honourable Member for St. Peter. 3.25 p.m.

QUESTION RE SIXTH FORM CURRICULUM

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 208 standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport: Are Economics, Politics, and Sociology taught in the sixth forms at Grammar Schools which carry those forms? 2. If not, why not.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 208 is as follows

The subjects taught in the sixth forms of the government secondary schools reflect the syllabuses prescribed by the Cambridge Examinations Syndicate which do not include Politics and Sociology, while the subject Economics only becomes available from this year. However, some elements of

Economics, Politics and Sociology are imparted during the course of instruction in other subject disciplines as well as during Current Affairs programmes.

QUESTION RE TEACHERS' COTTAGES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No.

218 standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter:

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, let the Reply to that question be laid.

QUESTION RE SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 219 standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows

To enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport: Is it a fact that the libraries at Secondary Schools are inadequately equipped to meet present day demands? 2. If the answer is in the affirmative, what is being done to improve the situation?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 219 is as follows —

Library facilities at Government Secondary Schools have not yet reached an optimum standard. However steps towards that end are being taken as follows :—

(1) Grants are made annually to the older secondary schools for library development, and these grants have increased in value from \$4, 510 in 1961-62 to \$10, 100 in 1973-74.

(2) Whereas heretofore no systematic provision was made for the development of libraries in the newer secondary schools, provision is now being made for an annual allocation to these schools.

(3) A report requested from the Public Librarian on the development of libraries in the new secondary schools has been received and is being studied.

(4) Steps are being taken to provide a full-time member of staff, at the level of Library Assistant at least, with responsibility for the control and management of the School library.

QUESTION RE THE TEACHERS IN GRAMMAR SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 220 standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, let the Reply to that Question be laid.

QUESTION RE SEAWELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. SPEAKER:

Parliamentary Question No. 222 standing in the name of the honourable Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows—

To enquire of the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that conditions at Seawell, as an international airport, must measure up to certain set standards? 2. Is the Minister aware that the number of firemen for duty at Seawell International Airport fell from 13 to as low as 7 men on several occasions during the month of December, 1973? 3. Is the Minister aware that as a result of No. 2 above planes landed at Seawell International Airport between 20th and 23rd December, 1973 without adequate fire coverage? 4. Is the Minister aware that with Government accepting the 40-hour week for employees firemen are still working 96 hours per 7-day week, and without overtime pay? 5. Is it a fact that there is no permanent ambulance service at Seawell International Airport? 6. Does the potency of the Foam for use by Fire Services at Seawell International Airport have an expiry date? If so, how long has the present stock been retained since expiry date? 7. Has the Minister given any consideration to the fact that the Fire Station at Seawell, as presently sited, does not afford fire-men direct and un-interrupted access to arriving aircraft requiring such services? 8. Will the Minister take early steps to consider resiting the said Fire Station to afford firemen an unobstructed view of alighting aircraft and access to such planes requiring services?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 222 is as follows—

1. Yes, Sir.
2. Yes, Sir/The number of firemen on duty fell at times to 7 between the 22nd and 25th, both dates inclusive, due to the extremely high incidence of sick leave.
3. No, Sir.
4. No, Sir. Firemen do not have to work 96 hours per 7 day week as stated. They are available for service during such a period. Reductions in the hours of attendance will be effected with the introduction of phase 3 of the 5-day week.

5. No, Sir. There is a Standing Emergency Arrangement between the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Airport for the provision of immediate service in cases of emergency. An Emergency Stationary Ambulance Service is however being considered for the near future.

6. No, Sir.

7. Yes, Sir. In the development planning of the Airport, consideration is being given to the possibility of relocating the Fire Station on the north side of the runway for more direct access to the areas where fire services are most likely to be required.

8. Yes, Sir. It is not intended to relocate the Airport Fire Station immediately. However, the control room is being relocated to the first floor of the existing station in order to provide for firemen a better view of the runway and adjoining areas.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, does the Minister realise that when a fireman is standing by, that he is not free to use such standby hours to his own advantage or that of his family, and as such, these hours must be considered by reasonable standards as working hours ?

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, one can be on standby without working. If he does put in 96 hours of duty, part of that is on standby duty. In other words, a man on a hundred days voyage at sea is always on standby, but that does not mean that he is working for 100 days.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister in reply to the Question told us that it is not true that a fireman works 96 hours. In his Reply to my last supplementary, the Minister stated that a fireman might put in 96 hours' duty, but part might be as standby.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

On a point of order, I never said that he puts in 96 hours on duty. The question talked about 96 hours in a seven day week, and I said he does not work for 96 hours in a seven day week. If he is on standby duty at the station for 96 hours, that does not mean he is on duty for 96 hours.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Point of elucidation.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister agree that if a fireman were on standby in his own house that he is on duty and must be considered as working? 3.35 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

The answer is no, Mr. Speaker, because he is on call and not on duty. Every fire officer, every policeman and most civil servants are on 24 hours call but it does not mean that they are working for 24 hours a day. You can call on them at any time as long as you know where they are, and they usually leave instructions as to how to find them.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question Time is now ended.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 12 be the first Order of the Day under Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION OF THE RESOLUTION RE THE PUBLIC ENQUIRY AMONG RESIDENTS OF EMMERTON LANE

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think when time expired on the last occasion the honourable Member for St. Michael West was about to make his speech.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, on that occasion the honourable Member for the City made a speech about the problems in his constituency, and what I was surprised about was that when I looked through the Order Paper, I found Parliamentary Question No. 142 where he was asking the Minister whether he was aware of

the need to provide proper housing for the residents in the City of Bridgetown, especially in the areas of Chapman Lane, Bull's Alley, Cat's Castle, Hutson Alley, Greenfield, Lightfoot Lane, Church Village and Nelson Street.

I was a little taken aback, when I heard the honourable Member's speech on that occasion, with this question here, in which he was taking exception to the steps which were taken to provide this kind of system in the area. It would seem to me that there is an old fashioned habit in Barbados that if you are going to have a change, you must have a lot of talk before the change is begun, and I would have taken it that this change is so needed that if you are going to have a good sewerage system and you examine the possibility that this is going to bring better life to the residents there that it would be acceptable. I was really amazed at what the honourable Member was saying when he said that you must have a dialogue with the people before you can do something. There are some things that you must be in a position to be able to interpret as the wishes of the people you represent without a dialogue. You do not have to know if something is good for the people you represent, you should not have to have a dialogue when you want to bring good facilities to people, you must be able to interpret the aspirations of the people at any moment and debate them at the shortest moment, so I was somewhat amazed to hear the argument being raised.

Not only in Chapman Lane, but back of the office in which I work, which is a part of the honourable Member's constituency, needs some attention as well. There is no pride in having a City where you have valuable land and you have to do something about housing and bringing better life to the people of this area, but whatever you do to speed up this, must be done and I hope that the honourable Member is not suggesting that there is something improper about a sewerage plant, because it is going to be located in his constituency that this is some nuisance as if it is a factory in which you are manufacturing sewerage per se. This concept must be changed. Because you have a sewerage plant and it is something dirty you must not have it in my constituency but rather in somebody else's, this is primitive in thinking. It is a question of the area in which it should be placed.

Let us be quite frank. There are some areas in this country in which there are housing areas. There are some places which became housing areas because we had no laws to restrict people from putting their houses in certain areas and they were allowed to put their houses anywhere. I have visited some areas in my own constituency where a house is on land like a pasture, and this sort of slackness goes on. People come to you and ask for a road because they have put their houses on land in any form and they only have a track leading to these houses. The Government must have a massive programme for looking at this problem of the City and its environs, but I was a bit surprised when the honourable Member made his speech because I was of the point of view that the honourable Member would have welcomed anything which would accelerate the pace for making his constituents have a better life and not to continue to live in the way they are living now.

We have not had a lot of rain for a long time. I am not an expert on this, but I am satisfied in my mind that the next serious downpour we have in this country, that we are going to see new things opening up which we have not seen before. The reason for this is that we do not have the engineers in this Island, we have never really been water engineers or hydraulics men, and I am satisfied of this because even now when there is a drizzle, River Road and the place where I work are full of water when there is a downpour. I am not an engineer but I am satisfied that with all the buildings going up, River Road will be impassable if we get any downpour of rain, with the tide coming back, the mouth of the careenage is going to be narrow, the banks are going to overflow into the bus stand, so I hope that the honourable Member sees that far from Emmerton having problems, he might find that Nelson Street will have a problem with the next downpour. I think that anything which is done to alleviate this problem should be welcomed by the honourable Member. That is what I have to say, Mr. Speaker. 3.45 p.m.

I was a little bit alarmed when I heard the Member's speech, because I thought that he would have welcomed anything that would improve the city areas where people are living.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

The question of the resiting of people in the Emmerton area strictly falls under the Ministry of Lands and Housing. My Ministry is always concerned about conditions which we know exist there, and my Ministry is always willing to assist.

I do not think, Sir, that I am expected to make any long speech on this issue because we all share concern over this issue and should be prepared to see the matter clearly, apart from parochial politics as something which must be done for the people of Emmerton Lane.

You must not always do these things to please an individual. What we do, must be in the interest of the people of Emmerton as a whole. I think their interest must be paramount and transcend sectional interest.

I can understand how some Members feel about this matter. After all, they are human and they understand the problem; but one special problem must not in any way undercut the massive problems that confront the people of Emmerton today.

What are the facts? My Ministry, my Housing Corporation owns a sizeable part, and this is not the worst part because in that section there is no house where you will not find a pit; but there are other houses where we will not find pits.

There are 176 houses sited on land owned by the National Housing Corporation, and according to the survey a sizeable portion of them are in a state of dilapidation. Those are some of the facts. What are the problems? Emmerton is a low lying area and therefore drainage is quite difficult in that part of the City. There are also problems of over crowding, drainage and poor sanitary conditions, and when added together it comes to some of the worst living conditions one could hope to encounter in any country.

I have had the privilege of taking around some representatives of national institutions to slums in Barbados including Emmerton, and I have been told by them that we have no slums in Barbados. I believe that the question of what is or is not a slum is a relative thing. What may be slums to us may not be slums in another country; but we all know that this is relative.

I can say that there is no intention whatsoever by international financial institutions to give money for urban renewal in Barbados. International financial institutions have run away from it. They make loans and grants to no country for some clearance. International financial institutions do not like the idea of relocating people.

My Ministry has been placing great emphasis on improving Housing in Barbados. My Ministry would like to do something about Emmerton, but in order to do something about it, one needs massive finance. We need massive grants which at this moment are not available to Barbados; but we are fortunate at this time in that we can tie in the urbanisation or rather the improvement of Emmerton area with another project which is a sewerage project. By doing this we would be able to obtain some funds for the resiting of these persons.

What we are doing is not only developing a sewerage disposal plant, but at the same time, we are doing something about urban renewal in Barbados. Let us face the facts, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The whole of the City of Bridgetown in terms of population is diminishing because, as people improve their conditions, they move out from slum conditions.

We have heard today from the Member for St. Michael West that at the back of the Union Building 'where he works, slum conditions exist, and the Government should do something about it. The fact is that the Member who represents the area should put on the pressure and try to see if something can be done about this area.

I can assure the honourable Member for St. Michael West as well as any other honourable Member

that the Government really intends to do something about that area of land, east of the office block now under construction. The Government is considering purchasing a considerable area — I do not know if we will be financially able to purchase that massive structure of the BWU — but it is the intention of the Government to purchase a sizeable portion of the land including Jordan's Lane and Jessamy Lane and of course Nelson Street, and we are hoping, Fairchild Street.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite frankly I think that this is an opportunity that we cannot let slip. It is not an opportunity that comes very often to a country like Barbados. If it happens to come by some fortuitous circumstance, we cannot let it escape. I understand the problems of the honourable mover of this Resolution, but I understand the problems of the people of Emmerton Lane better.

The Member's Resolution calls for a Public Enquiry. In fact there has been a public Enquiry. The Town and Country Planning Department conducted a Public Enquiry there. It was not in the nature, perhaps, of the one suggested by the Member, but the types of questions that were asked have already been made available to this House by the honourable Member for St. Michael North Central when he addressed this Chamber. There was the Questionnaire that was being put, and we cannot say that it was not a fair and reasonable Questionnaire.

I would like to ignore certain allegations made by the mover of the Resolution about people of Emmerton being offered houses for \$25, 000 and \$30, 000. There is no house in Wildey being sold for \$25, 000 or \$30, 000, and in any case, who would offer such people such houses when it would be known that they would not have the money at their disposal to purchase them? That should be ignored not only by Members on this Side but by everyone. I think it is too laughably to make any serious comment on. 3.55 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is now an opportunity which I see is given to us to do something for the people of Emmerton. I myself am making preparations for Emmerton when the time comes for them to be resited, and I can assure this Honourable Chamber that the standards we set in the Ministry of Housing will be maintained. I can give the assurance that a proper water borne toilet system will be provided, and Emmerton will be an area properly laid out. We will be observing proper standards in Town Planning as well. These, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are the standards which we observe in the Ministry of Housing and these will be observed for the people of Emmerton, when the time comes for them to be resited.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was surprised when I discovered that the honourable Member for the City of Bridgetown objected to moving the people out of Emmerton.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of personal explanation, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at no time did I object to moving the people out of Emmerton. I want that to be made clear on the record. At no stage in the debate in this House, did I object to moving the people out of Emmerton.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

The honourable Member did complain about how the people's houses and clothes were saturated in water for days when the rain fell and he suggested that they be moved. This was given very, very careful

consideration by my Ministry. I was a bit surprised also when I discovered that consideration had been given to running a sewerage pipe from the Indian Ground, better known as Burial Ground, out to the Deep Water Harbour. I objected to this and felt it would be important to understand the Deep Water Harbour area when it came to the question of dropping anchors to come along side the shore, and I figured that the site in Emmerton would be the best site — cheaper — from the point of close proximity to the sea where it would be in the best interest of taking all the refuse that comes out and would improve the Emmerton area.

My colleague in the Ministry of Housing felt that the Emmerton Area should be improved as soon as possible. The people of Emmerton Area have to be making a request for help each time the rain falls. That area is a couple of feet below sea level and when we get heavy rainfall and we get water filling up the canal, this is one of the main problems because the sea water also runs into the land. Any time between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock in the evening when there is rainfall and there is any new moon or full moon, this would cause a lot of trouble in the area. So it is not that anybody without any interest is doing injustice to the people in Emmerton. There is a great consideration and humane consideration for the people living in that area. We have considered many times the question of making some improvement but the opportunity has never arisen and my colleague and I decided that we would kill two birds with one stone and put sewerage in Emmerton Lane and move out the people at the same time. This would not take up the entire area. I can assure you that what is proposed is not something to do any harm, but rather it is in the interest of the people in the area.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have heard very much about Emmerton and so much about the interest of Members on the other side, that it is astonishing that nothing yet has been done for Emmerton. However, I will accept the speeches I have heard and particularly the speech of the honourable Member for St. Michael North Central because we know that any of those on the other side will use any argument they can against the honourable Member for the City. Never in my years in the House have I heard such an attack couched in such low terms on the bona fides of another Member as I heard from the honourable Member for St. Michael North Central when speaking on this Resolution. One can well understand that this speech can be considered as a round-about, left handed way to put a knife in the back of the honourable Member for Bridgetown; a speech in which he does every bit to, if I may say so, spite him for humiliating him in the City in 1966. 4.05 p.m.

It was so roundabout that, perhaps, no individual parts could be categorised offensive although the entire speech was as offensive to a young man coming along in politics as it was possible to be in the circumstances.

Now, I want to deal with the honourable Member for St. Michael South West and, to some extent, the honourable Member for St. Michael North Central: the people who tell you what is essential and what is not essential. I am suggesting to the Minister of Housing that, if he believes he can get a Slum Clearance Programme passed by an International Financial Organisation under the guise of such a Scheme, he must think that the International Fund Organisation is as foolish as some of his Advisers to the Housing Corporation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I have never in my speech made any such suggestion. I have

said that we have an assurance that the Bank is prepared to put in a sum of money for clearing the site. I do not believe that I am guilty of doing something wrong.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am not accusing the honourable Member of doing anything. He must not think that, because on every occasion he is accused, he is now accused. It is extremely difficult to get International assistance for slum clearance. I want to use the honourable Member's words. He is now speaking in the genitive.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

What are you talking about the genitive?

Mr. ADAMS:

I have been away from school for a long time, and I have forgotten most of what I have learnt. He must correct me, Sir. The schoolmaster is there to correct his students in English construction and Latin verbs, and I can be corrected by the honourable Member for St. Michael South in that respect. I know that the International Financial Institution does not like the idea of destruction or relocating people. These are his words. The idea of destruction or relocating people leads us to support the Resolution on this side. Destruction of a community and the necessary relocation of people without something being done for them on the same spot is what we have in mind.

With regard to the Chapman Lane area, for a very long time it has been known that conditions were bad. There is a Report in 1946 of which the Minister is aware. There have been some amelioration of conditions since that time, and just before the last Government went out of power a good portion of the tenancies in that area was acquired by the Government for the purpose of improving things. This Government has proved to be the worst landlords in the area. Messrs Carrington and Sealy's tenancies have good roads; the houses are raised on groundsills and so on. You cross the road, walk between the tenancies and you will find two football fields that cannot be used at some times. The drains there, far from taking off the water, are throwing the water on to the pasture.

Sir, I am surprised to hear that there are only 176 houses there. I do not believe that the Government owns houses. I think the Minister means house spots.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there are 176 houses sited on Government-owned land. I do not like dealing in these verbal.....(Asides.)

Mr. ADAMS:

Sir, I am dealing with a Minister who likes that. He does not realise that he is insulting people. I am not going to call him a liar because he said that there were 176 houses. The Government has proved to be a worse steward of the land it actually owns than the private owners in the area. The honourable Member for St. Michael North Central said that there are 600 houses with two or three thousand people, but it does not make any difference to the honourable Member what he says. I would prefer to take the accurate figures given by the Minister of Housing in this matter. There is no housing area in Barbados with 176 houses on it. I am suggesting that there will be a problem in relocating 176 houses, or the people who were living on 176 spots. The people who live in the 176 houses and in the surrounding

dwellings will prove to be a formidable task to rehouse. I am sure that any Housing Corporation will find this to be a very formidable problem.

Sir, I ask the hon. member for St. Lucy and the hon. Member for St. Philip to agree with me there are many plantation tenancies which are still without any roads — roads that do not have to wait until a flood comes along to be impassable, but those roads are impassable whenever the rain comes down. There are no lights, water nor any means of facilitating access to people living in certain areas. I think that before the Minister thinks of the relocation of people, he should first deal with the inaccessible parts of Barbados where persons are living under worse conditions than the people at Emmerton Lane and Chapman Lane. 4.15p.m.

I do not like all these attacks on Emmerton Lane and Chapman Lane. I do not know what you call the idea which has been mentioned in here that the children of these good citizens of Barbados When they go to school are told by the Headmaster that he does not like people from Chapman Lane and they must go home and put on shoes, but the fact is that the people who live there have suffered from these insults. You hear all these hon. Members talking about slums, and they believe that something is wrong with them because they live in these circumstances. I do not like it, but the fact is that they are not the worst, and I believe that the relocation of Emmerton Lane or a plan for the relocation of Emmerton Lane and Chapman Lane will prove to be too great a load for the National Housing Corporation to digest within the framework of Barbados' general housing problems. I do not think it is the worst problem and I do not believe it is fair to the others all over the country in Barbados, and indeed in St. Michael as well to regard the moving of people from Emmerton Lane as the No. 1 priority. There is a priority to improve their living conditions. That is a priority within the context of life in the City and St. Michael, but I do not believe that throwing them on to the list of persons who must be housed at Government expense will solve the problem. Many of the houses are in bad condition and they are not going to be moved and become viable when they are moved. That is a problem to be recognised, and I am going to accuse the hon. Member for St. Michael North Central of something because I believe that the same motives which he ascribed to the hon. Member for the City in wanting to keep them there are present in his mind in wanting to move them. They would not support him, so let them be spread all over Barbados.

I want to deal with the sewerage plant itself. We have a remarkable debate in here in which there has been a total absence of genuine expert information on what is involved in a sewerage plant. I cannot take seriously that the Minister of Home Affairs believes that a sewerage plant is going to have pipes like the hospital pipes discharging raw sewage into the harbour or having the discharge in the bottom of the sea bed where it would not be so offensive. I do not believe that his colleagues can allow him to take that picture of a sewerage plant. There are others who know something about it. Why is he concealing it from the House? The customary sewerage plant as hon. Members who have seen such plants in other countries would confirm is not a system of raw sewage into a body of water. A sewerage plant is a system by which you set up large treatment areas, and you have large open areas where the soil wastes are separated from the water which carries them, the water is filtered one way or another or purified and returned to use and the solid wastes are pulverised and disposed of some other way. You should leave out the problems involved in returning treated water to rivers because nearly all sewerage plants return water that is very rich in fertilising materials, and when returned to a river, it goes to aid the growth of marine life. To my mind the Caribbean is a big sea and you can safely pump treated sewage water into the Caribbean. We do not catch fish outside the Cheapside Market, and if seaweed grows up out of the sea there, I do not believe it would do any harm to Barbados. I believe it would be a help because it

would prevent the high waters from washing ashore when you have stormy weather. I believe the conventional types of sewage treatment plants are what are envisaged and are suitable, but these plants need great areas.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not have to tell hon. Members what life would be like next to a sewerage plant even situated in Emmerton Lane if you lived in Fontabelle and there were treatment areas there where the water was filtered and the solid wastes left to dry in the sun. I believe that on a matter such as this the hon. Member for St. Michael North Central since he was the first to carry the torch, ought to be able to give the House some assurance of what type of sewerage plant is intended. Such plants occupy a great area and my believe is that the two things are getting confused — the need for a proper size area to accommodate a sewerage plant, and the need for doing something with Emmerton, and seeing Emmerton on the list has excited hon. Members on the other side.

Now I am not an expert but I cannot see that a conventional sewerage plant is out of place in a comparatively unpopulated area stretching from Indian River going north next to Berger Paints and the shallow waters which lie there. I am sorry somebody misled the hon. Member, but I understand that these outlets are not at bottom level. You put them on the edge, and on the harbour bed. I cannot see why, unless you took the advice of the Minister of Home Affairs, the idea of the sewerage plant at Indian Ground has been rejected out of hand, and when we asked for a public enquiry, it is because we want to see why. A public enquiry is not to ask the people in Emmerton Lane whether they want to move or stay. A public enquiry is about the development of the area. Is it necessary to move anybody to have a sewerage plant? Is it conceivable to have a sewerage plant within smelling distance of Cheffette? I am sorry the hon. Member for St. Michael South East is not in his seat. Is it conceivable to have a sewerage plant in smelling distance of Kensington Oval? I do not believe the Minister of Health knows either and I feel a public enquiry would benefit him as much as it would benefit me.

The Minister of Housing spoke about how fair and reasonable the questions which were asked were and his colleague outlined the questions to the House. What I know is that his colleague took a paper that could not be a Cabinet paper or a public document of Government because it was shown to the people of Emmerton Lane by people walking about and using it as a Questionnaire. I do not believe that is all that was in the paper read out by him and if all that was on the paper was read out, he would have produced it to the House instead of sheltering behind the fact that it is in his file,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to deal very briefly, because I do not want to even take up my full half an hour, and I would say like the Prime Minister.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. Member not to refer to what the Prune Minister said.

Mr. ADAMS:

I want to deal with the allegation about the offer of houses. These allegations are beyond doubt. I was present when a sufficient number of persons in the Chapman Lane area in my presence and hearing and to which I can testify in a court of law or at a public enquiry if necessary, told the hon. Member for Bridgetown that they had been offered houses at prices varying from \$4, 000 to \$24, 000. One person with very straitened circumstances said how she had been shown these photographs by a young man. She told him that she had an income of \$32 a week and he said it would cost \$27 a week to buy one of

those houses; and then she asked what were the actual prices and he said he had better not go in for the paper for fear it might frighten her, but he started to hold it up and on it were prices of \$18, 000, \$20, 000, \$24, 000 and \$32, 000. I do not believe that people would send us in here to confuse the Minister of Housing. The Minister of Housing can believe things like that about decent Barbadian people. I do not believe he could believe that people would stand up and tell Members of Parliament lies when the Members of Parliament are trying to get something for them. I have a better opinion of people's honesty. 4.25 p.m.

I have a better opinion of the people of Barbados than the Minister of Health has; I have a better opinion of the people's interest than the two of them; I am not like the two of them looking at people as evil scandal mongers; I even look at them decently and give them the benefit of the doubt wherever possible. The Minister of Housing put forward a case but he put it badly. What exactly was this so-called enquiry about? It is not a public enquiry because the questions which were asked cannot be exposed on the floor of the House. It is the Minister of Health's enquiry as far as I am aware. What were these questions which were asked? Did they touch on the problems of the entire district? We have always in here been prepared to say that the 'Emmerton area must be re-developed, not with \warehouses or anything like that, but so that some element of community life is lived there. We have never been against moving some persons who are not in a position to repair very bad houses, but we do not want catch-ons; we do not want an idea which has not been thought through to the end suddenly to grab hold of the young and inexperienced Ministers and carry the rest of the Cabinet and the rest of Barbados along with them.

I have heard the sewerage scheme is only for the City, Jemmotts Lane, Country Road and these areas, but all these things could have been talked about by the Ministers — not the Minister of Health — instead of indulging in cheap public abuse. This is why we on this side say that since we can only get it by debate in the House, more than any other way, we need an enquiry. President Nixon said he believed in open decisions openly arrived at, I believe in open decisions openly arrived at. We should have nothing in here to hide from the people. We are of the people and we believe in Government of the people by the people and for the people, and we should be prepared to accede to the public demand for an enquiry as to whether their future lies in the face of Government action. We are not a Nazi Government, we are not so far communist, and I very much urge those members who have spoken against it to change their minds and support this Resolution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member will note that Private Members' Time expires at 4.45 p.m. Is he ready to make his final Reply?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

At this stage, I beg to move that further consideration of this matter be now postponed, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I want to enquire, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the time comes when the hon. Member should make his

Reply and he does not utilise the time which is at his disposal now and is asking for the debate to be postponed, when nobody else is speakiig, if he would not lose that time. It is mandatory for him to proceed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

As I see it, there are 15 minutes left but that is not compulsory. The only thing that can happen is that it can be voted against.

The Question that further consideration of this Resolution be now postponed was put and resolved in the negative, the House dividing as follows:

NOES:

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES. Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES -12.

AYES:

Mr. E. D). MOTTLEY, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN -4.
4.35 p.m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a Resolution which calls on the Government, which requests the Government to conduct a public inquiry so that the residents of the Emmerton Lane area, Bridgetown, be afforded an opportunity for a full and frank discussion on the matter of the proposed establishment of a sewerage plant in Emmerton Lane, and also the question of the removal of the residents from that area.

Now, Sir, one of the Ministers implied in his speech that I did not want the people to move from that area. That, Sir, is completely untrue, and at no stage of my opening remarks did I say that the people should be moved or should not be moved. The point that I made, and the point that I am making now, is that rather than the Government just arbitrarily deciding that the residents of the area or community should be broken up, those persons should be given an opportunity to state their feelings in relation to the Government's plan to establish a sewerage plant in the Emmerton Lane area.

One of the reasons might well be as regards the public inquiry the suitability of the Emmerton Lane area for the sewerage plant. We know for a fact that the engineers' survey which has been done showed that in the order of priority the Indian Ground area was first recommended as the most suitable area, and then the second one was the Chapman Lane area.

We heard today from the Minister of Home Affairs that he objected to the Indian Ground area for reasons that he told us today. That in itself indicates, if nothing else, and even if the Minister of Health was to deny that the Indian Ground area was the one recommended first, that the statement of the Minister of Home Affairs supports my statement that the Indian Ground area was the one that was first recommended.

Now, Sir, one of the amusing things that we heard said here today and two weeks ago listening to the Minister of Health was the bad living conditions of the residents of Chapman Lane. I also listened to the Member for St. Michael West and the Minister of Housing tell us of the bad conditions of the residents of that area.

What I think all these admissions amount to is a total indictment against a Government that has been in power for some 13 years. Indeed it clearly shows that throughout that period of time they, by their own admission, have neglected this area and that they have equally neglected not only the Emmerton Lane area, but as the Member for St. Michael West has said, other areas in Bridgetown. They have completely neglected the area of Bridgetown as regards housing and urban renewal.

All that we are told about this site is that the reason why we must use Emmerton Lane is because in addition to getting money for the sewerage scheme, they may be able to get some money for urban renewal, and the Minister is not even too certain about it. He is not certain that he will get money for the urban renewal programme that he wants.

Now, Sir, it appears to me that the attitude is to do this in order to get the money necessary for urban renewal, and even despite the statement made by the Minister of Housing, the people of Chapman Lane and Emmerton Lane will have no say as regards their future, and the Government will decide arbitrarily to move them.

We have been told of investigations carried out by the Town and Country Planning Department. One would have expected that at least one of the Ministers in replying today could have stated something about the results of the inquiry carried out by the Town and Country Planning Department. What we find now is that the Government is deciding that in anything in regard to the welfare of the people in the community and the social and economic conditions, they are going to decide arbitrarily that the residents in the Chapman Lane area must move.

We have been told from time to time by Ministers from this House that an enquiry was carried out, and that the residents decided that they did not want to move, but that they preferred to live in the area if, to use the word of the Member for St. Michael West, the necessary infrastructure was provided in the area. That is something which the Government is aware of.

They were aware of it as long ago as 1969 when a debate took place in this House about improving the living standards of people in this area.

As I have said, when the survey was carried out, the residents of the area intimated to the Government that they would prefer to live in the area if they had better housing, better roads and better conditions generally.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The time for Private Members' Business has now expired. Government Business will now be resumed.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next Order under Government Business is an item standing in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning which he sought permission to deal with in all its stages today. It is a Resolution to authorise the Minister responsible for finance to borrow by the issue of Treasury Bills sums not exceeding \$20 million and such sums as may be required to pay off at maturity bills already lawfully issued and outstanding.

4.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. Thomas was speaking on this last time. He is not in his place at present. In the absence of other Members wishing to speak on the motion, I will put the question.

The Question that the Resolution be dealt with in all its stages was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Resolution will now be proceeded with, in all its stages.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I heard raised earlier in the day, the question regarding the increase in the Public Debt, and all I can say that I have heard coming from the opposite side is cheap politics. They say that we are increasing the Public Debt of Barbados. I am not surprised that we have to be exposed to and ready for these abuses from time to time, but I have heard a lot from the Leader of the Opposition about his interest in the Public Debt of Barbados.

I pointed out that the Central Bank of Barbados stipulated that the commercial banks of which there are now about forty, had to conserve a percentage of deposits as Cash Reserves with the Central Bank, on which no interest would be paid. I understand that fear has been stressed by some parties with whom the honourable Member for St. Thomas has some interest, that the Central Bank was going to close down the commercial banks and I have been amazed on the whole to hear the views expressed about the Central Bank by Members of the Opposition. I invite honourable Members to read the debates of the Other Place when the Central Bank Act was introduced and they will see the level of the contribution made by the honourable Members of that Place.

The honourable Member for St. Thomas always likes to play on people who are ignorant and do not understand these things, and I suppose he realizes that he does not elect to present the real picture. He does not elect on any account to present the real picture of anything that comes on in public life; rather, he considers it his duty as Leader of the Opposition to present unreal pictures.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is no point saying that the Leader of the Opposition presents unreal pictures. I object to that. The Prime Minister should rather say the Leader of the Opposition presents things in a certain light.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Very well; I withdraw unreservedly. He considers it is his duty to make real pictures look unreal. I regret saying that he presents unreal pictures because they do not exist so that is still what I call cheap politics. You alarm the people, make them think that they are on the brink of some monumental disaster, and therefore "if you want to be saved, cover your eyes and we will save you." So that when the honourable Member is saying that there is no money in the Treasury, he also wants to say that the civil servants are not being paid. 4.55 p.m.

When we come in here, we come to increase the Treasury Bills, say, by \$10 million. First, to get money, you have to borrow it. In order to borrow money, you must have people who are willing to loan you the money. We could not come in here with a Resolution for increasing the Treasury Bills by another \$20 million without knowing what we are doing when we have just had a Canadian loan for \$26 million; we had one for \$17 million and so on. One of my recently promoted Heads of Government, could not go into his Parliament with a Resolution for \$20 million, because he could not even get \$2 million. When we come in here with a Resolution, it means that people are knocking upon the door to lend us money.

Now Treasury Bills have a maturity of 90 days and people bid for them. We do not go out and say that we are issuing Treasury Bills and paying 10% on them. We say that you must put in a bid for them. Once you have a Central Bank Institution, the Central Bank will manipulate the money supply in the country and the rate of credit. There are two strategies which it is enjoying at the moment. The interest rate is a device for regulating the level of economic activity in the country, but it has been discarded in the United Kingdom since 1972-73, and the question of how to keep control over your commercial banks is very essential to this Resolution. The Central Bank in Barbados has stipulated that the commercial banks must, over a period of months, maintain with the Central Bank a cash reserve ratio of X percent of their credit deposits, taking into account their total commitments.

Now, the cash reserve ratio in the United Kingdom used to be considered at a level of about 8%, and the commercial banks in the United Kingdom were enjoined under the Treasury Bank Act to have a cash reserve ratio of 8% of their deposits. Let us use the term 'deposits' because it is easier to understand. In the United Kingdom there were five great Banks: National Provincial, Westminster, Lloyds, Barclays and Midland. The Midland was the largest of the Banks. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that they should keep a cash reserve ratio in order to prevent inflationary pressure on the economy by overlending. The five big banks got together and formed a plan. The Midland Bank used to make up its returns on Mondays, the National Provincial on Tuesday; Westminster on Wednesday; Barclays on Thursdays, and Lloyds on Friday. If you studied their balance sheets you would see columns for cash in hand; money at call on short notice, Treasury Bills and so on. Between these three you had to show that you had 8%, and then you went on to Government securities, other securities, and made up your balance sheet. The balance sheets were made up on five different days, since there were only five banks.

On Tuesday a man would drive a van to one of the banks and an officer would say: "Cash in hand so much and so on." It merely shows you how banks can operate. To all intents and purposes they would show that they had an 8% reserve. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer discovered what was happening he said that every bank had to make up its balance sheet at eleven o'clock on a Thursday. In the circumstances, the banks had to start showing the true state of their finances on that particular day.

What is the relationship between what I have said and what is in this Resolution? The Governors in the Central Bank in Barbados are saying that the commercial banks in Barbados must retain with the Central Bank at the moment 5% of their deposits and they will pay no interest on that money. This is how the Central Bank will be run. If there is a sum of \$200 million in circulation, the commercial banks will have to put into the Central Bank \$10 million in cash or its equivalent. The Central Bank will deal with them on a cash ratio reserve which will be retained by the Central Bank, and over and above that the Central Bank has ordained that the commercial banks must take out a certain amount of Government Securities. The most liquid form of Government Securities we have will be Treasury Bills which are repayable in 90 days, and these can be used as a second line of defence.

Now, if a bank goes broke, the people who have deposited money in that bank will go to the Central Bank and the Central Bank will be responsible for paying the people. 5.05 p.m.

Elementary lessons in banking is not my function here, I do not like to hear foolishness talked, so I like to go back to low primer and try to explain in words of one syllable what the position is. But you say now, how come you have \$200 million in deposits and you only have \$10 million in liquid cash reserve ratio. The answer to that is very simple. The banking system in Barbados and all over the world in which we live has grown up on a basis of Book Entries, cheques and promissory notes and things like that which are not really cash money, and the banks do not toil, neither do they spin, they do not plant or supply or force back, they do not manure or cultivate; they use other people's money, and every time you deposit \$100, 000 with any commercial bank, they create new money because they will tell the country that you have deposited \$100, 000, and you would think that if the cash reserve ratio is 5%, that they have \$95, 000 available for lending out to the general public. If the man comes back for his \$100, 000 and the bank is "bust" and the people to whom they have lent the money do not repay, then it means the bank only has \$5, 000 and the Central Bank should pay them back, but it does not work like that.

Let me tell you the secret of all these things and why we in Barbados should get our own institutions. Every time you lend money to somebody, it is a fresh deposit; so let us start a kind of chain reaction. Let us take somebody like the Minister of Home Affairs. When we get up to those kinds of figures, I am out of that deal. He goes in and deposits \$100, 000, and I go in and want to borrow some money from the bank, or I want to lend the Leader of the Opposition the money, so I will have a mortgage on his house. I am going to borrow some money from the bank. Theoretically the bank only had \$95, 000 because they have sent \$5, 000 to the Central Bank to protect his investment, and I go in and they say we cannot lend you \$95, 000 because that is all we have, but we will lend you \$50, 000. They lend me \$50, 000 and theoretically they have now got \$45, 000 to lend out, but this is not so, because when they lend me \$50, 000 I do not carry along a crocus bag and collect the \$50, 000 in one dollar of \$5 notes. I open an account with the same bank and as soon as I open that account with the \$50, 000, I have created another deposit for \$50, 000. Let me simplify it. Suppose they lend me the full \$95, 000, they will create a deposit of \$95, 000; so instead of having \$100,000, they have \$195, 000 and then they will have to reserve 5% of that, they lend out another, say, \$89, 000 or \$91, 000, and then have \$300, 000 and they can go all the way down to almost infinity; but of course when they get down to small amounts like \$1, 000, they are not lending; so in truth and in fact banks lend out ten times the amount of money they have deposited with them because of making book entries. That is why a 5% cash reserve ratio is realistic because for everybody that has a deposit, somebody owes the Bank, but the true pump primer has been the Minister of Home Affairs and he is the only man who has actually put in cash, and so if they lend out \$1 million and we say that your cash reserve ratio is 10%, that is \$100, 000 with the Central Bank to

protect the man who does not owe the commercial bank. It is not an individual bank; I mentioned a bank, but it is the whole system. If there was one bank it would work with one bank, but it works through the system because not everybody that borrows will deposit necessarily in the same bank.

That is how banks make money. They make money by charging interest on ten times the amount of money that is deposited with them, and it is not their money; it is your money, the money of the Leader of the Opposition and my overdraft, and every time they lend, they are lending somebody's else money and creating further deposits by the loans they are making.

Let us come back to the Treasury Bills. We have told the banks that they have to take out a certain amount of money in Treasury Bills. If we do not have the Treasury Bills available, we cannot get that cash in, and therefore we have reached the limit, since the Central Bank has been inaugurated, of \$25 million authorised by this House up to the end of January 1974, and we have 90 day bills which have to be re-issued and we have new bills and we have bills which the commercial banks want to take up, and therefore we have to have them available, and the only way we can have them available is by the authority of the House, because it is to all intents and purposes a charge on the public funds, but we have the money in the Central Bank, and from these cash deposits we do not have now to be in the ignominious position of going and asking Mr. Midland or Mr. Westminster or Mr. Barclay whether, since the civil servants raided the Treasury as they did last year of \$11 million and the amount of income tax coming in was only \$5 million, could we have \$6 million overdraft facilities? It is the duty of the Central Bank now to provide the ways and means advances of the Government, so we are now not only out of the hands of the commercial banks, but there will be no more sorrow, no more weeping and no more tears by the Leader of the Opposition, because we will never, if the House approves this, have to be in a position to ask any commercial bank to tide the Treasury over pending the receipt of taxes which people are reluctant to pay, and because of the systematic raids made on the Treasury by the public officers from time to time. I recommend Mr. William Demas' work on the Caribbean Community in which he said that public officers seem to think that all public saving is pre-empted for their account alone and not for the community. That is why we need the \$25 million and here endeth the first lesson.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, it was a most unfortunate day for Barbados when a so-called University in need of prestige recruited a person who, after all, although Barbados is very small, has been Premier or Prime Minister for a number of years. He likes dropping names and I can drop a little name to him. He dropped Harold Wilson's the last time he was in here. Mr. Harold Wilson and I have discussed in Downing Street how long the present Premier had held office, but it was a really unfortunate day when he lent his prestige to teaching because it seems that whatever happened to him at Florida has given him a sad and new way approaching this House, a didactic approach as if all of us in here are Latin American students with an imperfect command of English whom he had to instruct in basket-making or whatever it was the newspapers rather rudely said at the time.

About the story about the van driving around with the money in it, when he said the Fifties, it took me a little time and then I realised he meant the 1850's, something that happened before the 1870 Banking Act in England, because I first heard that story when I read a short story by the American short story writer O'Henry referring to banks in the American West when I was in the younger teenage range, and I do not believe that it had assisted us in here to comprehend what is involved either in Central Bank or anything that is involved in the Resolution which is before the House today.

The Prime Minister does have a way in the last three minutes of his speech of becoming relevant, a saving grace which I have had to admire on more than one occasion, and three times already today I have had to admire it because in the last two minutes he reverted to a traditional theme, a theme we have heard, I think, in every speech the Prime Minister has made for the last three years, that the public officers of this island are responsible for the troubles, all, in which Barbados finds itself. 5.15 p.m.

I gather from the last three minutes, which were the only relevant moments of what he has said about the Resolution, that we need to borrow the \$20 million in order to satisfy the public officers' raise.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, the honourable Member may not have been present, I never said we had to raise the money to satisfy this, I mentioned what Mr. William Demas said about public officers in the Caribbean as a whole, but their back pay was circumvented over 12 months ago. I never said we were borrowing this money to pay public officers, that is nonsense.

Mr. ADAMS:

I agree it is nonsense, Sir. Those who read the record will judge whether I have placed the natural construction upon the words the Prime Minister used or whether his denial is more a construction of the words. I am suggesting to the House that the association of the two ideas, the public service raise immediately followed by the next sentence of the Resolution was designed for one purpose only. It has been pointed out to me by honourable Members on this side that although it may seem that a long speech rambling round and round the bush and finally coming to rest just a little off the target by the Prime Minister should not be replied to, yet there are persons who listen to what the Prime Minister says and believe it, report it in sealed envelopes to emissaries of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation to hustle it into the News Bulletin at 6 o'clock. There are persons who accept what is said in the House and believe that it is important and relevant.

We are prepared to hear something about the Public Debt. We cannot hear about it in the Estimates because it is not discussed. The Charges of Debt in Barbados for this year are going to increase by something like \$10 million over last year's. This is the Charge of Debt alone. Where the House was asked to vote \$11 million to pay the interest on the National Debt of Barbados last year, this year it is going to be asked to vote nearly \$20 million, and the people of Barbados want to hear something about this. Both the Prime Minister and I, have today been trying to discover the Estimates which will show what the Public Debt was at the time this Government took power.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I will ask the honourable Member to speak for himself, I have at no time today been trying to find out what the Public Debt was when this Government came into power.

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point 01 order

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, He made an untrue statement and I was correcting it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have the right to reply.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I have the right to correct any untrue statement about myself.

Mr. ADAMS:

I have fallen into the Prime Minister's error to some extent. I asked somebody and I was told that the Prime Minister was searching for the particular reference and I believed it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

On a point of order, I will ask the honourable Member to say who told him that, because that person is a diabolical liar.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order, no point of elucidation, I deem that to be an interruption.

Mr. ADAMS:

The person who is present will judge whether he or the Prime Minister is a diabolical liar. I was not there. Getting back to the subject, the Public Debt of Barbados as set out by the forthcoming Estimates which were laid in the House today is \$107, 8 million. That was the position before the Canadian loan, so I take it that the Public Debt is now of the order of \$130 million if the Canadian loan has been taken up. It was back paid to September last year. The Public Debt according to the 1959-60 Estimates stood at the sum of \$12.7 million, and I will take it that it must have reached approximately \$30 million by the time that this present Government took power.

It is known that the Prime Minister is a supporter of an increase in the Public Debt. A statement to the effect that the Public Debt was a little bit small was contained in last year's Budget Speech. Other statements have been attributed to the Minister of Finance — I dare not say he said that, he would no doubt say that the Reporters were diabolical liars — to the effect that the Public Debt must go up and Treasury Bills are intended to go up from \$25.5 million, a most tremendous increase by any standard, and we see that the Estimates project an increase of nearly \$1 million to pay interest on Treasury Bills, so I presume that the fact of this Resolution must have been known at least as long ago as the Estimates were being prepared. This Resolution is being dealt with in all its stages today but the printed Estimates also show an increase in the amount of interest to be paid by Treasury Bills in the coming financial year which bears the same amount, so I believe that for some time it has been known that this amount was going to be asked for, but we have had a word from the Prime Minister about how he is retiring in about 15 to 20 years' time. Honourable Members cheered, except the honourable Member for St. Michael South and the honourable Member for St. Michael West, , and I dare say if the honourable Member for St. Michael South Central was here, he would have set up his face. 5.25 p.m.

I am sorry to tell the Prime Minister that in recent years, I have found him very hideous to listen to. I am trying to be calm and to say what I have to say. It seems that when he comes into the House of Assembly, he has things in his head, which he must talk about.

The Prime Minister talked about approaching deviates in London. I may say that I saw him with my own eyes approaching people, whom I think were deviates, and asking for support for the Democratic

Labour Party. I do not know who the deviates are apart from the former Minister of Education; anyhow I would not pursue that.

When it comes to commercial banks, I remember the Minister of Finance chiding me as a liar or a fool for suggesting that every bank in this island was different. I heard the Prime Minister say that some Member of the Opposition said that a Central Bank would take away the business of the commercial bank. I heard that my father said that the Central Bank would take over the role of the commercial banks.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I cannot allow the Member to tell lies on me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. Please take your seat. The honourable Member has the right to reply, and if there are statements that he wants to reply to, he can do so. Take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am taking my seat, but do not shout at me.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am saying that it is not a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS:

In the last speech that he made in here, he said that he was once insulted. It may very well be that the misunderstanding has stuck in his mind for a long time and now he wants to project it into other people's minds. That is not the way to conduct legislation.

This is a Resolution on which we on this side would like more information. This Resolution and the Addendum proceed on the basis that \$20 million is all that is intended to be raised. Members on this side have suggested that if we look carefully at the Resolution, you can borrow \$20 million and then such further sums over and above \$20 million as may be required. That is what I also understand.

Perhaps, Sir, in fairness to the House, the Prime Minister could tell us that \$20 million is the sum to be borrowed. What I would like to comment on is the reserves which the Central Bank is entitled to hold. There has been the question of money in the Treasury; but these are matters which have been canvassed at length. If the Prime Minister means to create lies told about him, let me refer to a lie told about me. I have never introduced legislation in this House about there being no money in the Treasury. That is another example of which the Prime Minister hears something and does not understand it.

His brain may be full of other things; but when there was the argument that there was no money in the Treasury, the argument was that the Government could not pay its debts. It was not a question of two or three Civil Servants not getting their salaries. Everyone knew that the Government was in serious financial trouble, and now the Government is borrowing its way out of that trouble when you read that substantial amounts of money have to be set aside every year to pay the interest on money borrowed on the Consolidated Fund and other sources.

It is a matter of knowledge that the General Consolidated Fund has been for years and years in a state of overdraft. The Loan Welfare Fund is still in existence but has been borrowed from by the Government to pay day to day commitments. In other words, money which the Government has in the Treasury is money which has been borrowed by the Government which has no money to equate unless it is prepared to have a new issue of Treasury Bills and arrange an overdraft with the commercial banks and devise new methods of taxation to meet their commitments not only for Current Expenditure, but for the development needed in Barbados.

These are things which we want to hear from the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance would know that the Consolidated Fund went into general overdraft. I have seen a report from the Accountant General that it went into total overdraft. These are things that concern the public of Barbados, which concern us in the Opposition. We have to tell it as it is. No one can say that the Opposition has not reported and understood that the Government of Barbados is in one of the weakest financial positions that it has ever been in. I believe that the Prime Minister is afraid of new taxation. (ASIDE: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW I am not afraid of anything). if I became the new Prime Minister I would be afraid to do that. I would be afraid to do things that would oppress the people of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

May I rise on a point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. Please take your seat. The honourable Member has the right of reply to the points made and you have the right to reply too. No point of interruption will be entertained. Let the honourable Member for St. Thomas carry on.

Mr. ADAMS:

All means of borrowing are being adopted by the Government. I hope that the Government is not thinking of the printing of money. My final point relates to the international position of the new Barbados Currency. Many persons are already worried about that. If exchange control is being imposed at this time in Barbados, I would point out that exchange control is a prerequisite when your currency is threatened. You do not impose it only as a retaliation against some other country which has imposed it.

In the case of sterling, it happened since 1971 when the question of negotiable sterling arose. When the Prime Minister said that London unilaterally abolished the sterling area, we are entitled to some explanation that now in Barbados it is necessary to see imports of \$280 million to \$290 million, an adverse balance of payments of gigantic proportions. This can only mean that any responsible leader of the financial position of this country must be concerned about the value of the country's currency. 5.35 p.m.

The Prime Minister owes it to this country to make a statement on the subject of devaluation as he owes it to make a statement on the policy of exchange control and new borrowing. The public debt of Barbados has increased tremendously. The people want to hear about the financial situation of Barbados and this is where the Prime Minister has failed in every contribution which he has made within this House within the last twelve months.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that this Resolution do now pass.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, earlier when I arose on a point of order, you enjoined me at that time that I would have a right of Reply.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

Yes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I am not having any controversy with Your Honour, but it appears to me that a Member of this House can get up and make accusations against other Members or can carry on some very strange conduct, and that the Member so offended, cannot get up and correct the record. That is what I want to say.

Now I have been in here, with the exception of the Leader of this House, longer than any other Member. I have been in here twenty three years — longer than any person in this House other than the Leader of this House — and I must say that it is regrettable that we have to waste so much of the public time counteracting the rather evil insinuations which are made by politicians. In the light of what a living person says about a dead person, the dead person is not in a position to defend himself, and the honourable Member for St. Thomas has said that his father told him — which is a form of hearsay of a dead man — that I told him, his illustrious father, that the purpose of the Central Bank was to put all the commercial banks out of business. I make no apology. I have never made contact or have I ever had any discussion with him about the Central Bank, for one reason, because it was irrelevant, and I deplore that any honourable Member would use a dead ancestor to give corroboration to ill-considered trivialities. I will have to make myself emphatically clear in saying that not only is he straying from the truth but straying so far out of sight, that I am dumbfounded. All I can say is, God help Barbados.

Now when certain occasions arise in another territory, that makes it necessary, it is my duty usually to send some kind of message, and recently I left instruction for a very simple message which would have saved the taxpayers a lot of money and which was in no way offensive because all it said was, "May God help Grenada." I would say that if the honourable Member ever becomes Minister of Finance in Barbados all I would say is, "God help Barbados."

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

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today's Sitting. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday next 12th March, at 12.00 o'clock noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Before I put the Question, the honourable Member for St. Lucy had intimated to me earlier that he wanted to give notice of two Private Members' Notices. With the leave of the whole House he may now do so.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of the two following Resolutions -

1. WHEREAS under the present severance payment legislation in Barbados, a worker 19 eligible for severance pay up to the age of 63 years;

AND WHEREAS a number of employers are dismissing workers who attain the age of 65 years without compensating them;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT an amendment be made to the existing legislation to prevent employers from taking an unfair advantage of a loop-hole in law and thereby depriving workers of their due.

Mr. Speaker, the second Resolution reads as follows:

2. WHEREAS the workers at Fairfield Factory in St. Lucy were severed when that factory ceased operations at the end of the 1973 sugar crop;

AND WHEREAS the workers have not as yet received their severance pay;

AND WHEREAS many of these workers are now without work and are consequently finding it difficult to maintain their families;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House take the necessary action to ensure that the severed workers receive the money to which they are entitled without any further delays;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a statutory provision be made to ensure that if severance pay due and owing to a worker is not paid within two months after a worker is severed, interest at the rate of 8 per cent per annum be added to the amount due and owing.

ADJOURNMENT

The Question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 12th March, 1974 at 12.00 noon was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 5.45 p.m.

