

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4th November, 1975.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 o'clock p.m.

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (Econ.), LL.D., (Prime Minister); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister Without Portfolio); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Mr. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); Mr. H. deB. FORDE, M.A., LL.B.; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology) and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A., (Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare).

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting for Tuesday, 21st October, 1975 have been circulated and are before you for confirmation. There being no amendments, these Minutes are duly confirmed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

I have received the Accounts and Statements for the month of June 1975 prepared by the Accountant General. They have been circulated.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) Order, 1975.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Scholarships, Exhibitions and Bursaries Regulations 1975.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations 1975.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I give notice of a Resolution to approve the sale to Miss Minna McCaskie of a parcel of land situate at Bridge Road in the Parish of St. Michael.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Regulations, 1975.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilization and Labour Welfare) Order, 1975.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Scholarships, Exhibitions and Bursaries Regulations, 1975.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$25,030 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of

the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76 No. 16 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Leader of the House I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to marriage.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Bill to amend and consolidate the law relating to marriage was read a first time.

MOTION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

4 WEEKS' LEAVE GRANTED TO HON. A. MORRISON

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to request that I be granted four weeks' leave of absence with effect from the 6th November to attend a conference of the Food and Agriculture Organisation in Rome.

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

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

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 48 is now ready.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the First Order of the Day.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 13

The Resolution for the sum of \$221,100 was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the amount of money provided under Head 23 — Queen Elizabeth Hospital in respect of Items 5 and 7 has proved to be inadequate to carry out the purposes for which the original provision was made, and this Resolution is therefore seeking the sum of \$221,100 to supplement that original provision.

Specifically in respect of Item 5 — Travel and Subsistence, a supplement of \$68,100 is being requested in order to enable the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to continue to provide the services under Travel and Subsistence. This is largely in respect of the provision of transport for medical staff, medical laboratory, X-Ray and dispensing staff who are on call, and also to provide for the kitchen staff who may be working on the late shift. The transport would normally be provided by the hospital but the vehicles during this period for which the amount is being requested either had not passed the inspection or were undergoing repairs and hence private transport had to be hired. A large portion of this money is a carry over from the previous year, indeed \$50,000 out of the \$68,100 is a carry over from the previous financial year. I would like to say that recently four vehicles have been added to the transportation fleet at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and this should bring about a reduction in the need to hire private transport.

As far as Item 7 — Utilities is concerned, the supplement being requested is \$153,000 and this is brought about because electricity expenditure for the year 1974-75 amounted to some \$68,368. 12.25 p.m.

Water bills from previous years, as far back as 1973, have recently been received and these are due for payment.

Mr. Chairman, the supplements for these two items largely arise out of carry-over sums from the previous financial year, and the services that are provided are necessary for the continuation of the service.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, we must be perturbed by the fact that such a large sum of money is being asked for to supplement an estimate where the cause of this is due to the fact that the original provision has been

exhausted and private transport has had to supplement the Hospital's resources. Now, \$68,000 is a lot of money, and I would have expected the Minister to give us some breakdown concerning the period of time to which this relates, and the first notification which had come to the attention of the Hospital Authorities that their transport was defective. Has this large sum of money come about because we did not, in time, provide adequate replacements for the Hospital's vehicles? Has this come about because the maintenance of the Hospital's vehicles had not been up to standard? If these are the two reasons, then it is obvious that the administration has not kept abreast with what has been happening in this segment of Hospital's administration.

It is a little difficult for the House to be asked to just disgorge money, from time to time, unless we know whether or not the administration has been functioning properly. I cannot believe that there was an overnight breakdown of transport at the Hospital. Certainly the engineers and the maintenance staff should have kept the Permanent Secretary properly notified of what was happening, and it was his duty, in turn, to keep the Minister notified of the necessity to either provide alternative vehicles, or to properly maintain the existing vehicles. What is the life span of the vehicles involved? Why were they not retired earlier? Why was there not the necessity for a capital vote so that this recurrent cost would have been avoided? Those are some of the questions on which I would like the Minister to enlighten the House before we can vote for this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not one of those persons who is a believer in the trend that the private sector is of necessity more efficient than the public sector because these are mere slogans used by people. From my own observation, it appears to me that the Hospital is too big for the type of administration that is operating there. There is a tendency in Barbados that, if something gets over a certain limit, the people who operate it do not seem to be able to handle it any longer. This petty-size concept has gone.

I go to the Hospital and observe certain things. I am not one of those men in public life who go to the Hospital, or other Departments, to interfere with the people working there. I do not believe in that type of ignorance. Because I am a member of the House of Assembly I would not go to the Hospital either to eavesdrop, or to interfere with the people who run it. I use my eyes. At a glance it appears to me that the

administration cannot keep pace with things up there. It appears to be something that has outgrown the type of administration operating there at the moment.

Now, \$68,000 represents a substantial portion of the total amount of this Resolution. I believe that in some of these Departments you are getting a breakdown. The Hospital started as a small institution, relatively speaking, and maybe the personnel cannot handle the operation of an institution which is now handling something like \$3 million. This is symptomatic of not only the Hospital, but other Departments in Barbados. As an example, if three airlines came to Barbados at the same time you would get a breakdown in operations because the people are not accustomed to dealing with so many people at one time. Everybody would panic, and you would get a lot of confusion.

Mr. Chairman, when I read of this \$68,000, in terms of the total Resolution, it seemed to me to be a sizeable sum of money to be handed out to people. Unfortunately, too many of these things are happening. I feel that, when things get too big for the administration to cope with, it leads to the breakdown which now seems to be more and more prevalent in Departments and you are having a lot of misdemeanours committed by people working in them.

I do not like to accuse people. Thieves like to accuse people of stealing. I do not like to do that unless I have proof. I am of the opinion that whenever there is a breakdown in these things it is a question of administrative inefficiency. From my own observation, it appears to me that the Hospital has grown so big that the people who administer the Hospital from day to day cannot keep pace with all of the things that are going on and that is a big problem.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, what worries me is the statement that a private vehicle was hired to transport the kitchen staff who worked on a late shift. Now, this is something very disturbing because there are quite a number of nurses who work on a late shift. I have brought to this Chamber examples of people who live in St. Joseph. I know, personally, two Nurses who live in St. Joseph and whenever they work on a late shift they have to hire a taxi in order to get home. I am now hearing that the kitchen staff is provided with transportation after working on a late shift. This seems to me to be a rather unfair situation existing at the Hospital. We are paying out this large sum of money for transportation when there are other persons who have to make their own arrangements for transportation to

their homes after working on a late shift. It certainly seems to me that the time has arisen when the Government should consider a full-scale investigation into the operation of the Hospital because of the numerous defects which are coming to light daily and show that the present administration cannot cope with the operation of the institution as it should.

12.35 p.m.

When one hears of the larceny of large quantities of the hospital's goods, and now one hears that vehicles have broken down or have not been able to pass inspection which I consider is a very lame excuse because if the hospital had the number of vehicles, it should have competent mechanics and they would know when to pull one off the road to get it ready for inspection and have it serviceable; but you do not wait until the very week of inspection and pull them all off the road and they apply to the Treasury for a large sum of money because the vehicles either did not pass inspection or were under repairs.

This certainly is not befitting an institution like the hospital, and I believe the Government would be looking in the right direction if they would have a fullscale investigation into the whole operation of the hospital and then come up with the sort of administration that would save at least some of this money which obviously could have been saved if the whole operation was under constant review by competent persons.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may just reply briefly to the comments which have been made. First of all, as far as the administration of the hospital is concerned I do not need to tell members that the administration of a large hospital — in this case a 600-bed hospital — is a very complex business, and the top administration of the hospital still consists of one director and an executive or chief executive officer, I believe; and my own particular view is that this is something to which consideration has to be given, that the administration would have to be strengthened to deal with the problems of administering a modern and complex hospital.

Indeed I believe there are three persons out in training in hospital administration and the intention is to strengthen the administration of the hospital services. I take the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael West about administration, but the administration of an institution depends largely upon the resources that are available to carry out the jobs of administration.

As far as the breakdown in the transport services of the hospital are concerned, as I

indicated, there are four vehicles, which were available for transporting patients and staff. All of them except one was over five years old and that one failed the inspection test, and one vehicle was out of commission since 1974 because of the unavailability of parts. This particular situation was realized and it is because it was realized that funds were provided by this Honourable Chamber in the current estimates for the purchase of three additional vehicles. These vehicles have now arrived and are therefore at the disposal of the hospital, which would mean that there should not be this heavy reliance on private transport to transport the staff who are provided with transport when they are on call or on the late shift.

I can give hon. members the assurance that I will consider the points that have been made and see how this particular service as part of the general administration of the hospital can be improved.

The Question that the Resolution for the sum of \$221,100 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 14

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution before this Honourable Chamber for the sum of slightly over \$30,000 I should assume, is non-controversial, and the addendum clearly explains the purpose for which this money is required, and, it is the sole part of meeting the needs of education at the tertiary level.

I assume that hon. members of the Opposition have read it, and they are all committed to this particular project. Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would not allow this occasion to pass without commenting in general on certain aspects of the administration of the University of the West Indies. I am going to make what I consider a very correct statement. The cost of tertiary education in Barbados at the university level has been unnecessarily magnified for the taxpayers of these countries by the political incompetence of the Leaders during the last few years. That is the statement I want to make, and by that I mean all the Leaders in the Caribbean.

It is obvious to me as a taxpayer in the West Indies that the expenditure on university

education per capita is one of the highest in any of the developing countries in the Caribbean. The reason is simply that the political Leaders have allowed political considerations to influence their approach to rationalization of a Caribbean university, and we are seeing more and more a duplication in each of the main centres, of facilities being provided.

Now the money for this must come from somewhere, and I hate the thought that we believe the money comes from Governments or from particular politicians. The money for this comes out of the people of the Caribbean and it is becoming intolerable at the moment to continue to under-utilize existing staff, to under-utilize existing plant, because of the fact that each of the territories wants to prove that they themselves have some particular faculty or some particular institution in the area. That is what is bothering me very strongly about this.

Now it is a fact that the cost of law in the Caribbean is terrific. Barbados was suggested as the headquarters for the faculty of law. It was necessary to have a professional training school as part of this course. The result is that instead of setting up the whole institution in Barbados we have had to set up a training school in Trinidad, and a training school in Jamaica.
12.45 p.m.

Now, this meant all kinds of ancillary services. It has meant paying a Deputy Director in Trinidad at a rate of \$40,000. It has meant the provision of library services. It has meant the provision of additional manpower to man these services, and all of this at a cost to the taxpayer.

We are seeing the same repetition in relation to the Liberal Arts Centre, and we have seen the same repetition in relation to Science. Now we have a call from Trinidad for a further devolution of the university to establish a Faculty of Medicine in Trinidad; and very soon you will hear that they want a Faculty of Medicine in Barbados itself.

Caribbean people must begin to be sensible. We must really stop this foolishness. We are the laughing stock of the world. We are allowing the concept of narrow nationalisms and sovereignty to guide our thinking, and we are making gross mistakes in this field; and the result is that the taxpayer has to pay for all of it.

A couple of days ago Mr. William Demas talked about rationalising the situation in relation to the University of Guyana. Why did Guyana slip from the University of the West Indies? It was

because they wanted certain faculties there at the time. Cheddi Jagan did not get what he wanted and therefore he formed the University of Guyana.

It is a fact that there are some classes that have one professor, a lecturer and other people to teach 10 or 12 people in the faculty. The only faculty in the University of Cambridge that has been so under utilised as far as I know was the Faculty of Veterinary Science formerly, and that nonsense has been stopped in that University of Cambridge which is one of the oldest institutions in the world. At the moment that university is talking about improving the number of pupils available to the teaching staff, not only for research; but we are duplicating, triplicating, quadruplicating and if we do not look sharp we will be sextuplicating — if I may coin a word for the occasion.

This is really not satisfactory as a West Indian. I cannot see how governments can sit down and go happily and preach at election time in Trinidad, Guyana and Barbados that they have brought university education to your door step without telling the people the true cost of this. I want to make it absolutely clear, in case I am misrepresented on this, that I believe in greater mass education at the tertiary level continuing not only for people who are going to get a formal degree, but at all levels of education. I want to make my position on that principle quite clear; but it seems to me that we are going about this the wrong way; because we cannot have a sensible rationalisation in the Caribbean.

I am begging the existing politicians. Those who are dead are now dead. I am begging existing politicians to be bold. Why must we be scare crows and believe that we have to go and tell the people on platforms that the only salvation to the country is that we must have a repetition of institutions in each place?

If Trinidad has a Central Bank, Barbados must have one. If Trinidad has an Institute of International Relations, Jamaica must have an Institute of International Relations. Trinidad has a Faculty of Engineering, so we will hear that Jamaica wants a Faculty of Engineering. It is the same repetition. There is a scarcity of resources, a scarcity of manpower, a scarcity of capital, and there is the hypocrisy of the politicians in believing that they are doing something great.

I personally cannot stomach it any more. I am becoming very cynical about the whole of the political process in the Caribbean which is driving people who have democracy in their hearts to

think otherwise. One has really become cynical of this approach to rationalising our resources, and I cannot sit down day in and day out and vote money for institutions such as these knowing that in honesty we are not telling the people to face up to a bold statement and to look at rationalising Caribbean Institutions.

Mr. Chairman, if I speak very strongly on this it is because I am really dissatisfied about what has been happening in this realm of our public life. I do not know how we will solve the situation at this time. *(laughter)* I said at this time, and I go on to say with the attitude of the present political leaders in the territories. I really do not know because I will be bold enough to submit that there is really no forward leadership in this sphere in the Caribbean.

The nationalisms that are being encouraged are a good thing only to the limited extent that they make people conscious of their identity; but we are encouraging it to be introspective in relation to the island territories when we should be really encouraging a true West Indian identity. Until we move to a true West Indian identity, the cost of living — used in the broad sense — the cost of living for people living in this area is going to be exorbitant.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was a little bit surprised that the hon. member for Christ Church West is pessimistic about this matter. He said that it is nationalism. I have my views about the West Indian University like him. It is not nationalism at all. It is the price of colonialism. We have been tie-footed colonials for 300 years and we do not know yet what it is to be free.

We are in a mad scramble to identify ourselves. The hon. Member spoke about identification. There is no real West Indian identification. What are you going to identify in the West Indies as a West Indian when it comes to this question of political identification? If you are in London, if you are in New York, if you are in the centre of Europe or in the Sahara where you are so far from anywhere in the West Indies that nobody knows any of the territories, then you will group together; but when you are back home you have been taught from the time that you are a child that if you are from Montserrat, Montserrat is the world.

It is conceit; and who is more conceited than the Barbadian? If you read the newspapers in Barbados that sometimes we are forced to read, have you ever seen more conceit that you are forced to put up with? You would believe that Barbados is the world waiting for somebody to write the answers to mankind. So you get this

overdose of conceit poured out not only from the ignorant. That being so, what do you expect from the political leaders who are only the reflection of the societies in which they live? The hon. member just now talked about St. Joseph. We are all in a large measure a reflection of what we want the people to send back. So we play up.

The hon. member talked about leadership. Leadership is a very serious quality. The hon. member knows that the UWI had this unfortunate background to start with. You had to start it with what you had, the political leaders that you had. Unfortunately, unless you believe in a coup, you cannot get rid of leaders other than by constitutional methods. Who is going to be the leader of the coup? *(Aside: Sidney Alleyne)*. We are talking about sane people. That again is the Barbadian cult. Barbadians can always find an area of laughter in madness. What we have in our community is that all the lunatics are those who now want to run the country.
12.55 p.m.

If you read the paper from day to day you will find a whole mass of lunacy that you have to put up with, and you are asking the community to accept lunacy as the norm. If you are operating on the basis that the best qualified person to run a country is a lunatic then you have this situation. All of the West Indian Islands decided that each territory must send to the university its own delegates to sit on this seminar. The reason for that is that they do not trust each other, and politics is a universal matter of trust. If you send a man from St. Vincent the man from Grenada is going to say that he is not a Grenadian although that has nothing to do with where we are going. You only have to hear a Barbadian speak and you would know where he comes from, there is no West Indian identity, and even in Barbados you get this parochialism which will tell you that he is from Carrington Village or from some other district that is noted for something that is not in the district from which you came. Everybody thinks that by knowing everybody else you have achieved something.

I think the University of the West Indies should really branch out. Unfortunately the area has a very small population in numbers and therefore it is going to be a small population for this kind of education. I remember some years ago — he is not a favourite of mine — but Sir Arthur Lewis made one of the first pleas that the university should branch out into wider areas and bigger numbers and bring more people into it than the few people it had at the time. At one

stage the university was no bigger than a full size Grammar School. It has improved, but the hon. member must understand there are other faculties. I have said already, not because I deal with it, that with a predominantly wage earning community there is no faculty at the university for industrial relations, so you are sending out people year after year with no understanding of what is going to be very vital to them, how they are going to live within their own societies or anything of this kind. The hon. member would think that you have to go to Cambridge to get it. All this is going to make up what you are.

The university has a lot of problems. I think that you will see this very clearly, that if you are finding it so difficult with a West Indian University, the hon. member who is a very strong believer in West Indian federation will see the greater problems if you force this federation. This university has been given to the West Indians, for practical purposes it was given to them and you see how difficult it is to operate a West Indian institution.

I went to Montserrat on one occasion and there was not a master in Montserrat to teach anyone mathematics at that time, the country was so poor and the human resources so few. One of the problems you have in the West Indies is that it is not a climate which understands yet that university education is not an education to provide any special area for people not to work in the society. In the United States and the United Kingdom there are thousands of people coming out of universities every year performing jobs in the community. Unfortunately there is still the tendency in these parts to believe that a university education is a separate thing from work and that is why I say a chair for industrial relations has not been created and it is not going to be created for a long time because these societies are gradually emerging into some semi, quasi, old fashioned concept that the only thing that matters is that if you give somebody a job it does not matter what you pay them, it is more important then to let them have a job.

I feel that the time has come that the university itself should try to reach out. When this university first started it had an Extra Mural aspect of the university life that was more vigorous in my view than what is taking place today. If we look back at the people who are responsible for the institute it does seem to me that the university itself can reach out into the community and touch more areas within the society than believing that the university is going to be in an area where you must walk to it. I feel that if the States are going to spend money on

the university the university should come nearer and closer to the people within the community and then we will see a real change and what the hon. member would hope for. Then we will see the kind of leadership we will hope for, but it takes time to create leaders. You cannot make a leader like you make a concrete block, it takes over 25 or 30 years before what you call a leader is created and that takes a lot of nurturing. Leadership calls for a variety of qualities and the university can be a very excellent means of assisting in building these qualities. It is not the only source but it can be the surest method for so doing, but here in Barbados and in the Caribbean we have a problem. The hon. member spoke about a problem he has to face himself. As long as you have Barbados as Barbados, Trinidad as Trinidad, Jamaica as Jamaica, all the islands as they are, as long as you have that you have these problems to live with and you could as well make up your mind that you are going to live with these problems. The hon. member said he does not know what to do, but you must now forge a means of changing these methods.

1.05 p.m.

We cannot change anything in the West Indies unless we change ourselves. These changes have to take place where you have authority in your own territory. If you want to see a change in the Caribbean, then you will have to begin with a change in Barbados. That is the whole concept of life. You cannot stand in the House of Assembly and ask Dr. Williams, Manley, or Bramble, to say something. You have to make conditions in Barbados to show people what we would like to have. It is no point making a repetition of what somebody said 30 years ago. What do you see today is the need for the University? Do you think the University is doing what it should have been doing? Do you think the University is reaching out to the people of the Caribbean in a different way from what the old Universities were reaching out to the people 500 years ago in the United Kingdom, or 600 years ago in France? They still have their problems that were going on for 600 years. Some of the revolutions we are seeing today are the results of some of the students in the Universities who are now revolting against the old institutions.

I am not as despondent as the hon. member about these things. I am an older man than he is, and I should be more despondent than he is. I have been seeing things for a longer time than he has seen them. If I believed in a change I would set about the change myself, and I do not ask anybody: What change do you think is good? I will set about to help create the change that I

think is necessary. One of the problems that I see in the University is that we sit back and believe that the University can create answers for us. We do not believe that we should tell the University that these are some of the problems we would like you to think about, instead of sitting outside the University and believing that whatever they tell us is good enough for us to accept. That is the mistake that people have made with this institution. Too many of the people in the University believe that the people outside are only waiting for them to open their mouths and they will accept whatever they say. That is not true.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I have taken note of the righteous indignation which the hon. member for Christ Church West has given expression to and for a very complex problem. I am surprised that he has found the simplest answer that the problem, or responsibility for the problem, within the University rests on the shoulders of the political leaders of the region. I think the hon. member realises that the problems which the University of the West Indies face are problems which all other regional institutions, or regional efforts, in the area face. There are fundamental problems. Like the hon. member, I am a believer that facilities for education should be provided at all levels in the country, primary, secondary, or tertiary, and that as many persons as possible who have the capabilities of benefiting and the motivation to benefit from those facilities should so benefit.

The problem in the Caribbean is not necessarily whether there should be a University. The problem is what type of University. If you have to contend in a situation of a regional project like the University of the West Indies where there are some 14 different contributing Governments — some contribute, and some do not contribute — you automatically have a problem. Because those Governments make a contribution, or are supposed to make a contribution, towards the finances of the University of the West Indies, they still ask a question which was posed by Professor Harold Laswell that politics is about who gets what, how, when, and where. This is a question which each territory, or the leadership in the territories, tends to ask: "We put so many resources in the University, and what are we getting out of the University?" The University's administration and the University as a whole finds itself in this particular position because, like all regional institutions, the leader and those who are responsible for formulating the overall policy of the University have to come to conclusions on

the basis of the maximum possible consensus at any particular time.

In other words, you get the representative of the Government sitting around a table to discuss a particular matter. Let us take the Faculty of Law, for example. Now, at the time the consensus that was arrived at was that the Faculty as such would be located in Barbados, but the first year's programme would be available not only in Barbados, but in Jamaica, Trinidad and Guyana. Now, that was the agreement arrived at at that particular time and, presumably, this was the maximum possible agreement that could have been arrived at under the circumstances. It would have been either that, or no Faculty of Law at all. It is not for me to judge whether the latter situation would have been the best situation. I would not speak on that particular subject, but the point I am trying to make is that, in a regional institution where you have more than one Government making a contribution to a particular service, each contributing Government asks the question: "What do I put into the University, and what do I get out of it?" Naturally, each territory has particular interests. The fact that you are in a region and is part of a regional approach to a problem does not necessarily mean that there is complete identity, 100% agreement, on the needs and requirements of the particular territory.

Let us take the present Resolution which is before us. This is for the Biology Block at Cave Hill. Barbados said it had a particular interest in the development of Biological Studies at Cave Hill, and it has been a very popular option for Barbadian students. We had to support this programme 100% in order to get the project going. This is one of the agreements that has been worked out by the University Grants Committee in the financing of the University. We have a special interest in developing training programmes at the post-graduate diploma level in education for the training of our graduate teachers who have not obtained a professional qualification. We wanted this particular programme set up. It was of particular interest to us because we felt it would improve education at the secondary level if we had our graduate teachers who had the academic training in their particular discipline, or subject, but who did not have the professional training regarding how to teach. We decided that it was an important matter for us to set up a programme, or to ask the University to set up a programme, for an In-Service Diploma for the graduate teachers who were untrained.

This fell within the scope of the policy of the University Grants Committee that where such circumstances existed, and there was good academic and policy grounds for the establishment of the programme and it was one in which other territories were not particularly interested, then the country that had a particular interest would pay 100% of the financing.
1.15 p.m.

This is what happened in the case of the diploma programme.

Now you could say that there was a programme going on in Jamaica, there was a faculty of education in Jamaica; but that programme up there could not do the job that we wanted done down here because this would have meant taking up the teachers out of a system when we could ill afford to lose them for the period of a whole year, because that meant that the students would be deprived of a large number of teachers going up on this particular programme.

So, Sir, we came upon the solution to that problem by way of the establishment of an in-service programme whereby the teachers would still be available to the system, in most cases on a reduced programme but their services would still be available to the school system and they would also be undergoing their professional training. That was something in which we were particularly interested.

So the fundamental question that has to be asked is, what type of university? Is it to be a centralized university located in one territory with all of the faculty and all of the teaching there, and an extra-mural arm reaching out into the territories, or do we have a dispersal of the faculties, the teaching programmes, the physical plan and so on in the most efficient manner possible? This is the fundamental question.

The problem indeed has been with us as far as the federation of the West Indies is concerned. It is a question of what is the maximum possible consensus that can be arrived at at any particular time, and a reconciliation of this ever present problem of those forces which on rational grounds try to get tight centralized service, and those forces which believe that there should be a dispersal. As it is put in other types of terminology, it is the conflict between the centrifugal forces and the centripetal forces. This basically is the problem which the university faces.

As far as duplication is concerned, if you come on the faculty of medicine or the faculty of engineering, or you have it in the faculty of

law, this is a question which each particular territory has to decide. The Government of Barbados felt it wanted a particular programme in biology and in education. These were two important areas; and within the framework of the policies we decided that those programmes could be put on, but we paid for them. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago is requesting that consideration be given to expansion of the medical faculty in Trinidad and Tobago in accordance with a study that had been done by the Inter-American Development Bank.

My submission, Mr. Chairman, is this; that it is wrong to blame wholly and solely the political leaders of the region for the fact that there are problems within a regional institution. I would submit that we need a much broader approach to that particular problem. It arises fundamentally out of the very nature of the Caribbean in which we live, not only the political situation, the economic situation and all of the other factors which have to come together in order to arrive at a decision; and the approach of the Government of Barbados in educational matters and indeed on regional matters, on regional co-operation, has been to try as far as possible, subject to the over-riding interests of the people of this country, to try to get the greatest measure of consensus in our regional institutions.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that a concept of the University of the West Indies, a concept which 30 years ago one could consider truly noble in the context of resources of the islands at the time, should at this stage, 30 years after, give birth to the disappointment and dissolutionment of the member for Christ Church West, and which I share. Thirty years in the life of an institution is a long time, and if that institution happens to be a university from which should flow the fountain of knowledge and experience — and when we look through the West Indies today we can see that the University of the West Indies has not made any impact in any field whatsoever in the West Indies. Look at it. Throughout the West Indies, 30 years after its formation the University of the West Indies has not been able to throw out a political leader. Thirty years after, if you should look through the West Indies, whether it is Barbados, Jamaica, St. Lucia or St. Kitts, the outstanding medical men are either from Edinburgh or McGill or Howard, and some of them have even come from Madras; even Madras; as far as Madras.

If you look through any particular field, even in agriculture, rarely can one claim they have come from the University of the West Indies. Even Trinidadians are claiming that the

Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture did more for agriculture in the area than the University of the West Indies since they had the faculty.

Do not blame the political Leaders. The problem is that the people who go in there to learn do anything else but learn. The people who go in there to lecture do not want to lecture. All of them want to run the university the way they think it should be run, and the leaders in the country do not have the type of support right through the university which they should have.
1.25 p.m.

I think it is scandalous that to educate a child in Canada in Agriculture costs less to a parent than it does to the taxpayers in Trinidad and Tobago. It costs approximately \$3,000 (Can.) in fees to do Agriculture in Nova Scotia, and it costs \$6,000 per student per annum to go to Trinidad and do a similar degree.

After 30 years, Mr. Chairman, has the University of the West Indies really reached down to the people in the street — to the poor taxpayer who could not himself go and send his child, to the man who would have liked to go? Has the university reached down and created an impact? No. Every now and again you hear about a sit out at the university. The taxpayer is paying the professor while the students sit out. While the students are sitting out the lecturer is sitting in and the tax payers are paying.

The hon. member for Christ Church West says that he is disappointed and disillusioned. I am too. He talks about the policy being a failure. It is a failure because people at the top in the university and the people at the bottom are the same, just as how democracy is a failure throughout the West Indies because the people on the Government benches are of the same social background as the people in the Opposition. There is no real difference. What real difference could there be rather than to let vested interests divide the people? That is the problem in the West Indies. There are no split policies; there are split personalities. It is so in politics and it is so at the university.

We cannot decide that there is no answer. We have got to find an answer. We have got to search and come up with an answer, and then if it is wrong we will have to correct it. There is a problem in the University of the West Indies and with every student up there. One only has to look at how they behave. You know why? It was a big thing 30 years ago to go to a university. You had to catch a ship. Somebody had to hold a farewell party. People had to see you off with a lot of crying. It meant something. Now the

university is down Black Rock. You turn the corner by Mr. Elcock and climb over the hill. It is near to Mr. So and So's breadfruit tree, but the cost is the same. If you go down to Trinidad the same type of thing is happening. It is just past Beetham Highway. You pass Hi-Lo and it is the place on the left; but the cost is the same. The people at the university have no respect for the people who are paying to keep them there. That is the problem we have to find an answer to.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I shall not be long, Mr. Chairman. Where the criticism of the university is concerned, my view is that it is not the time in a Resolution of this nature to deal with the criticisms raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West. Of course he appreciates that the UWI is not Cambridge or Oxford. I cannot think of any country in the world where a regional university such as the UWI is being operated. Therefore I think that he is just not being fair to suggest that political leaders are responsible for the present state of the university and for duplication.

Nobody in his right mind could seriously level that criticism at politicians, either for the present state of the university, for the unrest at the university or for the future development of the university. After all, we are not utopians; we have got to be realists. When we are operating a university with four independent countries, apart from colonial countries and apart from countries in association with Great Britain, and all contributing to the university, to level the blame on politicians is either fooling the public or not being appreciative of the problems in the institution.

I think that my learned colleague, the Minister of Health, who has had a long experience of the university very ably explained the situation and gave a true appreciation of the problem. The politicians have nothing to do with the university. We are all committed, and this Government in particular, because higher education in this country is due to the Democratic Labour Party. Cave Hill is the DLP's institution, due to the foresight of the Hon. Prime Minister. So do not let them get up and bustle in now on this university business. The Opposition had nothing to do with this. They did not have anything to do with free education much less a university.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. The hon. member may claim some plaudits for the Democratic Labour Party, but his historical facts on how the faculty came to be established are incorrect. The decision was taken prior to 1961

about the establishment of a faculty at Cave Hill. (ASIDE: Not so.) Go and look at the papers. Then the university's records are incorrect.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When I hear them jumping up and claiming credit I am amazed. When we talked about a school meals programme they were talking about mashing up pots and pans. When we talked about free secondary education they said it was impossible.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. This idea of mashing up pots and pans is incorrect. If my learned friend is talking about free school meals, they started with Madame Ifill and John Beckles since the 1930s.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All right. Madame Ifill is not the Barbados Labour Party. I am not talking about individuals who were motivated by some altruistic spirit. I am talking about the party to which he claims affiliation.

When I hear the hon. member blame politicians I do not know why he does it. We as a Government are concerned with how the contribution from working class people should be best developed in training manpower. When I hear the hon. member, I think that I give him more credit than he has claimed today. He knows that politicians have done nothing to create the situation in which the university finds itself. If the Prime Minister and the persons who were involved in university administration did not make the compromises that we had to make we would never have had the Law Faculty at Cave Hill today. Do you want a Law Faculty or do you not want it? There was a compromise because Barbadians did not appreciate that the whole training of lawyers should be in Barbados. If we did not make a compromise, advised by Barbadians who were committed and who were involved in university education over the years, there would be no Law Faculty at Cave Hill of which Barbadians can boast today.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way — the hon. member must try to understand the point that I am making. The point that I am making is that the decisions are made by politicians. Secondly, I am not levelling my criticisms at any particular politician. The hon. member seems to be under a duty to defend the Barbados politician. The point I am making is that politicians in the context of the West Indies make decisions to duplicate. I am not saying that it was wrong for Barbados to press for the Faculty of Law. I was saying that it

was unnecessary to have all the facilities here and then duplicate and triplicate them in other territories.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What he does not understand, simply Mr. Chairman, is that if the islands in the Caribbean are contributing in different proportions, where Jamaica is paying so much, Trinidad is paying so much, somebody is paying a half of one per cent and somebody is paying two per cent, then the politicians who are asking the taxpayers in the individual territories for money must at least justify to their electorates that they are getting something for it.

He is talking as if in the region everybody is contributing 10 per cent and so everybody should have an equal share in what is happening. Whether it is shipping, whether it is meteorology, whether it is any other regional institution, as my colleague said the individual leaders have got to satisfy the people from whom they get money for this institution that they are getting something in return.

We are contributing to the hospital of the UWI. Who benefits from the UWI hospital? Unless we have a rare case in Barbados which cannot be treated locally and we have to use their facilities, 99 per cent of the people in casualty are Jamaicans; 99 per cent of the people in surgery are Jamaicans; 99 per cent of the people who are getting tests of all sorts are Jamaicans; but Barbados contributes. That is the problem with a regional institution, and this UWI hospital is unique throughout the world.
1.35 p.m.

It is unique, so when I hear him blaming politicians, saying that the politicians are responsible for the fragmentation, the duplication and whatever "ation" he feels to add, it is not fair. We are prepared to take blame, but it is not fair. The time will come when this Government will make a complete and clear statement to the public of Barbados on our views on the institution, on our views for reforming the institution and what we feel of the institution and the way in which we think the institution should go to meet the needs of the public of Barbados. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that this resolution for the biology block is not the right place to start a debate on the whole university, because time does not allow us to deal with it and explain it in detail. The member for Christ Church West is saying nothing new, because everything the university has been doing for the past 15 years has been in the hands of the Democratic Labour Party and we are

completely aware of what the problems are and what the future of this institution should be in the interest of the public of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not regard this as a general examination of the function, purpose and direction of the University of the West Indies. This is a simple Resolution to provide the counterpart funds from the Government of Barbados due to the grant which was made to the British Government. The reason why this is peculiar to Barbados has been fully explained by the Minister of Health who was familiar with the setting up of the Department of Biological Sciences at the University at Cave Hill when the other Governments in the region were unwilling and reluctant to provide this expansion. Both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education have explained that the university was established in 1948, quite likely with a faculty of medicine and an intake of less than 40 students, because the provision of adequate medical services for the people in the Caribbean — the health problem quite apart from the employment problem — was the major problem in the area at the time. More than 30% or 40% of the people occupying the higher posts in the health services of the region were people from outside the region.

I want to say that right now there are about 400 properly qualified students applying for admission to the Department of Medicine in the university every year and we have only been able to admit 25% of these, so the doctors throughout the region are earning inflated salaries quite out of proportion to what the other professions are earning in the West Indies largely due not to any super skills which they possess but due to the fact that there is a shortage of doctors in the region. There are 140 doctors in a population of about 250,000 people. The situation in dentistry is worse because there are 10 or 11 dentists to the same size population, so if you multiply that by 13 there is a dentist to every 25,000 people in Barbados. The university has no faculty of dentistry at all.

As far as the law faculty is concerned, the Barbados Government's delegation had a long drawn out battle with other territories and we felt that since Barbados was making a substantial contribution to the university that at least one faculty should be here and not merely a glorified community college, qualified teachers with B.A. degrees to teach low primer as happened in Trinidad. People in the teaching profession were using the College of Arts and Sciences to gain degrees mainly to increase their personal incomes at the expense of the Governments because the

Governments had a policy that once you were qualified you got paid on the graduate scale when you were only teaching low primer. It is for this reason that the Council of the University of which I was a member — the Minister of Education is a Council member now — set up and Appraisals Committee after the university had become an independent institution to see how the university was meeting the requirements of the region and whether it was merely providing its function and not just a vehicle for persons to increase their incomes at the expense of the Governments. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, one of the first meetings of the Appraisals Committee, a Committee which was evaluating the function of the university and the requirements of the region, met right here in this Chamber on a Saturday morning over 10 years ago as far as I can remember. The Appraisals Committee set out certain priorities, the teaching of dentistry was one, the expansion of the medical teaching facilities was another, the establishment of a faculty of law, the establishment of a school of forestry in Guyana if possible, and so on, and also the provision of university presence in the lesser developed territories, not full university faculties or campuses but such facilities as Extra Mural Departments in the non-campus territories, the three campus territories being Mona, Cave Hill and St. Augustine in Jamaica, Barbados and Trinidad respectively.

Some of those things were carried out at great cost to the contributing and paying Governments — because you have to divide the Governments into two categories, those who contribute to the idea of the university, attend all the meetings and talk quite a lot, and those who pay. To boil it down, the university is being supported by four Governments, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, the Government of Jamaica, the Government of Barbados and the Government of the Bahamas which at the moment gets very little in return for its generous contribution not only to the university but in its own way to the whole concept of Caribbean economic and social integration.

1.45 p.m.

Now, I have heard, or I have read that they are calling for my withdrawal from the Chairmanship of the University. I think I ought to explain what is the position. This is a non-paying post to which I was appointed by the Heads of Governments. It is an inter-governmental institution. When the then Prime Minister of Jamaica, Sir Donald Sangster, unfortunately passed away I succeeded him as Chairman of the University Grants Committee.

The whole concept of the University Grants Committee was based on the need for having an institution in which we did not have to go back and have debates in every single Parliament on what the University should do, but which would have full governmental authority.

The British Government, at the time when I was appointed, had about thirty-three Universities to cater for. The British Government hit upon the device of appointing a University Grants Committee, politically appointed, to examine the requirements of the thirty-three or so University Institutions they then had in the United Kingdom and to allocate a given sum of money between those Universities bearing in mind the regional requirements such as the need for technological bias in places like Leeds and Manchester, and the humanities in Oxford Cambridge, and the out-turn of the people who were to run the old and the new economic order from London Universities throughout the world. The Technocrats in London, the Physiocrats maybe from the older University, and the Mercantilists from Birmingham, and the engineers and so on from Leeds and those places. Bearing all of that in mind, there was a block grant in the Estimates of the United Kingdom which was given to the University Grants Committee, and the Grants Committee had the pleasure of the criticism, or praise, from the several Universities as to how those grants were allocated. The Government did not come into the matter. The Government did not say that Oxford should get more than Leeds, or Manchester should get more than Birmingham. I told the Chairman of that Committee some years ago: You have a very simple problem. You have 33 Universities, but only one Government with which to deal. I have only one University, but 14 Governments with which to deal.

Now, this is the problem. The University does not have any large contributions coming from any millionaires or millionaire benefactors. We started a Princess Alice Appeal Fund, which is minimal when taking into consideration the requirements for tertiary education in the Caribbean region as a whole. You can almost say, without fear of contradiction, that 100% of the recurrent expenditure of the University is borne by the Governments of the region. The proportion starts with Jamaica paying probably the largest proportion; Trinidad and Tobago will be next: the proportions being roughly, let us say, 42%, 36% to 38% for Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados between 11% and 12%. You can see that 42% and 38% is 80%, and our 11% is 91%, and all of the rest only pay 9%. It is only for the reason that they should pay such a small proportion of the total cost of running the

University that we have been able to survive, because they do not pay anything.

Now, the Appraisals Committee, which was established at the behest of the Governments, drew up its priorities, but we have not been able to do any expansion to the University because the Governments have not been able to support the existing facilities at the University. We have been concerned with the continuation of existing activities and consolidating the activities at the three Campuses over the past six years. Apart from the Faculty of Law, we have introduced no innovation; we have not expanded the medical facilities in the way that we should have expanded them, but to this end we have secured a loan from the Inter-American Development Bank for the expansion of the facilities in Medicine and Engineering.

On the other side of the picture, when we talk about providing things that are expensive, for a long time Agriculture was below what was considered a reasonable student/staff position. There were fewer students than we should have had. We were overstaffed in Agriculture, but this year we have had to turn back people in Agriculture. As a matter of fact, a lot of young women are getting interested in Agriculture, and we have been able to recruit some of the female graduates from the Faculty of Agriculture in Trinidad.

Let me go back to my Committee. The students do not appoint me, and, therefore, they cannot dismiss me. The Barbados Government do not appoint me, and they cannot dismiss me. The management of the University do not appoint me, and they cannot dismiss me. The University Grants Committee was set up in 1962 at the Common Services Conference at the same time that the Regional Shipping Council and the Meteorological Council were set up. In other words, the Conference which we attended under the chairmanship of Sir Stephen Luke in the Federal House in Port of Spain in 1962 was the Conference that took care of what institutions the Governments considered should survive the Federation on a continuing basis and on a regional basis, and the University of the West Indies is one of them. The money called the mandatory levy — we paid about \$1 million towards that. We paid roughly 10% — used to be paid into the Federal Government, and the Federal Government used to take care of the Common Services, whether it was the Shipping Corporation, the Federal Ship, the Meteorological Services, or the University of the West Indies. The Barbados Government paid one lump-sum contribution to the Federal Government, and

then the Federal Government, whatever little it did, redirected the money to the various institutions which were of a regional nature. It may be the Selsmic Research Unit, the University, the Shipping Corporation, and the Meteorological Services, etc. I do not want to go through the list at this stage.

In Port of Spain in 1962, when Sir Stephen Luke was there, we went through all of the Common Services. We tried to salvage some services because, obviously, some of the services were truly regional institutions, including the College of Tropical Agriculture and so on. Now, that Committee was comprised of Ministerial representatives of each contributing Government. Are you saying something to me, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am replying on behalf of the Government. I can talk as long as I want to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Standing Order states that in Committee of Supply every hon. member has the right to speak for 15 minutes, and the person who takes charge, which would be the Minister, has the right to reply to any statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I am replying for the Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has already replied.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution is in the name of the Prime Minister of Barbados. Whose name do you think it is? If you do not want to hear me, are you going to allow the hon. member to get up and make a lot of wild statements — the *Advocate* takes care of suppressing the Government's point of view. It is not the duty of the Chairman to suppress the Government's point of view.
1.55 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is in my name and I reserved the right to put the Government's case, and I am replying and winding up the debate on the part of the Government. (*Asides*) If you are going to take orders from over there let me know early. I will sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I want to know. May I ask a question? Is the

Resolution in my name? Am I entitled to reply to my own Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Minister had introduced the Resolution and hon. Members had spoken, and the Minister got up and replied; you as an hon. Member in this Chamber, were given the option as I would have given any other hon. member in Committee of Supply, to speak for fifteen minutes.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, the Resolution is in my name and I am replying on my own Resolution. The Minister was not replying for me. The Minister could speak as many times as he wants to speak in Committee. The Resolution is in my name; It is my Resolution. Mr. Chairman, any Minister can reply, but this is my Resolution. Are you saying that I cannot reply? I got up to wind up the Resolution. This is a financial Resolution in the name of the Minister of Finance, and in case you did not know Mr. Chairman, I am the Minister of Finance; nobody else in here is the Minister of Finance. I have not been disorderly. I have been trying to explain to hon. Members the true position, to wind up the debate, and you are telling me that I cannot speak. That is what Barbados is coming to.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I give my interpretation of the Standing Orders — I do not hear from any person inside here, when I sit in this Chair. I rule according to the Standing Orders. If you had introduced the money Resolution it would be your option to wind up.

This is a precedent in this Chamber. This is a very unfortunate situation that has taken place inside here today, because I am well aware that the Standing Orders for the debate on Supplementary Estimates stand all through the Session. I have already ruled, that every hon. Member has the right to speak for fifteen minutes; every member except the introducer of the Resolution.

Now this is one of the things on which the Standing Orders are silent. As far as I have read in the Standing Orders, I know that where a Bill is concerned, that after the Minister has replied, no other hon. member can speak. That is not the position in Committee of Supply.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. The Resolution on the Order Paper stands in the name of the Minister of Finance. I got up and spoke. I did not ask for leave to deal with it on his behalf so I have not robbed him of his right to speak as the Minister of Finance.

I got up and spoke but I did not ask leave of this House to deal with it on behalf of the Minister of Finance, and therefore I cannot rob the Minister of Finance in whose name on the Order Paper the Resolution stands, of his right to speak for the Government.

I do not introduce anything. It is in the name of the Minister of Finance and if I speak first and I wanted to take over I should say 'Mr. Chairman, this Resolution stands in the name of the Minister of Finance, it is a money Resolution and I seek leave to introduce it or speak on it.' Check the debate. I did not do that; so by not having done that, I cannot rob the Minister of Finance in whose name the Resolution stands on the Order Paper, of his right as the Minister of Finance, to deal with a Money Resolution.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member will sit.

The time now being 2 o'clock, I will now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You are going to ask for leave to sit again, when? In December? not today.

Mr. Chairman reported progress and asked for leave to sit again.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and suspended the sitting until 2.45 p.m.
2.05 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. Deputy Speaker took the Chair at 2.45 p.m.

Mr. LOWE: I draw to your attention that there is no quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

QUESTION TIME

QUESTION RE STREET LIGHTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Question No. 48 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker — To ask the Minister of Communications and Works: 1.

Is the Minister aware that the residents of Headley's Land, Deacons Road and Crab Land, St. Stephens, are without street lighting?

2. Will the Minister take the necessary steps to have street lights installed in the above areas as soon as possible?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works I will give the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 48. The Reply is as follows:—

The provision of street lighting at Headley's Land, Deacons Road, Crab Land, St. Stephens have been included for consideration in the Ministry's street lighting programme in the current financial year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There being no supplementary, that brings us to the end of Question Time.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 1 under Private Members' Business stands in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church West be the next order of the day.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant order of the day.

THE BILL TO INCORPORATE THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF BRIDGETOWN —KINGSTOWN

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to incorporate the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Bridgetown—Kingstown. This Bill has become necessary because of the creation of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Bridgetown—Kingstown in 1970 and the assumption of this office by the Rt. Rev. Anthony Dickson in 1971. Prior to the creation of the new Diocese, the property was held by the Roman Catholic Bishop of St. Georges in Grenada.

The Church's solicitors have drafted this Bill, and the trustees for the Roman Catholic Diocese have through their solicitors also indicated their acceptance of the draft. There are some amendments which it will be necessary to make. They are mostly typographical errors which I will be asking leave to deal with in Committee.

I think that everyone is aware of the contribution made by the Roman Catholic Church in Barbados and the work that it is doing in both Barbados and St. Vincent, particularly in the field of education and social work. I also think it is true to say that more and more of our people have become Roman Catholics; and I think that this Bill should have the sanction of all hon. members.

I am asking hon. members to agree to the passing of this Bill. I have spoken to the Hon. Minister responsible for Ecclesiastical Affairs and suggested to him that although this is a private motion, that certainly any committee set up by this House should be chaired by him as Minister responsible for Ecclesiastical Affairs.

I believe, Sir, that the Bill is non-controversial and I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that further consideration of this Bill be now postponed.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps the Minister could indicate why. I would ask that the Bill go to a Select Committee, and any Committee set up could have a look at the Bill. It will be some time before the Committee meets. The Committee, I suggest should be composed of the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, the hon. Member for Christ Church East and the hon. Member for St. Michael North Central from that side, and the hon. Member for the City of Bridgetown and myself from this side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion before the House is that further consideration of this Bill be postponed.

Mr. FORDE: Could the Minister give a reason? Otherwise I will move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed of the members I have mentioned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is only one motion and that is the one moved by the Hon. Minister of Education.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 under Private Members' Business standing in the name of the hon. Member for Christ Church West be the next order of the day.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

THE BILL TO REVISE THE LAW RELATING TO DEFAMATION, MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD AND CRIMINAL LIBEL

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 6 under Private Members' Business is the instant order of the day.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, those of us who are familiar with Shakespeare would recall the sentiments expressed in Othello:—

"Good name in man and woman, dear my lord, Is the immediate jewel of their souls; Who steals my purse steals trash; 'tis something, nothing; 'Twas mine, 'tis his, and has been slave to thousands But he that filches from me my good name Robs me of that which not enriches him And makes me poor indeed."

That was Shakespeare talking about the necessity of maintaining the good name of persons. One of the ways in which one does this from time to time is by ensuring that there are facilities in the law to control the publication of defamatory words. The purpose of the Bill which I am introducing this afternoon is to revise the law relating to defamation, malicious falsehood and criminal libel.

In Barbados the legislation dealing with this matter is contained in the Defamatory Words Act of 1906. Since that time there has been no amendment of the law dealing with defamation in Barbados, so that any student of the law of libel is forced to look at the common law as it existed in the United Kingdom for a long time and which has been inherited by this island, as well as the Act which was consolidated in the year 1906.

3.00 p.m.

Essentially this Act is based on English legislation of the late 19th Century, and since that time in England the libel laws have been amended substantially in 1952, and currently there is before the United Kingdom authorities a report called the Fawkes Report the aim of which is to amend still further the law dealing with libel. I think one can say without a doubt that the law of libel in Barbados is in many respects archaic and it does not help to keep the judicious balance which it is necessary to preserve between the reputations of persons and the right of freedom of speech. As a result we have had judges of the courts in this Island as well as other persons interested in freedom of speech talking about the limitations which exist on the law of libel in Barbados. For instance, if I may explain one of the limitations, spoken defamation is treated differently in law from written defamation. Spoken defamation is known as slander and except in very limited circumstances to bring a man for slander one has to prove special damage and it is open to a person to abuse one very officiously and yet there is no redress given to the subject.

Likewise there is considerable confusion in relation to broadcasting. Of course when the rules of common law were fashioned broadcasting was not a thing known at all either in fact or to the law, and so it was said that what a person in speech over the wireless telegraphy utters is merely slander but what is written and what he writes would constitute libel, and this legal distinction has caused a lot of difficulties before the courts. To put the matter in doubt the United Kingdom in 1952 amended the Act to make broadcasting matters subject to libel actions as such distinct from actions for slander. In addition one found in defences in the law of libel that there is a lot of difficulty sometimes in being able to establish a proper defence. If I may give one instance, a person who disseminates a libel like a news vendor is able to argue that he had no knowledge of the libel and that he had taken all steps within his power, all reasonable steps not to be a party to the libel. This is the defence broadly speaking of defamation, but this defence is not available to the printer of libel. Again in the United Kingdom and in most of the forward looking Commonwealth countries steps have been taken to change this situation.

Likewise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, at present in our law if there are three persons defamed and they have commenced actions before the Court to vindicate their good names, one of those persons dies whilst the action is pending damages can only be awarded to the two who

are left and not to the one who has died. I have had the opportunity, if I could put it that way, of appearing in a libel action in this Island on behalf of the late junior member for the City, Mr. Louis Lynch, in which he died before the action was adjudicated and the action on his part had to be discontinued because with his death the action fell to the ground despite the fact that it was necessary to vindicate his name in such circumstances. One of the innovations of this Bill would be to ensure that there is the continuation of an action even after the death of the person defamed, but the Bill goes further and I seriously urge to this Hon. House that it has a good Bill of merit in its provisions.

It gives to deceased persons the right to bring an action for declaration concerning the character of a person who has died. In other words, if a person is defamed and dies his executors can bring an action for declaration to vindicate his good name. In such a case the Bill does not seek to give the executors the right to damages, it does not seek to do that at all and I think this is proper because the executors should not benefit in a monetary sense from actions for defamation, but even a dead person is entitled to his good name once he has had that good name whilst alive. Likewise I have taken the opportunity in this Bill to state that a single publication could give rise to only one cause of action. Those of us who are lawyers are familiar with the concept of the legal innuendo so that if one publishes a statement about a person that person can get damages not only about that statement in its ordinary and natural meaning but in its extended meaning if you can bring extraneous facts which when coupled with the publication itself shows that there has been another legal action or another cause of action in those circumstances.

Current thinking is that this is wrong. The result has been in some countries that in relation to the libel being treated on its merits you are finding that one publication has given rise to 7, 8 or 9 different heads of claims and of different libels, and therefore increasing the damages which have been available, and a review of legislation as I have done in France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America shows that the current trend is to limit this right so that you have your cause of action, your character can be vindicated, you are entitled to substantial damages but they are not so aggravated that you are getting more than is your due, and I would strongly suggest that this amendment is very necessary in our law of libel.

I have taken the opportunity to renege the defences of truth and fair comment as the defence of justification and fair comment is the defence of truth and the defence of comment. The Bill does not seek to get rid of these defences but it seeks to upgrade them. At present there are some very fine distinctions in the law of defamation which sometimes mean that a person can lose an action simply because he cannot prove every lot of the facts on which his comment is based, while he can prove the substantial part of the allegations and the things he cannot prove may not be material at all. What this Bill seeks to do is to clarify the law in this respect and to give added protection in such circumstances to people.

3.10 p.m.

I have taken the opportunity to widen the categories of proceedings in public which are to be protected by absolute or qualified privilege, and it would be of particular interest to the House to note that, for the purpose of clarifying the law, the Bill declares that the proceedings of this House are subject to absolute privilege. It is most material that this should be clarified. Likewise, live broadcast of this House will attract absolute privilege. It is but proper that if a broadcast goes from this House live that, in the interest of damaging the freedom of hon. members to speak and the liberty of the subject and the right of the subject to his privacy and good name, there should be freedom of speech granted to Members of Parliament. It is expected, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will ensure that hon. members will follow the Standing Orders of this House, which also seeks to protect the good names of people who are not members of the House or may well be members of the House themselves. The House has some control over what is said and what is done in the House, but at the same time one would not like to put limitations in the way of hon. members to prevent them from speaking on matters simply because they are afraid of an action for defamation.

Now, I would respectfully suggest to this House that a live broadcast merits different treatment in the law of libel from a broadcast which is a re-broadcast of what has happened in the House, because in the meantime the station would have had an opportunity to consider the nature of the statement made and an opportunity to edit. Again, I would like to refer to the type of treatment one finds in Commonwealth and other countries on this subject who have accepted that the two situations should be treated differently. It is not that the re-broadcast loses any right of protection. It has the right of protection by way of qualified privilege, but

where there is malice in the proceedings in such circumstances, then that right to qualified privilege may well be lost.

I have also taken the opportunity in the Bill to abolish the distinction between actions for libel and actions for slander. It is only in Section 19 that a certain limited number or category of persons would have to prove special damage to succeed in an action for defamation. Other than that it would no longer be necessary to prove special damage. One of the complaints of the Press is that juries and judges in particular tend to mulct newspapers in damages. The law of damages has grown up in an unwieldy way to the extent that there is a distinction in the Commonwealth countries between the United Kingdom and Australia as to what circumstances merit the award of exemplary or punitive damages. The decision in the House of Lords in *Rootes Versus Bernard* has stated the limited circumstances for which punitive damages are available, whereas in the Commonwealth of Australia a different rule obtains as a result of a Federal Supreme Court ruling in the *Skeleton* case. It is very doubtful which precedent will be followed in Barbados finally, but it is still a fact that people are scared of the award of unusually high and punitive damages, and modern thought towards this is that the reputation of a person can still be maintained without necessarily demanding such exemplary and punitive damages.

This Act, therefore, whilst maintaining the concept of aggravated damages, or substantial damages, seeks to abolish the right for exemplary and punitive damages to be awarded to a person. I commend this as highly acceptable and creating an atmosphere in which one could have greater freedom in the Press, and one would hope at the same time it would encourage responsible journalism. I wish to make it quite clear that my concept of responsible journalism is not the concept of controlled journalism. Too many people believe that responsible journalism means only journalism that is favourable to their point of view — journalism that only they themselves can control to give only their side of the matter.

I think that if we are always to ferret out the truth in a society that one must allow journalists some scope to practise their profession and to bring the facts before the public eye. I should hope that, with the removal of this type of limitation that exists at the moment, the newspapers would feel freer to comment and publish what is true. There will still be the danger that, if they publish untruths and they cannot justify those untruths, they run afoul of the law as it stands.

I have found during the last 16 years in practice that there has not been one libel action

tried in this country with a jury. I think that the pattern is similar throughout the whole Commonwealth Caribbean. A libel action raises very serious issues of fact, and although the jury are directed on the law by the judge that they are the eventual arbiters of fact and they may eventually award damages, as the law stands in Barbados there is a discretion of the Judge to sit with the jury if a request is made for the same. Of course, this provision is contained in our Juries Act. This Act seeks to remove that discretion and to, more or less, give legal teeth to the practice which has grown up during the years where defamatory actions are no longer tried by a judge and jury.

I go a little further, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in this Bill to introduce what I would like to think is a new concept in the law of defamation. There are several plaintiffs who are not interested in an award of money. They would prefer to have their good name; they do not bring libel actions simply to get money; they bring libel actions simply to vindicate their character. What the Act now seeks to do is to give those persons the right to waive their rights to damages, but to ask for a declaration to be granted. In circumstances where they do so the Court is obligated to give precedent to that type of action over other actions other than where the privacy of the subject is involved. There may be a pending action of *habeas corpus*. I think this would, generally, provide an opportunity for those people who feel that they have been defamed and who are not seeking simply to mulct newspapers of damages.

Likewise, I have taken the opportunity in reforming the law to deal with the question of the limitation of actions. At the moment I do not know whether hon. members are conscious of the fact that most of the provisions in the law of Barbados dealing with the limitation of actions date back to 1623, a statute in the reign of King James I, and simply because 1623 preceded 1627, the date of settlement, that statute automatically became part of the law of Barbados, and nobody has taken any opportunity since then to legislate properly in the law of contract, or in the law of tort, concerning the time when an action for defamation, or an action in tort or contract, should be brought.

It is open to people six years after a publication to bring an action for defamation. This is an inordinately long period and, indeed, it is being found in most jurisdictions that it is an unnecessary period. The essential thing about an action for defamation is that it should be dealt with quickly, that there should be a speedy trial

and that the person should have the right for his good name to be vindicated in public. What we are proposing in this Bill is that the period of limitation should be three years, except in the case of persons who are suffering from disabilities; for instance, an infant who has been defamed should be given an opportunity to bring the action at such time as his disabilities have ceased. The reason for this is that their guardian may not have been assiduous and may have done nothing to promote their case during the period of guardianship. I should like to make clear here that in bringing about these reforms, we have borne in mind that a parent is not merely a legitimate parent, or a lawful parent, but we have extended the facilities to persons whose parents are not necessarily married.

3.20 p.m.

We have given their parents also the right to bring actions on their behalf.

I have taken the opportunity in this Bill to update the aspect of criminal libel and to make what I think is a much more useful provision than exists.

I want to talk about unintentional defamation a bit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and to show in what way I believe we are reforming the law. The law has been described in some quarters as being an ass, and to some extent that is true. There are all sorts of contradictions that one sometimes find in the law, and a newspaper, or indeed anybody else can publish or issue a release relating to Tom Jones or Ivy Jones which is absolutely true of that particular Tom Jones or Ivy Jones, without realizing that in the same district there is another Tom Jones and another Ivy Jones, and without intending to defame that other Tom Jones or that other Ivy Jones; and yet because the Ivy Jones or the second Tom Jones lived in the same district, they are able to bring actions for damages and to obtain not only substantial damages but in some cases they may also ask — I am not sure whether they will succeed — for exemplary or punitive damages, as the law now stands. And legal history is replete with several of these cases taking place in Commonwealth and other countries, and many similar cases have occurred in Barbados and some recently — they have been settled out of court — in which a publication is made about a correct person but another person happens to have the same name and they sue or threaten to sue the originator of the particular article. That is what we call circumstances of innocent dissemination.

What this Bill seeks to do is to protect the innocent disseminator in such circumstances; but

he must do a bit more. If a newspaper, for instances, disseminates innocently publication, then it can rely on the defence of innocent dissemination provided that is showed that it had given an apology or an explanation as soon as possible and it had taken all steps to protect the reputation of the person.

Now this is not a new provision in many Commonwealth countries. This came in in England in 1952 as a result of a committee set up some time, I believe in 1947, and it has also been part of the law of Jamaica. I believe it is part of the law of Trinidad, and it is the law in all of the Canadian provinces, Australia, the Scandinavian countries, and Germany; any forward-looking country has this type of protection in its laws; and it seems to me a pity that despite the changes which have occurred in countries where people are conscious of the necessity to maintain freedom of the Press, despite these changes which have undoubtedly been beneficial without working any undue hardship on the character of innocent people, despite these changes we have hesitated to make this necessary amendment in our laws: and I commend very strongly to this House this section of the Bill which seeks to bring in this protection and to give a defence of innocent dissemination in circumstances where they are warranted.

It will be necessary for the Bill, assuming the House agrees to the second reading of the Bill, to go to a Select Committee. I would welcome this because it would give the members of the public an opportunity to express their views on any provision on which they may wish further updating of the legislation, and it would also give one an opportunity to hear from the Government's legal draftsmen, their comments on any provisions of the Bill that they think need further legal shape, and by that time I hope that the Government would have a point of view on this necessary piece of legislation.

I have appeared throughout the Commonwealth Caribbean now in several libel actions both on behalf of plaintiffs and defendants and I am deeply conscious of the different stages of the law governing defamation in the region. I would hope that this Bill which I think is far more forward-looking than anything at present existing in the other countries — certainly much more forward looking than our existing legislation and a bit more advanced in some of its provisions than what exists even in Jamaica.

I would hope that this Bill would be welcomed by the legal profession, by the

newspapers, by the Governments of the area, and more important, by the ordinary citizen who needs to have adequate protection of his good name, whilst at the same time ensuring that newspapers are given opportunity to perform their true role in the community, which is to guide and influence public opinion in their columns but only based on a situation of absolute truth and fact.

I think the Press in the Caribbean need this type of fillip and I would hope that if the hon. member agrees with my views on this Bill, would welcome comments from any other fillips of that nature on this type of Bill. I do not want to be facetious or too long in making this introduction but it seems to me that there are a lot of other areas of our law that call for this type of treatment. Many people are not interested in the law of libel because they say it is a lawyer's field and it calls, it is true, for a lot of expertise, but everyone ought to be interested in the law of libel for two reasons; the first is that it is necessary that persons' good names and reputations should be maintained at all times. Those of us who are interested in the concept of clean politics, who are interested in the concept of integrity, who are interested in giving Jack his jacket, should be deeply conscious of that first principle.

There is also a second principle. The second principle is that the law should not be so shaped that it is impossible for the public to get a view of people who are not entitled to a good name. It is a balance which we have to maintain in this House, or ought to maintain. It is a balance that the community at large must maintain, and I consider that a forward-looking defamation Bill is certainly a tremendous asset and help in maintaining those two principles. In short, in my view such a Bill is the foundation on which the right to one's good name and the right to privacy as well as to freedom of the Press stand, and on which the two fundamental principles in our Constitution can be maintained; and I therefore have much pleasure in moving that this Bill be read a second time.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there can be no doubt in my mind that the legislation to update the laws of libel and defamation in Barbados is long overdue. When I was Attorney General representations were made to me to do something about this matter, but I think you will appreciate that in an office which is short of draftsmen and in an office in which the department has got to keep the Government's

legislation up to date to come before Parliament as well as to make subsidiary legislation statutory instruments, as long as the freedom of the individual is not interfered with, then of course priority could not be given to legislation of this nature.

3.30 p.m.

To me Severance Payment legislation is a priority. Social legislation is a priority, whether it is National Insurance, amendments to the Old Age Pensions Act — these are priorities. These are pieces of legislation which benefit the broad masses.

Because the Constitution guarantees the individual freedom of speech, the need for leaving everything else and doing an amendment to laws of libel and slander which have been on the Statute Book for a considerable time and which, I may say, have not really and truly inhibited the freedom of the Press and the individual — I think that any Government, any Attorney General, must give priority to areas of social legislation which will benefit the broad masses of the people.

So, Sir, I want to go on record as saying that the failure of the Government to update this piece of legislation is not because the Government is not aware of the antiquated method of it, but because the department which is short of draftsmen finds it difficult to get legislation of a social nature out as fast as possible, and this piece of legislation cannot rank in priority.

I remember when I was Minister of Communications and Works. Today we have the Post Office Act, the Wireless Telegraphy Act and other pieces of legislation which are of a vital nature and of vital importance to the preservation of the life of the community and the conditions under which workers work in industry and in factories etc. There is the question of so many pieces of vital legislation, that while I do not think it is true to say that this legislation before us today should be ignored, it cannot be given priority.

The hon. member for Christ Church West in the midst of his busy schedule has found time to attend to this piece of legislation which to my mind on first perusal is a good thing. I do not think that the Government side is any way antagonistic to this piece of legislation. I want to go on record as saying that when legislation is introduced by a private member, the position is that the Ministry responsible for that legislation is supposed to submit the Ministry's view of the

legislation so that the Government can take a decision as to whether that legislation should be supported or not.

That is very reasonable. The Government does not quarrel with the right of private members to introduce legislation; but the Government is responsible for the running of the country. I can assure the hon. member that although this legislation has been on the Order Paper for some time, the Cabinet has not had a submission from the Ministry of Legal Affairs which is responsible for this type of legislation. I think that he will appreciate that this type of legislation does not fall under any specific Ministry, but is rather a piece of legislation under the realm of law reform or of updating the laws.

I think that by giving a Second Reading to this Bill, and the fact that it will have to go to a Select Committee of this Chamber under the Rules of the House, the Ministry of Legal Affairs will have to do something about what the Government's attitude should be. Secondly, the Legal Draftsmen will have to do some research and advise the Government on what it should do.

At the moment I do not see any difficulty on the Government's part. It is not the only piece of legislation which needs updating; but I think that the hon. member for Christ Church West will be the first to admit as a lawyer that Legal Draftsmen are not knocking around the place. It is difficult to get draftsmen even for ordinary legislative matters apart from being assigned purely and solely to the question of legal reform. I think he knows that the Commonwealth Secretariat for some years now has been concerned that throughout the Commonwealth there is such a shortage of Legal Draftsmen; and both Canada and Jamaica have started courses to train lawyers in this special field.

I want to assure the hon. member that this piece of legislation is not opposed by the Government. The Ministry of Legal Affairs will in due course submit their views on it. The Government is concerned to the extent that we believe in the fundamental freedoms as guaranteed by the Constitution of which freedom of assembly is one and freedom of speech is another, and there are other freedoms enshrined in the Constitution with which the Government is concerned. The Government is concerned that these freedoms should be enjoyed by every citizen of Barbados unhindered, and consequently anything that we can do to enable these freedoms to be enjoyed is part of the Government's policy.

Of course, as I say, freedom can degenerate into license. The Government is not opposed to this piece of legislation, because anything that the Government does can stand the scrutiny of day either in the Press or in the other media; but, as I say, there is a limit to the invasion of privacy. There is a limit to freedom and many people in Barbados do not seem to understand that the Constitution of Barbados does not give anybody absolute freedom. In the Constitution even freedom of speech is not absolute. Freedom of assembly and freedom of property are not absolute, but a lot of people walk around and say that the Constitution guarantees freedom. Freedom is not absolute, and if they will read the Constitution they will realise that freedom of speech in any community, even though it is a fundamental right, has certain limitations as imposed by law.

During my five years as Attorney General, although the Opposition say that I am no lawyer, that I do not know any law that I lost more cases than anybody else, not one piece of legislation that passed through my hands in the five years immediately after independence has ever been challenged by any lawyer in the Opposition as being in any way unconstitutional or in breach of the Constitution. I think it is a record — not a record — but it only shows that the Government is committed to the continuation and the perpetuation of the enjoyment of these freedoms by the citizens of this country.
3.40 p.m.

I just want to show the hon. member for Christ Church West that there is no opposition from us, that since it has to go to a Select Committee that by the time the Committee meets the Attorney General will be told that this Bill was debated..... (*Asides*) I would like to assure the hon. member for Christ Church West that we are not opposed to this. Any time in areas like this that the Opposition can update legislation and they can find the time and use their expertise the Government will certainly adopt it. We have adopted the amendment to the Maintenance Act, we have adopted the amendment to the Affiliation Act, and whatever people can say of this Government we are not opposed to any legislation coming from members of the Opposition or a back-bencher where we are satisfied that that legislation is in the interest of the broad masses of the people. Of course, I think the member for St. James will understand that certain legislation we may oppose, we oppose on the ground that it is in breach of the rules of the House and the Constitution where it imposes a charge on the Treasury and

calls on the Government to spend certain money in certain areas.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to assure the hon. member for Christ Church West that when it goes to the Select Committee the Government will not oppose it but will endeavour to come out with a piece of legislation which is in the interest of freedom of speech and the continuation of the fundamental rights of the citizens of Barbados. He is free to name the members of that committee, and I am sure he will get the support of the Government because in an area like this there can be no doubt that a piece of modern legislation giving freedom within the law and within a reasonable range to persons in the area is something which we all welcome. I want to repeat finally that this legislation did not come from the Government not because the Government was unconcerned but because the Government with its limited legal expertise in draftsmanship has to concentrate on legislation which is of a social nature and which is of vital interest to the broad masses of the people.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee comprised of the following members:

- (1) The Hon. Leader of the House, the Member for Christ Church East,
- (2) The Hon. Minister of Education, the Member for St. Michael South Central,
- (3) The Hon. Minister of Health, the Member for St. Michael South,
- (4) The Hon. Minister of Lands, Labour, Housing and National Insurance, the member for St. Michael North West,
- (5) The Honourable Member for St. Michael South East,
- (6) The Honourable Member for St. Joseph,
- (7) The Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the Member for St. Thomas, and
- (8) Myself, the Member for Christ Church West.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That concludes Private Members' Business.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed.

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

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it automatically reverts.

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

RESUMPTION OF THE RESOLUTION FOR THE SUM OF \$30,153.

The Question that the Resolution for the sum of \$30,153 do now pass was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two Money Resolutions in Committee of Supply. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, each seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the two Money Resolutions were read a first time, a second time and agreed to, respectively.
3.50 p.m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 standing in the name of the Minister of Labour be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE RESOLUTION RE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CLAPHAM IN THE PARISHES OF SAINT MICHAEL AND CHRIST CHURCH

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is for the acquisition of some land at Clapham in the parishes of St. Michael and Christ Church. I should like to state here, as I have said on so many occasions, that this land will be used for the purpose of re-siting tenants who will be moved from Emmerton Lane. Mr. Deputy Speaker, so much has been said about this re-settlement, even in this Honourable Chamber, that I am, indeed, loath to add one word because nothing I say now will be anything new to what has been said in this Chamber. However, for the purposes of record, I may say that the land involved is divided into about eighteen parcels.

In any event the Resolution amply sets out the number of areas to be acquired from, probably, about fifteen to sixteen owners. I want to state, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the area we are acquiring is an open field, and there are no houses on the land. We were set with a problem the moment that we agreed to the establishment of a Sewage Treatment Plant in the Emmerton area. It became a problem on the one hand, and on the other hand it became a blessing in disguise. I say this because we have been unable, for reasons of finance or lack of finance, to do anything in this country about what some people call slum clearance and what other persons prefer to call more elegantly urban renewal. It is well known that the Emmerton area is one of the most depressing areas in Barbados. It has been depressing because it is overcrowded, and it has been made depressing because of poor drainage. Whenever the rain, as we say in Barbados, sets up the people in Emmerton Lane have to look for shelter.

Not so long ago, maybe two weeks or so, the people in Emmerton were in very depressed circumstances because of a slightly more than usual rainfall and not a flood. At the same time it was found that, because the land is subject to flooding and it does not drain properly, there was water in and around people's homes. S.O.S. calls had to be made to the Fire Brigade to come and give assistance to persons living in that area. It is difficult for these people to keep any livestock because that is one of the first things affected whenever the area is flooded. I believe that over the years there has been some resistance to moving from the area to some

other place. That is understandable because some people have lived there for most of their lives. Some people have been born there. Some people have had their roots well established in Chapman Lane. Some persons have their neighbours as their friends and so on. I believe that the ordeals of recent times have forced upon these people a change of mind so that they are now willing to accept some shift from the land where they have been born to another area where they will feel more secure.

We, in the National Housing Corporation, have had a survey done of the Emmerton area. This survey reveals that a total of about 165 houses would have to give way to the establishment of the Sewage Treatment Plant. Looking around the St. Michael area, because we did not want to remove people too far from where they were living, with the assistance of Town Planning Studies done some years ago, we have been able to identify an open area of land where these people can be resited. I am of the opinion that we may have to acquire additional areas in order to fully accommodate these people. We have had studies done by the Chartered Town Planner about two years ago. I believe that the hon. member for Christ Church West will have some interest in this Report which has been done by the Town Planner. It is merely factual. It sets out the fact that this area of land is not only adequate, but suitable for resiting the tenants from Emmerton Lane.

We have also had some opposition from persons living in the area where we are moving these houses. I have received letters in my Ministry from some of these persons. I am assured that, if I were to quote or to cite the hon. member for Christ Church West in a previous debate in this Chamber, the tenants will now receive the people from Emmerton Lane with open arms. In fact, they are prepared to form Tenants Committees. I remember this was said in some previous debate by the hon. member for Christ Church West. They are prepared to do everything in their power to make the re-settlement of the people of Emmerton as easy and as painless as possible. We welcome this. We welcome any efforts that the hon. member for Christ Church West, or any public-spirited Barbadian, might want to give towards making these people feel at home once more.

I have received messages from some of the tenants at Emmerton who are very anxious to move. They want to know when we are going to move them. We have not yet done a layout

of the area, but we have done an outline survey of the area which, I regret, is not available now to this Chamber.

4.00 p.m.

We have done a topographical survey based on this. We are now going to do our layout, then our development, and at that stage, after we have done our development and put in the various services, etc., we will then move the tenants; but I would want to make this abundantly clear and I hope that the hon. member for Christ Church West will also make it clear to the people whom he represents in Parliament and who have been giving some opposition to this, that we are going to develop fully the lands on which we are going to site these people. We are not going to permit any overcrowding. The National Housing Corporation has certain standards; the Town Planning Department demands certain minimum size lots, and there can be no lot smaller than the minimum size lot that the Town Planner permits, which is 2,400 sq. ft.

Now there are moving in some cases to areas which are far less than that 2,400 sq. ft.; probably only 600 sq. ft. or 1,200 sq. ft. I have some figures here but I really cannot go through them now.

So we are going to move these people here to lands where water will be provided; it is up to the tenants, I presume, to have it installed in their homes, but this is something we have to look at carefully. There will be proper roads, lights, drainage. Now these are the things that we go for. What is more, I think it is known that some of the houses in the Emmerton area are in such an advanced state of dilapidation that we will be unable to remove some of them to Clapham. Those that cannot be removed – we have already done a survey on this, and the National Housing Corporation, according to the report, state that about 10% of the houses are unfit for removal. Well then, we will not remove those houses. Of course, we will pay for those houses and we will do our best to rehouse those persons, but we will rehouse them. We consider it our responsibility not only to do our best. We will rehouse those persons whose houses cannot be removed but in fact they will still need some physical accommodation.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have repeated to a great extent what I have said before. I do not know what further assurances I can give either to the people of Emmerton or to the people of Clapham – that part of Clapham which is in St. Michael and part in Christ Church – but what I want to state categorically is that whatever

reasonable assistance is required of the Government, we are quite prepared to give that reasonable assistance. With those few words, Sir, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, first I should like to thank the Minister for making available to me a copy of the preliminary assessment done by the Chartered Town Planners of whom he spoke during the debate, and I think it is a very interesting document and it contains quite a few of the matters on which I intended to speak, and I am satisfied that if the Report is carried out and some of the safeguards and some of the ideas implemented, then this would be to the benefit of all concerned.

I want on behalf of the residents of Clapham again to reassure our brothers and sisters of Emmerton that there is no ill feeling or hostility towards them at all. I must make this point clear because I was approached on Sunday whilst I was walking among the people in the Bridgetown area, by a gentleman who said that he understands that some of the Clapham residents were opposed to Emmertonians coming to Clapham, and he wanted to know my stand on the matter. I told him my stand was very clear; Barbados belongs to Barbadians regardless of your colour, economic circumstances, political, religious or other persuasions, and I do not think any of us has the right to arrogate to ourselves a superiority complex as to where some people should live and other people should not; and I would not like it to be thought at all that the people in Clapham have any such complex about themselves.

As I understand it the only complaint in fact that was made to me, and I think representation was made to the Minister also on this point, was that some of the persons whose lands were being acquired, felt that this was their only tangible asset. I remember one gentleman in particular told me that he had already made his will devising this to his children, and now the whole of his planning had been upset; and that is why when I spoke on this issue some time ago here, I suggested that although the Government has a very good case for acquiring private lands for public purposes in the interest of the wider community, that Government policy should be orientated towards exchanging other areas of Government land for lands being taken from private citizens. For instance, I am quite sure that many of these small holders — and some of them are small holders; 3,000 sq. ft., 8,000 sq. ft., 4,000 sq. ft. and 5,000 sq. ft, that sort of thing — many

of them would welcome the opportunity to get a residential lot in Wildey or Graeme Hall or wherever Government has suitable available land, rather than to get \$5,000 or \$6,000 of cash in their hands — something that in any event in these days of inflation is falling rapidly, and something which I believe people are more prone to use, rather than to leave after they have gone along; and it is that point of view that has been the predominant expression of opinion in the area.

There are only about 17 people involved in this exercise; there are not many persons whose lands are being taken and I should not wish at all, anybody to get the impression that the people in the Clapham area, whether it be the part of Clapham that is in St. Michael South East or the part of Clapham that is in Christ Church West or Christ Church Central — that any of these people are opposed in any way to the resettlement of Emmertonians in their area.

We would like to urge a few things on the Minister and to underscore the report which was given to him. That area is suitable for a community centre and a proper playing field, and I believe that the opportunity should be taken to have established a proper community centre which could act as a proper day care centre for children, to be used also in the health services and in the pre-school area for nursery education.

When these type of resettlements are being done there is no point in removing — and I hate to use the word but I must use it — one slum area and creating another slum area. I, a couple of weeks ago was in Trinidad and saw the spectacle along the Beetham highway, of that country removing a slum and putting a slum next door and the people in the slum on the river refused to go in the type of houses that they were creating for them next door, and the Government really had a problem.

4.10 p.m.

The Government really had a problem. They tried to do it as a rush job and were very dissatisfied about it; and the people who were being moved said that their existing circumstances might be bad, but not so bad that they were going to run into the type of conditions that the Government was creating. Therefore I am underscoring the need for total planning in that area.

I know that the Minister proposes, for instance, road widening in the area of Observatory Road. A very dangerous corner is one that comes through Observatory Road to the

Willey-Clapham highway. It is an extremely dangerous corner indeed and opportunity should be taken to widen this area. Opportunity should be taken also to update the drainage in the area. We do not have anywhere as serious a problem as that in Emmerton, but we do have a drain which comes down through Willey Road and through Clapham Heights and Forde Road going into the Rendezvous area and into the Club Morgan area, and opportunity should be taken to see that proper drainage is put in not only for those people who are being removed, but for the people who live in the surrounding Forde Road and Clapham area so that they too can get a bit of these facilities.

You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I have brought a Resolution to this House talking about the necessity to acquire lands further down at Forde Road — Crane's Pasture. I am wondering whether the Minister cannot now extend the largesse of the American Development Bank to take in the project at Crane's Pasture opposite the constituency of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Crane's Pasture has no drainage. There is no road for the people who live there to get to their houses and it is in a bad situation. Maybe if the Minister has not got enough land in that part of Clapham, we are quite willing at Crane's Pasture — solid rock — to offer him an opportunity to do some of the resiting there.

I am not one of those representatives who are afraid of the people. I am sure that when the people come from Emmerton they will get as good, if not better representation than they have at the moment. That is no criticism of the hon. member for Bridgetown. The hon. member for Bridgetown and I have already started a plan on how to make his constituents feel welcome in my constituency. It is as easy as that. I have no undoubted right to the constituency. I can be succeeded at any time. I need not stand again, or I can run and lose. There are all sorts of possibilities; but the point is that as long as he and I are representing a constituency we feel that we have a duty to co-operate for the betterment of the people; and we will give the Minister the assurance that in any way that we can we will co-operate with the Government and persuade the people what is in their best interest when the move is ahead.

I can assure the Minister that from the day the first stone is laid or the sod upturned I will be there. I go to the constituency. I can say that I go by day and by night, but I usually go to the area by night, and I can assure the Minister that I

am monitoring the position in that area very carefully because we want a happy set of circumstances.

Now, there are certain problems that we must underscore. I will not be much longer Sir. The people who are being removed need the assurance that their children will get transfers into the existing schools at Parkinson in the Pine and at St. Paul's. They should be given some priority in school places because it will be very difficult to send their children back down to Westbury Road or wherever it is that they used to go. The Minister of Education in his seat has indicated that this will be done. Also we are asking that those mothers whose children are in a children's home will be given some consideration of transfer to day care centres in that area. Also, there are a lot of old people involved in this exercise, and wherever we can we should facilitate them in resettling. Younger people are going to find it easier to resettle; but even in a small country like Barbados you get loyalty to districts. Younger people easily make friends. It is the older people who will find it a little bit difficult.

If the Government will make the services available to them, we in Clapham will do all that we can. I do not want to blow my own trumpet. I do not like doing this, but I give the undertaking to the House that anything that I can do to make the resettlement as smooth as possible and as beneficial as possible I will do it.

I have to be honest to this House. I have had to talk to only about two people whom I know in the area who have ever made any remark that could in any way be considered adverse. This was on the spur of the moment and before they were seized of the facts. They imagined that the Government was going to take up the houses from Emmerton regardless of the state they were in and land them on a pasture in Clapham without putting in basic facilities. This shows where communication is very necessary. I wish that the Press article which led to this upheaval had explained this a bit more thoroughly; but when it was explained to them what it was proposed to do, these two persons said to me, "there is no problem up here, Mr. Forde".

Indeed, Sir, we have two clubs in that area, Christ Church West and Clapham United who are at the top of the Christ Church Football League. We welcome the Emmertonians there. We have started that club in the area, and I will ensure that they have all the games and all the equipment that they need. It might well happen that we will produce another Gary Sobers for the

cricket field from among the crowd eventually because I believe that the Minister will see the need for a playing field when he brings in 400 or 500 new residents into the area of Clapham.

We have within less than 18 months produced two of the top football teams in the Christ Church Football League. The more I remain in politics the more I am convinced that it is among the less fortunate that we have the best potential for development. Certainly, if there is anything that we can do to make that development a reality we will do it in Clapham.

I regret that the hon. member for the City is not here. It is not because this Resolution is before the House. He was otherwise engaged. I must make his position absolutely clear, Sir. He was otherwise engaged but he wishes to make his position absolutely clear on this. His interest in this Resolution is that the Emmertonians, wherever they are, get the best that is available just as anybody else who is entitled to it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened to the hon. member for Christ Church West and I like his last defence. That is the sign of a clever lawyer. He realises that a Resolution of this nature required the presence of the hon. member for the City. I am not quarrelling about whether he is in sessions or not. The hon. member was just about to sit down, and it occurred to him or he remembered that he had to explain to this House in terms of the Emmertonians what the position of the hon. member for the City was.

Now it is interesting to discover that when a debate is shorn of its emotionalism, when politics is out of a debate we can get some rather interesting statements. Not too long ago there was a debate in this House when the Government first talked about establishing a scheme in that area. It was a debate in which all kinds of accusations were thrown against this Government — that we were trying to take electors out of the City. That we were trying to move them to other areas to make the Government's position sure and all kinds of accusations. If you read the debate on that particular Resolution you will see that we were subjected as a Government to all kinds of accusations and insinuations as to the motive that we had in putting a sewage scheme in Emmerton.

Now I was privileged to see after the first heavy rains, interviews with people in Emmerton Lane, how when the rain falls Emmerton is one of the greatest dangers to health in this community. Toilet pits overflow and children were shown playing in the water in these various streets. There was danger of their health being impaired.

4.20 p.m.

It is now clear — God works in a mysterious way, His wonders to perform — but it is difficult very often to fathom the workings of Providence. It took the recent rainfall to bring home to the public of Barbados what the Government had always felt that the time had come to resite and rehabilitate people who live in dangerous areas of the City, so when the public saw on television interviews with those ladies whose houses were being filled with water, the streets were impassable, it then dawned on them that the Government by putting the sewage scheme in that area was taking a positive step to rehabilitate the people in this area, that the purpose of the Government was not to rob any Opposition member of any votes but to implement a long overdue plan of urban renewal and urban rehabilitation. When I listened to the member for Christ Church West who has given the Government all the assurance and absolute and complete cooperation and extending a welcome with open arms to the people from Emmerton, who apologises for any reticence or reluctance on the part of the people of Clapham in welcoming the people from Emmerton I am really heartened as a member of this Government to realise that it has dawned on the member for Christ Church West and the Opposition that Government's motive in putting the sewage scheme there, and the Government's intention to rehouse the people, have always been honourable and in the best interests of the people of this country.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, if the hon. member would read an earlier debate on acquisition when this subject came before the House and read what the hon. member for Christ Church West said he will see that there has been no inconsistency in his approach to this matter. I have said today what I have said before.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that permission was granted to the hon. Member for St. James to move a resolution. If that is so, I am seeking leave to do it now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has been granted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am moving this resolution on behalf of the hon. Member for St. James:

Whereas the Permanent Representative of Barbados to the United Nations Organisation was recalled recently to Barbados to have talks with the Minister of External Affairs concerning a widely publicised report in connection with a letter sent by the Ambassador to the Mayor of Pelham in reply to the Mayor's letter re the proposed destruction of the Ambassador's dog which is alleged to have bitten several persons;

And Whereas the public is entitled to know what guidelines have been laid down for the future conduct of foreign service staff;

Be It Resolved that this Government make a statement on the outcome of the talks between the Minister of External Affairs and the Permanent Representative of Barbados to the United Nations Organisation to the Honourable the House of Assembly and lay down guide lines for diplomatic staff to avoid them causing further embarrassment to Barbados' good name.

There is also a Question, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leave has been granted to ask the Question on behalf of the honourable Member for St. James.

Mr. BOLDEN: To ask the appropriate Minister: Will the Minister state the cost to the taxpayers and Government of Barbados re bringing the Barbados Permanent Representative to the United Nations to Barbados between the 1st November, 1975 and 4th November, 1975?

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 11th November, 1975 at 12.00 o'clock noon.

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

The Question was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
4.25 p.m.