

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 3rd February, 1976.

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

PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister without Portfolio); Mr. R. ST. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); 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); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday 27th January, 1976 have been circulated and are before you for confirmation. There being no amendments or corrections, I declare these Minutes duly confirmed.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of Message No. 1, 1976, relating to

the issuance of a writ for an election for the constituency of St. Philip North. The Message reads as follows:—

“HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL
TO
THE HONOURABLE THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to refer to the address dated 20th January, 1976, passed by the Honourable the House of Assembly in accordance with the provisions of section 5(2) of the Representation of the People Act (Cap.12) requesting the issue of a writ for an election to fill the vacancy in the constituency of St. Philip North and to inform the Honourable the House of Assembly that he has, on the 2nd February, 1976, issued a writ in accordance with the provisions of section 36 of the said Representation of the People Act for election to be made of a member to serve in the House of Assembly for the said constituency of St. Philip North.

On the advice of the Prime Minister, the day of nomination of candidates has been fixed for Wednesday, 11th February, 1976, and the day upon which, if necessary, the poll shall be taken has been fixed for Thursday, 26th February, 1976. The writ is returnable on Friday, 27th February, 1976.

It is duly signed.

Government House
Barbados
3rd February, 1976.”

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I am commanded to lay the Customs Tariff (Amendment) order, 1976.

Also, an Account of the Transactions in Rum in the several districts of the Island for the quarter ended 31st December, 1975.

On my own behalf I am commanded to lay the Immigration (Forms and Fees) Regulations, 1976.

Also, Sir, the Immigration (Ports of Entry) Regulations, 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$500,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 33, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

I also beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$314,885 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates 1975-76, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 34, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES entered the House and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$2,351,420 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. 35 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$137,000 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. 36, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

FIRST READINGS OF BILLS

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Engineers (Registration) Act 1975, be read a first time.

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

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Professions (Registration Fees) Act be read a first time.

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

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have the following statement to make in connection with the use of the West St. Joseph Secondary School by the Old Scholars Association:—

During the sitting of the House on Tuesday, 16th December, 1975, the Honourable Member for St. Joseph stated that the Headmaster of the West St. Joseph Secondary School had refused permission for the Old Scholars Association to use the school.

I gave an undertaking to have this matter investigated since I was unaware of the incident to which the Honourable Member referred.

My investigations into the charge have revealed that an application dated 28th October, 1975, was submitted by the Secretary of the West St. Joseph Old Scholars Association to the Headmaster of the school for permission to hold a week of activities during the period 16th to 22nd November, 1975. The application was forwarded to the Ministry of Education and was supported by the Headmaster of the school.

Permission was granted for the West St. Joseph Old Scholars Association to use the school for the majority of activities planned for the week. The request to use the school buildings for a film show and social was not approved because these activities were likely to attract large crowds and it was not considered prudent to grant permission in view of the present state of the buildings at the school.

The allegation that the Headmaster of the West St. Joseph Secondary School refused to allow the Old Scholars Association to use the facilities at the school is without foundation. And this allegation of refusal has been further denied by the Chairman of the Steering Committee for the week of activities in a letter to the Advocate News of 29th December, 1975 under the caption "We were not denied the use of the school".

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement regarding the acquisition of the shares in Port Contractors (Barbados) Limited. The Statement reads as follows:—

The Barbados Harbours Act Cap. 286 empowers the Minister responsible to provide a

co-ordinated system of harbour facilities, lighthouses and port services within the Island by means of a department known as the Port Department.

2. The executive management of the Port Department is vested in the Port Manager.

3. The Act also empowers the Minister to determine, impose and levy rates, charges, dues or fees for any service performed by means of the Port Department or for use by any person of the facilities provided by means of the Port Department. When there is a substantial change the advice of the Harbour Advisory Board established under the provisions of Section 5 of the Act must be sought on these matters. The advice of the Board must also be sought on such matters as the estimates of revenue and expenditure of the Port Department and conditions of employment of persons employed in connection with lighthouses or port services where a substantial alteration is involved.

4. When the Deep Water Harbour was about to be brought into operation it was decided that one of the functions of the Port Department — the shorehandling of goods — should not be undertaken directly by the Department but that this function should be undertaken by one company to be formed by those concerns which were at the time working cargo through the Careenage. The Government itself subscribed to a number of shares in the company which was subsequently formed and registered as Port Contractors (Barbados) Ltd. Various firms and individuals were at the same time licensed to carry on the business of Stevedoring Contractors and Master Stevedores.

5. An agreement was entered into between the Government and Port Contractors (Barbados) Ltd. for a period of 25 years from the 3rd July, 1961, subject to prior termination. Under the agreement the company was required *inter alia* to

12.20 p.m.

(a) perform and be responsible for the shorehandling of all cargo (other than sugar, molasses and petroleum products and by-products in bulk and any cargo which was not then ordinarily passing through the harbours of the Island) including transshipment cargo, mails and passenger baggage;

(b) be responsible for the transportation within the Deep Water Harbour area of passengers

passing through the harbour between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m;

(c) provide and maintain such equipment as was required for the above purposes;

(d) keep the transit sheds, loading bank and stacking grounds of the Deep Water Harbour in good and clean order.

6. Following the decision of the Government to establish a Port Authority as provided for by the Barbados Port Authority Act, 1975, the Agreement with Port Contractors (Barbados) Ltd. was determined with effect from 1st July, 1975. It was subsequently agreed however that the establishment of the Port Authority should await the receipt of expert advice to be provided by means of a non-reimbursable loan made available by the Inter-American Development Bank. A new agreement was accordingly entered into with the firm for the continuation of its services for a further period. Stevedoring Contractors and Master Stevedores have also been granted permission to continue their operations.

7. In the meantime discussions were initiated for the acquisition of those of the shares in Port Contractors (Barbados) Ltd. which were not owned by the Government. The discussions were amicably completed and the 2,330 shares which were held by other shareholders have now been acquired at a cost of \$440 each. Funds provided in the Estimates under Capital Head 109 — Ministry of Finance and Planning — Item 6, Purchase of Assets, were used to acquire the shares.

8. The Directors of the Company will be—

1. Mr. S. K. Chapman, Chairman

2. Mr. D. P. Lynch

3. Mr. P. B. Parker

4. Mr. David Patterson

5. Mr. J. S. Patterson

6. The Permanent Secretary, Port Management Division of the Prime Minister's Office

7. Mr. R. St. C. Stuart

8. A representative of the Barbados Workers' Union.

9. The arrangement whereby Port Contractors (Barbados) Ltd. now operates as an agent of the Port Department for the shorehandling of cargo will continue until further notice. The Port Department itself will continue to exercise its functions under the Barbados Harbours Act Cap. 286 until such time as this Act is repealed by the Barbados Port Authority Act, 1975, and the proposed Port Authority is established.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 69, asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph, is ready.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 71 asked by the hon. member of St. James, is ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 3 be the First Order of the Day under Government Business.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

NATIONAL EMBLEMS AND NATIONAL ANTHEM OF BARBADOS (REGULATION) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out this Bill would amend the National Emblems and National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act (Cap. 300A) in order to provide for the collection of royalties imposed on imported items on which National Emblems are reproduced or represented, control the use of the Broken Trident and provide for introduction of a National Flower, a National Prayer and a National Song.

I should like to give hon. members some background information, as I think they are entitled to it, in order to refresh their memories on matters appertaining to the National Emblems and so on. the position is that on the 13th April, 1967 the Cabinet approved the Code of Etiquette for the use of the National Flag, the National

Anthem and the Coat of Arms of Barbados and concluded that this code should be embodied in legislation.

After obtaining instructions from the Ministry, the Crown Law Office has prepared the Bill to make provision for regulating the use of the National Emblems and Anthem of Barbados. The Bill proposes to vest in the Crown the copyright in the National Emblems and Anthem and to empower the Minister to grant licences in respect of the use or display of the Coat of Arms of Barbados in connection with any business, trade, profession or calling or with the activities of any body of persons and the sale or offering for sale of any article, goods or things which represent the Coat of Arms or on which it is reproduced or represented.

12.30 p.m.

Provision was also made for the proper use of the National Emblems and Anthem and for the imposition of royalties for the use of representations of the National Emblems on articles manufactured for sale or advertisement.

At that time the Ministry was considering the quantum of Royalties to be charged and the level of licences and these will be set out in Regulations to be made under Clause 7 of the Bill.

The Act was duly passed through Parliament; it was passed by the House of Assembly on 18th March, 1969, the Senate on 24th April, 1969 and was assented to by the Governor-General on 28th April, 1969.

The Act has not been proclaimed and is therefore not yet in operation. The reason for not proclaiming the Act is mainly due to pending the making of the Regulations, and another reason is, the Act was not proclaimed since on its becoming law, its provisions would be operative, but there would not have existed any means to control and regulate the uses of the national emblems. In the absence of the regulations you cannot operate the Act.

So in so far as this particular measure is concerned, this is the background that I give. The Cabinet at its meeting on 23rd March, 1972, concluded that the National Emblems and National Anthem, of Barbados (Regulation) Act (Cap. 300A) should be amended to provide for the imposition, collection and recovery of Royalty on important items. That is one of the objects of this Bill and (a) the control of the use of the broken trident and the National colours when used in conjunction as in the national flag

and (b) the Minister declaring by order a national song and national prayer and national flower.

The Attorney General received the instructions and he drew up the necessary Bill which we have before us, and in keeping with the Cabinet decision, and also regulations have been prepared in order to enable this Bill to become operative, and the regulations providing for the use of the national emblems and the national anthem on all occasions make such provisions under the regulations and provide for the imposition, collection and recovery of royalties payable for the use of representation of the Coat of Arms or the national flag, on articles manufactured for sale or advertisement, and also prescribing fees to be paid for licences granted under the Act.

I just mentioned that the regulations are ready. I know it is not in the Act but the regulations have to be made or else the Act could not be brought into force. So I am pointing out that the regulations have been made and make provision for these things.

So it should be noted that the National Emblems and the National Anthem of Barbados (Regulation) Act (Chapter 300A) has not been proclaimed. Again, I repeat, because I want to make myself clear because very often I am misunderstood. This Act has not been proclaimed, since, on its becoming law its provisions would be operative but there would not have existed any means of control to regulate the uses of the National Emblem, but now that the regulations are ready and are prepared, when we pass this Act we will be able to proclaim the original one as amended, owing to the fact that we have regulations to enforce the Act.

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

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply on this Bill.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. The House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive of the Bill were called, and they stood part.

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

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, each seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as THE NATIONAL EMBLEMS AND NATIONAL ANTHEM OF BARBADOS (REGULATION) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 4 on the Order Paper standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands and National Insurance is the next Order of the Day.

I beg to move that Order No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

THE MARINE AREAS (PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT) BILL, 1976

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that my Ministry has been pursuing for quite some time now, namely the establishment of a marine park or underwater, if I may call it that. We have been working on this for quite a number of years and this Bill is to enable the Parks and Beaches Commission to set up an underwater park in the area which has been chosen.

For about the past eight or nine years we have been looking at an area off the west coast of Barbados in the parish of St. James for the purpose of establishing there an underwater park. At first we had contemplated an area stretching from Folkestone right up to Sandy Lane. Subsequently it was changed to an area embracing Folkestone and going northwards I believe as far as Coral Reef, and now finally it has been decided that the underwater park should cover an area immediately west of the monument in Holetown and going as far south as the St.

James Rectory. That is the north to south boundary, the east boundary of course being the shore, and on the west boundary, somewhere about half a mile out to sea or thereabouts.

The area will be marked by buoys so that there will be no doubt in a person's mind as to what the area happens to be. Now maybe Barbadians are not familiar with underwater parks. I myself have been privileged to see the Buccoo Reef which indeed is an underwater park in Tobago, and I can state here that it is really and truly one of the most beautiful sights. The plans are to construct a jetty in the area of the St. James Police Station and to acquire a boat or boats for the purpose of conducting tours into the study area. I call it study area because in this area all fishing is prohibited and the hon. member for St. Michael South West has reminded me of the type of boats we will require — glass bottom boats, where one does not have to look over the sides, but where one can look through the bottom of the boats and see the beauties of nature down below.

At the same time it is also planned to set up there a kind of marine museum or an underwater art centre. I believe these are very rare. There are not many of these in the world and we have been approached about it, and we are convinced it will be of sufficiently educational and scientific value as far as art value is concerned to be able to give encouragement to the idea. It is planned too on the shore to set up a kind of display area in a separate building where people can see on shore the kind of things they will see out in the ocean. These are the broad plans for the establishment of the underwater park.

Hon. members would have seen advertisements in the newspapers for tenders for the construction of a jetty for this park. This Bill is to enable us to have proper regulations for the establishment of this park, to prohibit fishing, the use of speed boats, skiing and things of this nature, because this will certainly be in conflict with the purposes of the establishment of the park. Of course, too, it is also intended to prohibit spear fishing and all forms of fishing will be prohibited in this area.

The Act itself sets out the kind of things that will not be permitted. It also makes provision for regulations. I am not ashamed to say that we have borrowed legislation from some of those territories which have underwater parks which we have been able to study, and we have been able to formulate these in order to apply them in the establishment of this park. This, Mr. Speaker, explains the purpose of this Bill and I commend it to this Honourable House.

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

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very essential Bill and it will go further than just an underwater park. The Minister of Fisheries in future will have to pay great attention to this Bill to see some of the species of fish that will be seen within this area. Within the last thirty years the whole of the west coast waters of this Island have deteriorated considerably in certain species of fish including the spiny lobster. In another few years lobsters will be only a memory in this country since spear fishing started. Lobsters leave the ocean and come to these shallow waters around the reef and lay and hatch thousands of lobsters, and these young lobsters never reach the size of a large sized shrimp since spear fishing has come to this country. Now this area will be protected from all types of fishing and dynamiting and potting. We will be able to see certain species that have been dying out in this Island. It might be a good idea and a hint to the Minister of Fisheries in future to have certain areas cut off at certain times when he can prove the help that this area will form in producing the species of various fish that have deteriorated over the past years, and I am sure it will not create any hardship to any of the fishermen, because the biggest destruction to this type of fish is spear fishing, and the average fisherman does not actually engage in spear fishing. He goes further off shore for his catches of fish which is the larger type of fish. Fish like the red belly chubb and various species are dying out completely, but I am sure we will see great benefits in a few years' time after this area has been used and protected.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate from time to time to remind the people of Barbados of the importance of preserving their environment, and I use the word "environment" in the widest sense of the term. One of the criticisms I have heard made in the last elections was that the Barbados Labour Party did not have a policy, and this criticism was made of course by many people who are in the habit of just mouthing statements without doing adequate research to see what is the policy which the party has. On this Bill today it gives me great pleasure to draw to the attention of the House various suggestions which the Barbados Labour Party made in its last manifesto and which I think are as tenable today as they were at the time of the 1971 elections. It is a great tragedy indeed for Barbadians that they tend merely to become so lacking in depth of thought at time

that they do not examine ideas. Here are some of the ideas which we stated and which are relevant to this Bill. This is about pollution and is found on page 14 of the manifesto.
12.50 p.m.

This is what it says: "Barbados' air, water supply, beaches and city streets are all subject to the environmental pollution of modern life. Narrow city and suburban streets are fouled by fumes from motor vehicles; the island's water, many experts predict, will be contaminated by surface soakage of some of the chemical products of modern industry which do not break down in nature; beaches are spoilt by domestic waste, and areas immediately off shore are affected by sewage. Gullies in St. Thomas, St. Peter and St. James, are being used as dumping grounds for bulky garbage. The D.L.P. has not shown that it is even aware that there is a problem.

A department for the *Control of Environmental Pollution* will be set up and the B.L.P. pledges to keep this problem in the forefront of its considerations."

Mr. SPEAKER: I will ask the hon. member to make it a document of the House.

Mr. FORDE: A member, according to the rules, may read excerpts from books without making them documents of the House, and I do so read, but if the Hon. Minister of Housing and Lands would like to be educated now I would willingly give him 100 copies to distribute to his constituents.

This is a positive proposal which we made at the time because we have been cognisant of the problem and we go on on page 15 talking about parks and beaches to set out in detail adequate proposals for the preservation of the environment of Barbados. I said at the start that it is a tragedy that people are so unthinking in their political battles that they are not prepared to examine ideas. So many of them have their minds made up and make glib statements without proper analysis, but I suggest that the problem of environmental control is one to which the Barbados Labour Party has been very early attracted and one which we would ask the Government to take measures on to preserve the environment of the country.

I was glad to hear the Minister without Portfolio state that he is bothered about the marine life off Barbados, and particularly the fishes, because it is well known that effluence from some of the west coast hotels is causing a nuisance not only to the other residents in the

area but it is also a source of great danger to the marine life and particularly fishing off the Barbados coast line, and it has been so for several years now. I believe that we ought to take adequate measures to ensure the protection of the marine life off the whole of our coastal areas, but it is not only from effluence that you get this danger.

I should draw to the House's attention that very often oil slicks are discovered along the east coast and very little, if anything at all, seems to be done about it. We have an Oil Pollution Act passed some time in the 1920s which has not been updated and the powers which have been given to the Crown under this Act are in dire need of expansion. Most of the developing countries and the developed countries which are cautious of their environment have passed and updated their legislation dealing with oil in navigable waters, and I would counsel the Government very seriously to follow the international developments in this field and try to update the legislation, and what is better, use their policing powers which they have although limited at the moment under existing legislation to prevent oil spills from occurring. It is a problem that occurs more seriously in Trinidad than in Barbados, but if we are dependent on tourism as one of our natural resources, and more important to me, if Barbadians are to enjoy the amenities of nature and ecological conditions of their country they need protection from this type of danger which is posed to them.

I want to talk a bit about the beautiful coastline cliffs we have because if we are going to preserve the marine life we should also think of preserving the scenic beauty of the coastline of Barbados. There are cliffs like Pico Teneriffe, cliffs in St. Lucy and St. Peter, and very often I see that people are building almost indiscriminately on these cliffs without any regard to the ecological and aesthetic conditions which one should bear in mind in developing one's country. I believe that the land use regulations under the Town and Country Planning Act should be used rigidly for controlling the building on the cliffs of Barbados as we rise from south and go further inland towards the north. They are sights of natural beauty and they have gone on beautifying the country and made it a much happier place for people to live. We must recognise that we have in this generation a tremendous trust for future generations of Barbadians still unborn and we are duty bound to preserve it. Whilst I am not against developing for the benefit of the country as a whole it should be planned in such a way that it does not undermine the pleasure of life in the country as a whole.

I should like particularly to draw to the Minister's attention the building which has gone on at a terrific pace on the cliffs in St. George and that which is now taking place in St. Philip. Wherever one looks one sees concrete structures, some of them very ugly to behold, and the natural beauty of the country is damaged. As a person who is very interested in the Arts and who is interested in the amenities of the area I regret this very much.

There is another point I would make to the Minister. It is good we are preserving the reefs off our shores and coastline and territorial waters, but we should also take note of the fact that the burning and felling of trees indiscriminately is also undermining the whole position of the environment. There are existing powers under the Town and Country Planning Act to deal with the felling of these trees. I am not saying that these powers are being used or that proper enforcement measures are being taken. I consider this a very serious Bill and a very serious debate. It is not one we should take lightly, but I thought it necessary to state the position of the B.L.P. because we positively want to know that our great-great-great-grand-children, several generations from now, will have a country of which they can be properly proud, not merely concrete and mortar but a country that has a lot of beauty in it and something that should be enjoyed. I would refer to John Keats and say that if Barbados is a thing of beauty, a thing of beauty it will endure for ever.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this Bill is before us today, and I am certain that it will receive the approbation of both sides of this Chamber. The spokesman for the Opposition on the Bill has given it his own support and he has even gone to the extremity of quoting from a document which probably we can find in the Barbados Public Library and maybe the Archives Department by now. Apparently there are a number of copies for which there is no more use in this country and he is willing to allow us to have hundreds of those copies.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, is the hon. member saying that he has copied it so carefully that he no longer needs it, Sir?
1.00 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to be serious, lest there be any misunderstanding on this, as I understand it, I heard from the hon. member for Christ Church West that a proposal of the Barbados Labour Party was to support research projects investigating and preserving Barbados' off shore marine life.

There was a specific proposal which we made and that is in the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto to establish an under water park. The history of this goes further back than the 1971 general elections. Indeed, it was in 1966 that this matter was considered by the Cabinet which gave its approval in principle for the development of such a park; and as the Minister responsible has stated, it has taken quite some time to develop the idea into its present form.

The preservation of our coast line and the establishment of under water parks is a matter of educational interest, and it was my privilege as Minister of Education at that time to give the proposal the whole hearted endorsement of the Ministry of Education. Indeed, I recall paying a visit to that area and introducing the Minister of Fisheries then the Hon. George Fergusson, and telling him something of the coast line of St. James with which I have some familiarity.

Mr. Speaker, this is a decision that we reached so that the animal life of Barbados will be preserved, and which will provide a point of interest to those who are seeking recreation, to those who are in pursuit of an understanding of nature in its marine form and which will also lead to some prevention of erosion on that part of the coast line.

I am very glad that the Parks and Beaches Commission which is doing an excellent job in this country — I know that this is a matter which is dear to the heart of the members of that particular Commission and I would like to pay tribute to the work that has been done on this particular matter by the Parks and Beaches Commission.

The park will be stretching from somewhere near the building that was the former rectory of St. James and will include the area around Holetown; and I would like to take this public opportunity to urge the Parks and Beaches Commission — I am leaving waters now and talking about Holetown, the monument itself, which I believe is in need of some beautification — and get a responsible body to pay some attention to this.

Mr. Speaker, this particular proposal for the establishment of an under water park and an under water art centre is a proposal that is very exciting and which would in fact be breaking new ground. I am speaking particularly of the under water art centre which, when we get it established I think would add to the amenities of this country available for the enjoyment of the citizens as well as for the enjoyment of visitors to our shores.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in respect of a comment on the subject which has been raised by the hon. member for Christ Church West because if I do not raise it people will get the wrong impression. Pollution is usually interpreted by people to mean different things; but when one is dealing with scientific matters, pollution generally relates to specific things and has specific meanings.

In relation to the atmosphere it relates to the presence of sulphur dioxide and related compounds to an extent which is liable to be injurious to the heart and lungs of human beings; and in relation to water it means the absence of oxygen, or oxygen in such a low concentration that it would not support life.

In Barbados at the moment we have a monitoring station, one in Bridgetown, which monitors the daily content of sulphur dioxide in the atmosphere; and we have nothing to fear about the concentration of sulphur dioxide or other injurious compounds in the atmosphere. That is understandable because we are a small country. The concentration of injurious compounds in Barbados is not so large as to produce these injurious oxides or substances in a high proportion; because with the wind that blows, the concentration that accumulates at specific times today in Bridgetown is usually washed out over the sea.

With regard to water one finds that the Careenage is polluted because the oxygen content of that is very low. It is so low that it will not support life; but the same cannot be said of the sea around us although when one talks about pollution in relation to the sea one is generally talking about sewage and other matters being deposited in the sea and which in good time is oxidised by bacteria in the sea and becomes harmless or untraceable.

In relation to the tar found on the eastern coast of Barbados we know that this comes from ships which washed out their tanks far outside of the limit of the territorial waters of Barbados, and there is very little that we can do at the moment about that. Maybe we would need a coast guard service which could go outside and pass a shell across the bow of one of these ships to deter them from doing that.

When I was in the Ministry of Health we got into contact with a firm in Britain about how to deal with these tar products found on the eastern shores of Barbados and to make recommendations as to what would be a suitable detergent to use for the removal of these tar products. I am no longer there, so I cannot say

what stage these investigations have reached; but I am pointing that out because I do not want people to get the impression that nothing is being done about the tar products which accumulate on the eastern side of Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to contribute to this debate, but I have heard contributions which have dragged me out of my seat, especially because those particular proposals to which hon. members who spoke on this side and that side referred in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party of 1971 were written by me.

I have been interested in these questions of environmental pollution for a long time; and what made me interested in it, especially dealing with the sea and so on, Sir, could be summed up in something that I also wrote at the time that the Democratic Labour Party had not shown — that was as of 1971 — that it was even aware that there was a problem.

This is a new concept. It was only after Lake Eire, a large lake, many times the size of Barbados — I would not like to state how many times the size of Barbados — had died and become unsafe to swim in and being destructive to everything that lived in it and even through that depth of many thousands of feet, the Baltic Sea, and the whole Baltic Sea which you could not pollute for five months a year that it is frozen over, had also shown unmistakable signs of death as a body of water.

1.10 p.m.

It is only after these things had happened that people really became aware of modern pollution and the importance to mankind of preserving the sea around us, and the sea which we may have, one of these days, to live in.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, knowledgeable about these things, puts the absence of lobsters in Barbados down to spear-fishing. It is, probably, due to over-fishing, but I would hope that nobody in here would believe that the reefs of Barbados, particularly on the Western coast, are in anything approaching a pristine condition. I have had the benefit of a lot of discussions with persons, mainly from Canada, who know about marine pollution, and I have been quite assured beyond any per-adventure that in no meaningful way the reef at Worthing, from St. Lawrence going North is dead. That reef can no longer support anything but the most rudimentary forms of marine life. It is a dead reef. The corals themselves will soon be dying. They have died inside, and they will soon die outside.

I have been advised, for example, that the only thing to do with that reef is to have a giant reclamation project. Forget Worthing Beach and fill it up from St. Lawrence Church to Cacrabank, for it is no longer viable. It will become a sea swamp just as Graeme Hall is an inland swamp. Now, this came about because people have houses on Worthing beach, and they have little rummels of water that go into that lagoon and that water carries modern detergents, some of which are not degradable. It carries, I suppose, some slight element of sewage water, and it must soak up from the pits that people have for their ordinary sewage arrangements; it carries all the detritus that washes out of people's houses when they wash the yard, when they sweep the floor, and so on.

We, in our lifetime, have seen that reef killed. Quite recently I was saying to somebody that I seem to remember when I was a little fellow being at Worthing one day when I heard that they had caught a shark inside the reef, and I happened to be sitting at a table with somebody who had helped catch the shark. Now, the reason why you would not see sharks of any size inside Worthing's reef today is that the water has become too unattractive. The whole area has become so inhospitable for marine life that you will not see sharks come to eat whatever smaller fish they eat because smaller fish themselves will not come there. Rockley's Beach, I also predict, is going to be affected by wash off and by drainage.

I spoke of the reef at Worthing's Beach being dead. I do not think that any hon. member will have to be told that the reef going up to the Hilton is, again, well nigh dead — the reef running from Rockley, broken in places, right up to the Hilton if not totally dead is dying. Time was when you heard of people catching turtles on these beaches. The last person I heard talking about a turtle coming in on the beach at Palm Beach was Mr. Neville Boxill when he was in here as the hon. junior member for St. Thomas. I believe the hon. member for St. George South may also have contributed to that debate at the time. We are seeing a problem which Barbados has allowed to happen in the last 30 years.

I do not know how many hon. members were Sea Scouts, or used to have occasion to go to Carlisle Bay a lot, but you could see 15 ft., 18 ft., 20 ft., in the sea on a hot day when I was a Sea Scout. You could see the wreck in the sea. The only way persons in Barbados, age 20, will now see the wreck that was sunk in Carlisle Bay — I do not mean the *William Johnson* — is if they dived down and see it. Things could be seen

from a boat, or seen when you are swimming. The bottom of the sea could clearly be seen and that is gone. It is not through oil leakage or anything like that. It is from the pouring of sewage, road wash, fish market wash, and the general effluence of Bridgetown. It is from the pouring of all these things into Carlisle Bay that it has built up. We have this problem going north, and the reefs themselves are dying. Perhaps, we may in time, save the area at Folkestone where the Marine Park is put, but it needs a recognition that what pollutes the sea at the present time in Barbados is what comes from the land. You either carry oil to sea and pollute the sea that way, or take other chemical products from land out to sea and throw them in the sea, or you have the wash off from the land which goes into marine areas and create these difficulties. The creation of a Marine Park by itself will not remove the danger to the western shores of Barbados that is presented by the intensity of the development in the Island. This is 20 miles of urbanisation. From Oistin to Speighstown is 20 miles of built-up area, and that is a lot of miles of urban development and a density of the coast that is seen only in big Cities in Northern countries.

We have to face the fact that with all of this, unless we take active measures, we are going to destroy marine life on our western coast. Eventually, we are going to destroy it on the eastern coast, too, because Barbados is a very thickly populated place. I was most surprised to hear the new Minister of Roads and Standpipes say that there are not so many vehicles in Barbados. I think there are about two hundred vehicles per square mile in Barbados. I do not believe that the State of New York has twenty-five million vehicles.....

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way, I would like to correct him on that — that I said there are not so many vehicles and factories in Barbados to contribute that amount of sulphur dioxide and other related substances to make the atmosphere injurious to the people, and what it has accumulated during the specific period of the day time dissipates due to the movement of the air.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point of elucidation made.

Mr. ADAMS: He did not say the movement of the air. It is not the lack of motor vehicles and so on that causes Barbados' atmosphere not to have carbon dioxide. I do not know that we have any particular sulphur products coming out of motor cars. Anyhow, he is the scientist. It is a fact that Barbados is blessed with a special

movement of air. Barbados is a very windy Island. You can go to London, which is cold, and never feel the wind blow in your face, but in Barbados the wind blows in your face everyday. It blows the stuff out to sea, and it is a potentially serious hazard in Barbados because we are very seriously over-stocked with motor vehicles. We have many, many more motor vehicles for our area than even the thickly populated states of the United States. It is foolish to think that we have no problem because we have no cars. We must have, barring Hong Kong, Singapore and Malta — there can be no where in the world with more cars per square mile than Barbados, or one of the little Islands such as these.

We are not really talking about air pollution. I want to take up the Minister on another point with regard to modern pollution. I am sure that the environmentalist's medicine, or whatever it is, that was taught to the Minister when he was learning science has developed beyond a stage where we could say that water is considered polluted only if there is a lack of oxygen. That may be the ultimate, but we are dealing in this country with civil servants, one of whom I heard with my own ears got on the T.V. and say that it does not matter if a little sewage gets into Carlisle Bay because it might only do you harm if a piece hits you. Now, that was said on C.B.C. some years ago. It was said that if you are bathing and a piece hits you that you might come to some harm. Where you are dealing with people charged with considering the effect of pollution of the environment and in the sea, and if they think that it is only where the sewage is raw and gives you a little embarrassment if you swim into it, then we on this side have to say that the Government is not aware of the problem.

I presume that the stage, eventually, is reached, which is referred to by the Minister, of the faeces breaking down and the process breaking down consumes the oxygen in the water. He will correct me if I am wrong. All modern environmentalists recognise that even when they treat sewage and break it down so that it does not consume the oxygen in the water and then discharge it into the water as allegedly harmless, fluid that the process of doing that increases the nitrogenous content of the water and causes sea weeds to grow and choke your beaches. You have just as serious a problem as before and, in fact, in a tourist Island like Barbados you have a more serious problem.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, let me just explain to him. The point of measuring whether the water is able to support

life or not is dependent upon the oxygen content, and there are many factors or substances which can reduce the oxygen content. Sometimes purely by physical means the oxygen content of the water can be reduced to insignificant levels. The reference to oxygen content is only a way of indicating whether or not the water can support life.

1.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the Minister up on this. I am nearly at the end, Sir, but I cannot leave that unsettled. Suppose a treatment plant is imposed — and I am thinking of the sewage plant too — suppose a treatment plant is imposed on the Bridgetown area and sewage is discharged into the sea, it is discharged in a form that does not reduce the oxygen content; it is treated, in other words, but it so enriches the inshore that seaweed grows all along the way down Paradise Beach Club when the current goes that way — I do not believe it goes the other way — but it so enriches it that you get thick seaweed all along the beach, would you say the sea has not been polluted? The oxygen content will be higher perhaps; I am no chemist, but it certainly will not be lower if something like this is done — would you still say that there has been no pollution? In short, in curing one problem you might create another.

I gather that the explanation and the suggestion is that the water is no longer polluted. The water is polluted by the treated sewage which has caused it to grow seaweed. It is not polluted in the out-of-date definition offered by the hon. member but it is polluted in the sense that you cannot go there and bathe comfortably, and the people who have establishments on the beach depend on there being good swimming to give Barbadians some work, to bring it down to concrete terms.

All of these matters, I hope, Government will deal with, and I would not like to see a sewage plant which is going to, as an hon. member said, avoid one evil only by creating another. These are all the matters which I hope the Minister, having had what is surely a highly non-partisan debate today, will consider during the few months that are left for them to hold office.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, having listened to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am reminded of a play I saw once based on a trilogy written by Somerset Maugham, and one of them was Mr. Know All. He just strikes me that, there is nothing under the sun that he does not know of. I am glad to hear him say today.....

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. Please sit. I would like the Hon. Minister of Education to confine his remarks to this Bill. I do not want to hear anything about the Leader of the Opposition. I want to hear something of the Bill. You may proceed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear him say that in Barbados there is no place—even in the great United States — that has the number of cars per square mile compared with Barbados. I hope when he goes to St. Philip he will tell the people that this situation arose under the Democratic Labour Party; that the Democratic Labour Party created this situation in which it can be said by him that there are more cars per square mile than in the great United States.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister has made a speech not pertaining to the Bill. Any member who gets up again I will have to ask him to take his seat if he does not speak on what is before us.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will be given the latitude to reply to everything that has been said, to whatever was said before whether it is related to the Bill or not, and I presume it related to the Bill because you did not stop them — it must be presumed therefore that what was said before was relevant, and I hope you will give me that latitude. Further, Sir, I do not think I will calaim it because quite frankly, the way the debate has gone so far there has not been very much to say by way of reply, but like the hon. member for Christ Church West I will begin my reply by reading that section of the Democratic Labour Party's manifesto that dealt with this matter. It is a section headed "Conservation and Recreation". It says, and I will read:

"Special attention will be paid to the development and improvement of our parks and beaches and other recreational areas and to the preservation of our trees and woodlands for the enjoyment and peaceful relaxation of our citizens.

"Specifically, Queen's Park is being improved to provide for a National Arts Theatre, an open barn theatre and an area reserved for those who enjoy dancing and the concerts. Comparable improvements are also planned for the King George V Memorial Park in St. Philip,

Farley Hill National Park at St. Peter where the Government recently acquired an additional 12 acres of land mainly for playing fields.

"There are plans for establishing a park at Folkestone and an under-water park offshore.

"Additional beach facilities will be developed in areas in which people normally frequent and find attractive for recreational purposes."

Mr. SPEAKER: Quite frankly having read it I do not thin it is really necessary for me to say more. I think that the whole question of doing something about the preservation of our nature spots commenced with this Government and it did not commence in 1971; it began even before 1971. It did not even begin with the establishment of the Parks and Beaches Commission; it began even before the Parks and Beaches Commission.

As the Minister for Health said, this matter of an under-water park we have been pursuing for the past ten or more years. In 1967 we brought to Barbados a conservationist by the name of Mr. Carl Carlozzi and Mr. Carlozzi carried out a survey and did investigations of our nature spots, places of beauty, places to be preserved and so on, and prepared a report which was handed in to the Government. That was a way back in 1967, even before we had established the Parks and Beaches Commission, which we were then thinking of establishing. We became members, I think, in 1963 or 1964 of the Caribbean Conservation Association.

1.30 p.m.

We have been very active memebtrs of the Caribbean Conservation Association. We have been so active, Mr. Speaker, that we were able to attract the Association to our shores and have as its first Caribbean President Mr. John Connell whom we are very pleased to have as one of our Deputy Clerks of this Chamber. As a matter of fact, Mr. Connell is the Chairman of the Underwater Parks Committee which is a sub-committee of the Parks and Beaches Commission.

Now I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West on the question of our cliffs. These too were treated by Mr. Carlozzi in his report, and we tried to establish in our Town and Country Planning Department — this has been very recently, too recent perhaps to have the kind of effect we could have had, but yet at the same time all is not lost — a building line of about 100 feet back from the high water mark as

a kind of regulation of the Parks and Beaches Commission which I think is a very good thing. I am sure hon. members will agree with me it is a very good thing, because some developers, some private owners of land and house builders have been building right almost on the water's edge. Now they have got away to my mind with murder, but we have now tried to establish this building line and we hope that we will be able to capture for ourselves and for our children an area, a zone if you like, that would normally have gone out if we did not have this building line.

One can think in terms of Atlantic Shores where houses have been built right on the cliff, and this is a very beautiful cliff. One can stand on the cliff and see a lovely vista right down the west coast, and on this, as I said earlier, I am very much in agreement with the hon. member for Christ Church West when he says that we should do something about our cliffs.

As regards the tar, I do not know if it is known, but it should be known how our beaches on the east coast become polluted with tar. It is that the tankers, I presume when they leave Barbados and when they get on the east side of Barbados and way out into the ocean, wash out their tankers and the oil drifts towards Barbados. What to do about that might be a bit of a problem. We have to set up a Coast Guard on that side of the country in order to prevent the tankers from so polluting our beaches. I do not think there is very much more to say except that perhaps I should have said earlier that it is our intention to bring fish into that area of the sea on the west coast and establish fish feeding stations that will attract the fish and keep them within the area which we are ourselves establishing. We do not want that area polluted. It is my understanding like that of the hon. member for St. Thomas that parts of our coral reef are dead. We would really like the west coast to be preserved. We have had to take strong action against a hotelier in very recent times, not more than a year or so ago, in order to get him to move his pipeline where he was discharging effluent precisely where we are establishing the underwater park, and eventually he had to discharge it the other way inland rather than out to sea. As a matter of fact, I believe this can be done with some other hotels that are really operating around the coasts of Barbados, because they too are some of the sources of pollution of our beaches.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr. W. R. LOWE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and they stood part.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am almost afraid to rise again, because for certain people when you get up and you know, they say you are a know-all, when you get up and you do not know, they say you are ignorant. They are so difficult to know who to satisfy. I did not know it was this candidate for St. Thomas that was a know-all because my effort has always been to know things right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This has absolutely nothing to do with the Bill. If you are going to speak on Clause 3, let me hear something relative to that clause.

Mr. ADAMS: I said I am afraid to get up because when you reveal knowledge, people who are jealous that they do not have the knowledge want to abuse you; but anyway we cannot deal with every human weakness. In this section I would like to advert to what the Minister has said, because clearly these things that deal with scientific studies and protection of the flora and fauna and indeed wrecks found on our restricted areas are all going to be threatened by this question of oil and tar pollution. I would respectfully suggest that this is a subject upon which international assistance would probably be readily available to assist Barbados in tracing the source of tar on the St. Andrew, St. Joseph and St. John beaches. This is a problem which I know is occupying the minds of many countries of the western hemisphere, because this is the principal destination of most of the seaborne oil that travels across the world's shipping lines that enters the Caribbean or comes to North America passing within polluting distance of Barbados, and I would really ask the Minister responsible to search out this with international agencies and be prepared to offer Barbados' participation in any policing arrangements that can be arrived at.

I remember the Bermuda Minister of Tourism, I think he was at the time telling me that not so long ago he was actually at sea in a yacht on a pleasure voyage and saw a tanker pouring oil and other polluting substance on to the sea. He could not see the name but he personally, as he told me and as I discovered otherwise, went to an immense amount of trouble checking with the register of ships at Lloyds, checking with tanker movements with the ships register in New York and Boston until he located what the only possible ship could be that was in that locality at that time, and he reported it and it turned out to be a ship that was in some way amenable to the jurisdiction of the American authorities — I suppose because it came to American ports and could be arrested. He reported it for breach of such regulations as existed and I believe eventually obtained a conviction or whatever penalty is obtainable under international treaty or under whatever the international arrangements that prevail may be.

1.40 p.m.

Clearly if we are suffering from this — and all of us have the experience of stepping in what we call tar, but is only really crude petroleum that has arrived on the beaches of Barbados — if we can find out whence our floating pools of tar that break up and get on the coast-line and find out what ships are likely to have discharged them, then we owe it to ourselves as much as Bermuda does or North America itself does, to take every step we can to enforce the necessary international obligations.

The question that clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clauses 4 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, seconded by Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the MARINE AREAS (PRESERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT) ACT, 1976.

THE NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Item is Order No. 5 which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing and National Insurance.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill which probably requires no greater treatment from me than just that.

Every year 700 Barbadians are recruited for work on Farms overseas, principally in Canada and followed next by the United States of America, in Florida. A sprinkling of persons is recruited for hotel service in the United States of America, one or two people in the Ascension Island. We are hoping that we will be able to improve on our recruitment to the United States for the purpose of reaping fruit. These persons go abroad and they have to make contributions to whatever security schemes there are in those countries. It means that when they do this some of them leave their work here and go to the United States and Canada and when they come back it is very possible that if there is any problem which they might have with regard to any compensation here after they have returned and they have not been contributing in recent times, it might mean that those persons will lose those short-term benefits which they will otherwise have been entitled to.

The purpose of this Bill is to save these benefits for those contributors if they continue to contribute. They will not be required to contribute both in the place where they are working as well as in Barbados because if they are contributing in Barbados they will not have to contribute to the Canadian Pension Plan and Unemployment Insurance in the case of Canada. We feel that the Act should therefore be amended to enable those persons to pay contributions to the National Insurance Scheme here in Barbados, and this is what this Bill is about.

I do not know if there is anything further I can say, I have explained what is the possible benefit of making contributions here, and I move, Sir, that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to give consideration to a further aspect of this. I have no objection to this at all but I view a matter as it relates to National Insurance in a way that the Minister should take up, and that is that he should have other arrangements made for seamen in Barbados than what the United Kingdom Government is doing. We have a situation where seamen are recruited in Barbados, and there was a time when Barbados

had no National Insurance Scheme and the seamen recruited in Barbados did not have to contribute to anything in Barbados, but since the Barbados Government has introduced the National Insurance scheme the seamen recruited in Barbados are Barbadians, when they sign off they will sign off here and there is no point in people fooling themselves, you have to save some people from themselves. Because a man gets all of his money and does not pay anything it does not mean that he is better off, and I heard the hon. member for St. James last week when they were talking about the old age pensioners, but I do not like to talk about these things because we have some bad old age pensioners too. I am not one of these people who believe that every old age pensioner is a blessed old soul and made this contribution to the country, he might be a blessed something else, but it is not that I am opposed to the principle of the old age pensions, I feel that when people grow old sometimes they do not make any provision for this when they are young and unfortunately sometimes we have to make provision for them, and this is the problem with the seamen.

1.50 p.m.

It is time that you pass a law in Barbados. The hon. member was worrying this morning about somebody saying that you know all. The hon. member must not worry about those things too much. I was reading a book this morning and it said that when you do things some people say that you do too much and when you do not do anything they say that you are a lazy so and so. There is no midway point between them. If we in the Trade Union movement call a strike, they say that you want to take over the Government; and if you do not call a strike they say that you are selling out.

You do not need to be a lawyer to see that you must be able to pass laws in your own country and say what should happen. You do not need to have legal advice on whether you should pass a law here. Anytime that a seaman is recruited in Barbados you should pass laws that apply to the people who recruited them and tell them what they must do if they want to recruit them. It is as simple as that; but if you make them believe that you are begging them for a job they will go on with this sort of nonsense.

Seamen leave here and leave their wives or somebody else with children. I know a youngster who used to play football with my club and who went to sea and left a woman with five children. He is now married in the

U.S.A. He is a seaman too. What is going to happen to these children? There are more people in Barbados who are unmarried with children than those who are married; and there are more seamen unmarried outside with children in Barbados than married seamen. I am talking about life in Barbados. More children are born in Barbados every year from parents who are not married than from those who are married. It is 70 per cent. Out of every 10 children born seven are from parents who are not married.

So far as the law is concerned, those children do not have any father. They only have a mother. You might just as well look into the matter seriously because by not having these kinds of laws you are going to have a heavier burden on your social services than you necessarily would have because you are not making provision for it.

Seamen, in my view, must make a contribution to the social provisions of their country like any other worker because he is a seaman recruited in Barbados, and does not pay income tax because under the income tax law he is not working for an employer in Barbados; but he has to return to Barbados, and for social purposes he should be contributing towards his children because the National Insurance Act makes provision for those children. If he dies at sea they will have to go to the Welfare Department, but he is not contributing to the scheme. His wife will be entitled under the National Insurance Scheme.

We have passed resolutions many times in the Union on that. It is one of the things that I feel that if it requires discussion between the Government of Barbados and the Government of the United Kingdom, it should be done at the appropriate level. I feel that seamen should come under the National Insurance Scheme like all the other people who work in Barbados.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the hon. member who has just sat down in connection with the necessity for embracing seamen within the National Insurance Scheme. As members of this Chamber who were in the House between 1966 and 1971 will recall, I raised this question, I think in 1968, by way of a Question and raised it also in debate on more than one occasion; and while I am grateful that the Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union has come around to this way of thinking and is lending his prestige at this stage in supporting the cause of seamen, I would like to point out

that this has been observed for years and years and yet nothing has been done about it.

The Barbados Workers Union has continued to recruit seamen although they know that the seamen are entering a service where they are not covered by social security of their native country or of the owners of the ship or the point of registration of the ship. That problem has become worse since the institution of the Barbados Social Security Scheme and the National Insurance Scheme.

As the hon. member will recognise, and as the Minister will also recognise, since the Workmen's Compensation Act was abolished by the National Insurance legislation of Barbados the lump sum that you used to get if your hand was cut off or if you were blinded and so on on your job you no longer get. What you get is a disability benefit paid weekly under the National Insurance Scheme.

Seamen used to benefit under the Workmen's Compensation Scheme. I believe that that was introduced indeed in the early years of the new Government, but when the Workmen's Compensation Act was repealed the seamen lost even that right of compensation for industrial injury; and it is particularly within the experience of many people who deal with legal matters of this sort that if your hand was cut off — people with this sort of experience know of a seaman losing his fingers in New Zealand, falling into the hatch in Fiji getting crushed in the docks at Lorenzo Marques — I am speaking from knowledge —, and they get nothing. The shipping line gives them a couple of hundred dollars and flies them back home, and they get nothing else under the Social Security Scheme for the rest of their lives as they would if they were working ashore in Barbados; no lump sum payment as they might have collected in the days before the repeal of the Workmen's Compensation Act. So their position is worse now than it was 12 years ago.

Sir, I cannot understand how the sentiments expressed by the Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union have not led him to convince his colleagues before now or to enter into negotiations with the Ministry of Labour in Great Britain before now which would result in some concrete proposal being put forward which would allow seamen recruited in Barbados to gain from social security in the same manner as other Barbadians.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour now being 2 p.m., this sitting is now suspended until 2.45 p.m.

On Resumption --

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, there being no quorum, I am asking that the bell be rung.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The bell was rung and a quorum obtained.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question time. Question No. 69 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph. I would like members to follow the procedure set out in the Standing Order relating to the manner of asking and answering Questions — Standing Order No. 16.

Mr. BOLDEN: If Your Honour would point out to me which section of Standing Order 16 you are referring to, I would like to comply with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Standing Order 16(1).....

"...The Member so called shall then arise in his place and ask the question by reference to its number on the Order Paper....."

FIRE TENDERS

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, Question No. 69:

To ask the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state: (a) the number of fire appliances stationed at the fire station in Saint John, Saint James and other fire stations in rural areas; and (b) the water-carrying capacity of each of the said vehicles? Is the Minister aware that in many cases, fires which occurred in the rural areas, did excessive damage, because the fire tenders carried a small amount of water and firemen were hampered in putting out the fires? Would the Minister state what plans are being made to place fire tenders with large water carrying capacities in rural areas especially during the sugar cane reaping season?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Replies are as follows:

"(a) There is one appliance at each of the fire stations in St. John, St. James and Worthing with water carrying capacity of 500 gallons, 500 gallons and 90 gallons respectively.

- (b) There is no truth in the allegation that the small water capacity of appliances has contributed to excessive damage by fires in rural areas.
- (c) There are plans for increasing the number of appliances available following proposed extensions at Worthing and St. James, and for a new station to serve other northern areas of the Island."

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that when a fire occurred at Vineyard Plantation, the fire tender which attended did not carry enough water to stop even a part of the fire?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I did not get the name of the Plantation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member repeat the question.

Mr. BOLDEN: I referred to the house at Vineyard Plantation. When a fire took place at that house, the fire tender which arrived there had only about ninety gallons of water.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that will have to be asked as a specific question in order to get full details.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the policy is to send a small fire tender and await a large tender coming from Bridgetown to fires which occur in rural areas?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the practice, in so far as the appliances are concerned in relation to the question which the hon. member is posing, as the Chief Fire Officer has pointed out in connection with the appliance at Worthing Station and small stations, is that on receipt of a call from the Worthing area, the fire appliance from Headquarters Station with 500 gallons of water would normally attend. In other words, the one from the Worthing Station would get there first, and the other one would be on the spot to assist. This has been the practice, but it is proposed to upgrade the equipment at the Worthing Station where the fire appliance can only carry 90 gallons. That Station is being upgraded, so that we will have a 500-gallon capacity appliance to assist. Apart from that, the whole matter as the reply suggests, is being looked into, and the fire appliance upgraded especially in the northern area.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 71 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. James.

NEED FOR ELECTRICITY AT SPRINGHEAD

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, to ask the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that the

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not allowing that; we are sticking to the Standing Orders, and the hon. member must call the number.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Standing Order does not say that. I do not want Your Honour to rule wrongly. I do not want Your Honour to get into a situation where you make a ruling today and tomorrow find yourself in difficulty.

Mr. SPEAKER: I want the hon. member to know that I have ruled such.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Order did not say that. It says he can rise in his place and ask the Question by reference to its number, but it does not say that he cannot proceed to read it. If the Standing Order wanted him only to call the number, it would have said: "He must call the number and sit, or he is not permitted to read the question." You cannot import something of this nature which is not written in the Standing Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am standing by my ruling that the member so called shall rise in his place and ask the Question by reference to its number on the Order Paper.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I know this is election time, and nobody wants to hear about what you are asking. I know this is done in the House of Commons. It is something which you have introduced in here, and I will go along with you for now. What is the number, again, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: No. 71.

Mr. CRAIG: It has been called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I asked the hon. member to call the number.

Mr. CRAIG: It has been called, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. James call the number of the Question.

Mr. CRAIG: The number has been called.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have not heard it. I asked the hon. member to call it.

Mr. CRAIG: Let them read it, lay it, or do whatever they care to do. Call it 73, or 74, or call it anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister may proceed. Is the reply ready for Question No. 71? (Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: "No question has been asked.") There being no further questions, that brings us to the end of Question Time, Private Members' Business.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, you asked me to call Question No. 71, and I have called Question No. 71. The Minister says no question has been asked, and you have said that it is the end of Question Time. That is the position in which we find ourselves in here today.
2.55 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said we are in Private Members' Business.

Order No. 1 was called.

Order No. 2 was called.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 3 is the first order of the day with which we can deal.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 is the instant order. When Order No. 3 was discussed the hon. member for St. Michael West was speaking. I do not now see him in his place. Any other hon. member who wishes to make his debate on Order No. 3 may do so. (*A pause*) The mover may make his final reply.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Leader of the House to allow me to make the final reply on behalf of the mover, Sir. I am just asking the Leader of the House to allow me to make the final reply on behalf of the mover, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: There seems to be no objection.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the final reply will be...

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am objecting, Mr. Speaker. You have to put it to the House, and I am voting against it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members in favour of the hon. member....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, does the hon. member who is making all the noise appreciate that somebody has the right to reply whether they have spoken already or not, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it your pleasure that the Leader of the Opposition make the final reply on this Bill?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No.

Mr. ADAMS: Aye. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour. (*A pause*) There being one dissenting voice (*Asides*) a division has been called for. (*A pause*).

Leave has not been granted. (*Asides*)

Mr. BOLDEN: I am at a loss. With all respect to you, Sir, I am at a loss. I heard a voice say "no", then I heard a statement "a division has been called for," and then I heard "leave has been refused," so I do not know where we are, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No leave has been granted to the Leader of the Opposition, and the only person who can speak now — the final reply — is the mover of the Bill. That is my ruling.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue against Your Honour about your ruling. All I say is, I heard a voice shout "no". I heard Your Honour ask if leave will be granted to the Leader of the Opposition to make a reply. I heard a voice shout "no". Then I heard Your Honour say a division has been called for. Is it that Your Honour is making a ruling based on a voice, without a count in a division? Because during my little time in here I know whenever a division is called for, there is a count. I have never heard a decision declared on a division, without a count. So if you are telling me that if a voice says "no" and you are saying that leave has not been granted, without a count, then I want to find out.

Mr. SPEAKER: I rule that the only speaker allowed on this motion now is the mover of the motion.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is Your Honour saying you have withdrawn the statement that a division has been called for? Is Your Honour saying that the voice which shouted "no" has no effect? That is all I am asking, because I heard Your Honour saying earlier....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, Mr. Speaker, the question is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition asked for leave to give the final reply. Leave was not granted because some of us on this side objected. Objection was raised, so therefore leave was not granted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Let us get something straight, Mr. Speaker. Let us get something absolutely straight. Your Honour is either ruling as the person sitting in the Chair or you are not ruling. If Your Honour has to take a cue from that side, I will say now, it brings you in a certain position in my mind. You either act on what is justice without somebody out there prompting you what to do.

If you are telling me that you could not make a decision unless somebody out there shout "no", then I have to put you in a completely different category. The Leader of the House is getting up saying that some members over there say no. That is all I am saying.

Mr. SPEAKER: There was an objection to the leave being granted.....

Mr. BOLDEN: Then if there is an objection, the correct method of doing it is to put it to a vote. You cannot take a one-voice "no".

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no vote on that.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I hope for the record we would always know that whenever there is one dissenting voice -- note carefully, Sir. This is what you have ruled, Sir. That you heard one dissenting voice, that when we out here object with one voice, then Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not say there has to be a vote.

We are accepting your ruling on this occasion, that there was one dissenting voice. When the Government ask for leave to do their business and you hear one voice from out here, Sir, I hope I do not hear it is going to the vote. You said 'one dissenting voice'. That is now on record that Your Honour's ruling must be upheld.

Sir, as far as this Bill is concerned, it is unfortunate that I was not in my place when other members spoke on this Bill. I remember it brought about -- the debate was a bit heated. I myself had to leave the Chamber on other business, and therefore that is why I asked my colleague who was in his place all the time, to wind up.

For me to wind up I would have to recite what I said in my opening remarks, that there is no doubt in my mind that we should have this Bill amended -- that this Bill should be amended to what it was originally, where these people who get their provident fund should get a lumpsum as they are accustomed getting, along with other benefits there are for them. There were cries, or a

cry or two that I heard from the Government benches on that occasion, and they ran us all into the old age pension talk; you may very well recall, Sir, how members on that side spoke about old age pensioners and members on this side spoke about them. We on this side, at least for me I can say I have been championing this cause from the time I came in here, and you will also recall, Sir, I believe, that the statement in the Press the following morning was that the Minister of Health is going to give the old age pensioners a better deal.

3.05 p.m.

I have been championing this cause from the time I came here and you will recall that the Press the following morning said that the Minister of Health was going to give the old age pensioners a better deal. This is the unfortunate position of the Opposition. However time will tell the story. I am hoping that members will examine this in the truest light, will examine it in the light in which I have moved it, and examine the plight of the old age pensioners over the years, many of whom die without having a funeral grant or before they get a chance to draw a little of the money. My view, Mr. Speaker, is that these people who were sugar workers should be in a position at least after they have retired from working over the years to get this lump sum of money which they were paid over the years, with which they would be in a position to repair their homes and make around them tidy so that in the evening of their years they can sit back and say they have got something for the years of their toil. Many of us today are enjoying the fruits of their labour, but as I have said over and over they have now become social lepers of the society, because they cannot serve the Government at the time or the Opposition. They are now thrown aside and down trodden. I cannot refer to them as anything but social lepers of the society created by the policies of the Government. Sometimes I wonder if some of the members on the other side realise that they have old aunts who still sell fruits in lower Broad Street. Some of them cannot see the problems of the old sugar workers, and this is the viciousness of the Government. You hear them shout for murder for the young people, but when the young ones become old and the Government is still in power, though I hope not, these people will be of no use to them to carry out their viciousness and they will be pushed aside too. That is the plank the Government has paraded on for the past fourteen years.

As a matter of fact, I will go further. In St. James I cannot get one single person in a Government house whether he is blind, old or has

amputated arms or legs, but sixty-eight houses were given out in St. James. I have asked the lady at the Housing Authority whose name I should not like to record repeatedly to lend some help. I have investigated the case and I have been told by the people working at the Housing Authority that it has been a decision of the Government not to give a single house on behalf of any member of the Opposition. Get up and deny that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is far from the truth. Not only is it far from the truth, but I have personally intervened in cases of persons whom members of the Opposition wanted to help and have helped them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made!

Mr. CRAIG: Nothing coming from the mouth of the Minister would I ever believe. I cannot trust the Minister; I cannot believe him. He is totally incompetent. He is unable to carry out his duties. I have no confidence in that particular Minister. I have seen him operate. He was at St. Thomas a couple of nights ago, and I am going to wait and see if people are going to bring money to him and see what he will do. I should get somebody to lick him, but I am not that sort. I can do it myself.

Sir, I feel this Bill should be amended to take its rightful place in the lives of the sugar workers of this country, and I believe if it is examined in the light in which I have introduced it, the members of the Cabinet will make their decision in such a manner.

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

Noes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Mr. W. R. LOWE; His Honour A. DaC EDWARDS; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES — 11.

Ayes: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 5.

Mr. SPEAKER: The next Item is Order No. 4.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, Order No. 4 is before the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5.

Mr. ADAMS: Order No. 5 is associated with Order No. 6. *(Aside)* I will let the hon. member for St. Joseph make a short statement on Order No. 5.

RESOLUTION RE NON-FAULT INSURANCE

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, this motion has been placed on the Order Paper in order to draw attention to the plight of persons who were injured on the roads of this country by motor vehicles. The hon. member for Christ Church West has brought an amendment to the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act. I know that if I proceed with this motion that members on the other side are going to say it will create a charge on the Government and vote against it. I like to be realistic. While there is still a need for non-fault insurance in Barbados, I should like to give way to the Bill which the hon. member for Christ Church West has brought forward which would partially solve the situation.

I therefore ask for leave to withdraw Order No. 5.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I will second this motion since the hon. member is withdrawing his Order, but I regret very much he is not pursuing this matter of no-fault insurance, because I believe that the Government must widen the sphere where people who are injured whether on the road or in industrial accidents or by virtue of a criminal cause for which they are not themselves responsible should be compensated for their injuries.

3.15 p.m.

I am hoping that when the Select Committee meets on the Motor Vehicles Insurance Act that perhaps the Select Committee will recommend to the House and to the Government the setting up of a high-powered National Commission to look into the provisions of payments and benefits to persons who are injured in the fields which I have set out.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 is withdrawn.

Mr. ADAMS: The next Order is Order No. 7.

RESOLUTION RE COMPENSATION FOR COM- PLAINING, AUTHORISED ELECTORS WHO ARE DENIED THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a rather interesting Resolution I would like to

say, and the Objects and Reasons of this Resolution are to protect the Registering Officer on election day as well as the Chief Electoral Officer, and also to protect the voter, and in the event of the voter being denied the right to vote through no fault of his own that he should be compensated. This is the whole context of the Resolution and I will not read it out because it is very long.

Before I had any interest in politics I was told how the Conservatives or the Government of that day had thrown away a number of votes in canefields, I am told that votes from a ballot box of which the Leader of the House, at that time a member of the Barbados Labour Party, the Party which was the Government.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I was not a member, I was a member of the Congress Party. I think he is referring to 1948.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, he has been a member of every Party in Barbados.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have been a labourite all through. The Congress Party was more radical, I would say, than the Barbados Labour Party, so when you get up and say that you are not saying anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like hon. members to observe the rules. If an hon. member is speaking and another member rises on a point of order and states that he is on a point of order, the first member should take his seat. Let us have decorum in the deliverance of speeches.

Mr. CRAIG: The Leader of the House vigorously denied that something of that nature happened.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I did not deny it happened, I merely denied that I was a member of the Barbados Labour Party. If you bear with me, Sir, in 1942 I was selected to run in St. James against the powers that were, long before adult suffrage and long before women's suffrage, and I ran against Mr. Walcott, a former Attorney General and one of the riches men in Barbados, but then in 1944 I decided whether I would run because I did not want to be a scapegoat any more so I ran independently.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, does the hon. member remember in 1951 on the Monday of the election week he said he was a Barbados Labour Party candidate and on election day when he was elected he said he was an independent?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: His memory is failing him. I ran in 1951 as an independent candidate and won by over 3,000 votes, and told the Leader of the Labour Party at the time, the late Sir Grantley Adams, a week or so before the election that when I got through I would rejoin the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I have no doubt in my mind that when we get the Government of 1976 you will find the Leader of the House looking for a seat on the front benches of the Barbados Labour Party. (Mr. ADAMS: You mean in the Senate.) It will have to be in the Senate but we do not mind that, we know he is a professional politician. Any party that is in power he is with them.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I am not only with them but I have also occupied the position of General Secretary and did a lot of hard work, except in the D.L.P. I have been General Secretary of the Progressive League, General Secretary of the Congress Party and did a lot of work in the Barbados Labour Party.

Mr. CRAIG: I do not see why the Leader of the House seems to be upset, I was paying him a compliment when I was introducing the Resolution. The point which I was making is that the reason why we have a Resolution of this nature is because people like the Leader of the House suffered problems of this nature. I am not concerned with how many parties he joined.

I heard as a young man — a younger man, I should say — before I got into active politics how a number of his votes were floating on the sea. When I became active in politics there were a number of complaints made of the Registering Officer, complaints against the Electoral Office, and complaints against the whole election system in this country. I recall in St. Joseph you had Registering Officers openly canvassing for the Government Party. I would think that if I were a member of the Barbados Labour Party and the Registering Officer or the Presiding Officer is aware of the fact that I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party and that I am going to support the Barbados Labour Party that he can safely say, "your name is not on the register." This is what he can say, or he can say he cannot find it. This is what is possible, I am not saying this is what has happened. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That is too remote to be considered.). I have told the Minister I have no home problems, man, do not put that on me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Members not addressing the Chair must speak in undertones.
3.25 p.m.

Yes, Mr. CRAIG: the purpose of this is to protect that officer. I believe that if the officer is aware of the fact that he may be brought before the Law Courts of this country because a voter is denied his right to vote through no fault of his own, that he can be brought into the Law Courts, and if convicted, that he must pay a fine, I believe that this would help our system altogether.

I think that you are well aware of this. In your own constituency you can have a family of six living in a house and all registered on the same day by the same officer; and then on polling day they go to the polling booth to be told that they have no vote at this booth, try another booth. They are told that the names are not on the register and you have the problem of these persons running up and down trying to find the polling booth they should vote at. Then it is 6 o'clock and those persons cannot vote. They are denied the right to exercise their vote through no fault of their own and somebody should be punished for it, and that is what this Resolution is all about.

You may recall, Sir, that in 1971 when you had the division of boundaries people were confused as to where they should go and vote. I am not saying that electoral officers presiding at the time took advantage of that situation, but I am saying what can happen. I have heard often of elections being rigged. I do not know what is going to happen in the coming general election, and therefore I am trying to protect the voters, the registering officers and the Chief Election Officer so that they should be able to carry out an honest duty.

If you have a typographical error you can expect this; but you have six people living in one house, and one is told that he must vote at Polling Booth F.A. and the five others at Polling Booth F.H., and when they get to F.H. they are told we have not got your name. Still the persons have with them their identification cards proving beyond a shadow of a doubt that they have a right to vote.

I do not go in for any light work. When I am batting I am batting. I do not go for this 40 thing. There is no light work. You do not have to waste time for any recount with me. With all respect to my colleague at my right I do not win by any nippy 70 anything. When I am making runs I am making a lot of runs. (Mr. ADAMS: I believe that 67 is better than 60). I agree with him. I said with great respect to him. I am a wicked man when I start beating you.

I am only trying to protect people like the Louis Tulls and the St. Johns and the Adamses who may be defeated by just a little 74 or 48 votes through no fault of the voters and which may cause this country not to have a good Government.

Sir, I am quite sure that if you found yourself as Chief Electoral Officer you would do as well a job as was made available to you; but when you have a Government which is prepared to play every political trick in the book, vicious types of political tricks, you must look for protective measures.

There is no doubt that the elections in Guyana had flaws, and there is not doubt that you will see the same thing happening in Barbados; because when you put your \$240 there, there is what I call the Sunday punch. Any number can play; and you, Mr. Speaker, may get up one of these mornings and find that you are no longer Speaker of Parliament although they claim that you had on the wig up side down. You understand what I mean. You may go to bed tonight and come back here to find that someone like Mr. Carl Fields is the Speaker. You will remember that it was said that you are only a care taker Speaker, a temporary Speaker, to use the words of the hon. member for St. Michael.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is entirely out of order. He should stick to what he is speaking about. Stick to the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, does he mean that you do not know what you are doing? I am making the point that through no fault of the electorate you could find yourself out of a seat. I am talking about the problems that you are liable to face up to. I am not driving any fear into you. You are big enough, old enough and have been in here long enough to take care of yourself.

Sir, it is my view that the members on both sides should examine this Resolution in its truest light. I know that it may be the type of Resolution that will pinch the nerves of some of the Government members; but I am of the impression that if they examine it they will observe that it is a Resolution to protect their voters because it makes it very clear what should be done if a voter is denied his right through no fault of his own.

Sir, I hope that the hon. member on the other side who seems to be some half baked lawyer will not get up with all his law books to

defeat the purpose of this Resolution. All that is being set out is to protect the voter if he is denied the right to vote through no fault of his own. With those few remarks, I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Mr. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker.....

Mr. BOLDEN: When the motion was introduced I seconded it. If your Honour needs it to be seconded again, I will second it again and reserve the right to speak. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are few things that disgrace a country's political life, whether we have a two-party system or a one party system which means that you have elections than electoral irregularities. I venture to say that if Mr. Burnham in Guyana had nationalised bauxite, socialised the economy or co-operated or whatever verb the business is his activities would have passed unnoticed if he had gradually carried Guyana into the Communist camp, had he not decided to fiddle the elections and carry out perhaps the largest scale electoral fraud in the Western Hemisphere.

3.35 p.m.

Even in dictatorships like Paraguay, Sir, the Opposition is guaranteed one-third of the seats in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I can hear voices. I should like to hear the Leader of the Opposition alone. Members should know better, especially those on the Government benches.

Mr. WALCOTT: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to what the hon. member is saying? Did you not hear the hon. member on his feet charging another friendly Government with fraud, and he is not dealing with a substantive motion on Guyana before us? It is improper. (*Asides*.) It is not a matter of the Standing Order. It is for you to understand that you are not discussing Guyana. (*Asides*.) It is a reflection on all of us when he can get up here and say that the Government of Guyana is a fraud, and we are not discussing Guyana.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have heard the Prime Minister standing in this Chamber and accusing the Government of

Grenada of high-class fraud, and nobody said anything. Is there any difference between the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition? The Prime Minister called them political bandits.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate, and I rise to support the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Michael West.....

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! If we are going to have this type of behaviour — will both members take their seats!

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will both members take their seats! Must I say that again? I am going to suspend the sitting until I feel like. Let us have some order!

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir.

(*Both hon. members remained standing.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now suspended for 15 minutes.

On resumption —

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I will try to appeal, at this stage, to the Leader of the Opposition, who is the Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, to rephrase his statement or allegation. It is most unfortunate, it is very insulting, and it could be determined as unfounded. When you consider that the allegation is made against the Leader of a friendly Commonwealth country, who has done so much for CARIFTA and CARICOM, and you hear such an allegation coming from the Leader of the Opposition whose Party has sent representatives to attend Conferences of the People's National Congress on no fewer than three occasions — (*Asides*.) The fact remains that the Leader of the Opposition holds a responsible post in here. It is wrong to do something like that, and we could not sit here and allow a statement like that to go unchallenged. I am appealing to Your Honour to have the statement expunged from the records. You cannot make those statements in here unless you can prove them. I do not know where you got that from.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, on a point of order. If you are prepared to accept the request of the Leader of the House — I am not saying that you are going to do so — to have such remarks expunged from the records, then whatever has been said about the American Government who sent technical aid to Barbados, whatever the Prime Minister has said about the Canadian Government, about the British Government, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, about the Grenada Government, the Government of Dominica and all the other Governments that they sit around tables with at the United Nations, who are supposed to be a friendly set of people, should be expunged from the records of the House. Whatever has been said from 1961 to 1976 by the Prime Minister and any member of the Government Party about any nation in the world, outside of the Communist Bloc, should also be expunged from the records of this House.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House made a point of order which was no point of order at all. It started out as an appeal to me that, in the interest of Carifta and Caricom, we should not say anything about Burnham. Now that is one thing, but when he spoils it by going on to use the words "unfounded, false and vicious", he is putting himself entirely out of court.

Now, I have here in my hand various documents which provide documentary evidence of electoral fraud in Guyana. I have Reports from the Opinion Research Centre, Mr. Humphrey Taylor is the Director, who found widescale false registration in the United Kingdom. I have Dr. Jagan's own Report of how in his own home district in Corentyne they could not get at Districts 1,4 and 5 so the P.N.C.'s vote only increased by 4% in District 5 and 13% in District 1, but they got at Districts 2,3 and 4 150% gain by false registration.

Having these documents here, nobody is going to tell me that the facts are unfounded. Nobody is going to tell me that, in the light of evidence, a man who has been hanged voted in the Guyana Election; that two people voted in the Guyana election from an address which had been a Railway since the year 1874; that out of 36,000 people 44,300 people registered in the United Kingdom as overseas Guyana voters and only 13,050 were genuine, and only 4,700 of the 11,750 in the United Kingdom. Do not tell me that, when a man well known to me in Barbados came to me with a list of Guyanese in Westbury Cemetery where they bury strangers and asked me if he could give them in to the Guyana

Registering Officer. I told the old man: "Do not get in that." Indeed, when the ballot sheet came to him and he marked it for the P.N.C., I took it and tore it up. I am speaking from knowledge.

But if you want me to give Burnham a break, ask me to give Burnham a break. But if you want me to say that there was no electoral fraud, go and ask somebody whose conscience is more pliable than mine, and who will speak against what he believes a little more easily and readily than I will. The Barbados Labour Party have sent representatives to Guyana's Congress, and I am saying now, for the first time in public that, as far as I can recall, on the last three occasions, when we received the Report back from these representatives there has been a stormy Executive meeting, and on the last occasion we voted not to send back any more representatives to Burnham's Conferences. You are hearing that for the first time in public.
4 p.m.

It is not the hon. member for St. James alone; when he has not been, there have been storms over the question of being represented at the Guyana P.N.C. Congress because we in the Barbados Labour Party are very unhappy over the electoral and other...

Mr. SPEAKER: Sorry to interrupt. I can hear the hon. member for St. Philip South. Is the hon. member for St. Philip South addressing the Chair? Please speak in undertones. You are annoying my hearing, and disrupting.

Mr. ADAMS: I should in fairness to the hon. member for St. James who has just reminded me and refreshed my memory — this decision was not even taken over his opposition, because at our executive meeting I remember the hon. member for St. James and another person who is a strong supporter of Mr. Burnham saying, "well look, this causes so much trouble, since you feel that way do not let us send back anybody again." It was a general support, because so much controversy is caused.

Now I do not want this kind of controversy ever to attach to the fair name of Barbados and that is why I support this Resolution. I do not like any situation where Senator Deighton Griffith is a Democratic Labour Party Senator and is yet a returning officer. A piece of corruption, I say; not financial corruption, but it is political corruption, to believe that your registration procedures are being conducted properly where a registration officer who was a returning officer no matter how decent he is, is a member of the Democratic Labour Party, in Parliament. (Asides)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, when Senator Deighton Griffith was a registering officer and returning officer he was not in any Parliament, neither here nor in the Senate. He had never exercised those functions as a Senator.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is made.

Mr. ADAMS: That point is wrong, Mr. Speaker. He is still the registering officer for St. Michael North West. (*Asides*) He is the registering officer for St. Michael North West. The Minister's interruption is wrong and he should apologise and withdraw it. Senator Griffith is the registering officer for St. Michael North West.. ..

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. He said that Senator Deighton Griffith was registering officer and returning officer. He is not registering and returning officer. He is the registering officer. He has been before he was a Senator. He is still registering officer as a Senator but he is not a returning officer as a Senator and has never been.

Mr. ADAMS: He was, I believe, a member of the Democratic Labour Party when he was returning officer; but.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: So who is not?

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the Minister say so. So who is not? I am glad to hear the Minister admit that all the returning officers are members of the Democratic Labour Party. That is what I mean by political corruption. That is what I mean; and that is why a Resolution like this has to be brought, because there is a danger in a registering officer registering the names of known supporters of the other side, out of the districts where they are to vote, so as to confuse them on election day. Only an idiot with no sense of political morality — you must develop a sense of political morality...

Mr. SPEAKER: Again, I am making a final appeal. Members must maintain silence, except when called upon by the Chair to speak. I know this debate is going to generate some kind of feeling but I want to hear the hon. member; every word. If members on my side or this side or any side (*Asides*)..... I would like the hon. member for St. Joseph to realise that I am speaking....

Mr. BOLDEN: And I draw to your attention that as Speaker you have no side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you please take your seat? (*Asides*) This is no laughing matter. This is.....

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is, it just shows.....

Mr. SPEAKER: But I am speaking. Don't you know the Rules? I expect better of the hon. member for St. Joseph. He knows the Rules and he should comply. What are you trying to do today?

Mr. BOLDEN: I would like to answer him.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can answer him outside, or at some future date. Let us have this debate continue, and observe the Rules for me. The hon. Leader of the Opposition may proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Now, the Representation of the People Act contains provisions obliging registering officers to register people. It does not contain provisions obliging them to register them correctly, and I agree with the mover of the Resolution that the Act needs amendment to that effect.

Now I want to draw attention to Section 9 of the Representation of the People Act, because the Democratic Labour Party — very much on the defensive these last few weeks — and a lot of Ministerial statements are put out, tendentious in their nature, malicious in their intent, false in their content, and highly misleading in their effect, and one such was a recent statement by the Attorney General relating to the registration of electors in the parish of St. Thomas. Now Section 9 says that the person registered pursuant to that part of the Act shall remain registered unless and until his name is deleted from the register, because he has died, or an objection has been allowed, or not being a foreign service elector, he has been absent from Barbados or he has become disqualified as an elector under this Act or any other enactment imposing disqualification for registration as an elector.

Now I am going to make a charge and I wish it to be noted, and I intend to justify it. I am dealing with the Attorney General. I am not dealing with the other froth on the top of the beer who write a lot of foolishness from time to time. They cannot be expected to know better. I am saying that there are persons who were on the electoral register in 1971 and voted, whose names have been removed from the electoral register in the constituency of St. Thomas, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 9 of the Representation of the People Act. I know — I am not going to

call the names. If the Minister was in, then I would give them to him. I have given one of the names in particular to the Chief Electoral Officer: a gentleman lived in Olive Branch, St. Thomas, who had his picture taken, did not get his I.D. card, did not see his name on the list, put in a claim to be registered, was registered, voted, and now sees his name off the list, and I state that George Moe is a liar if he said it did not happen....

Mr. SPEAKER: Who is George Moe? I ask the hon. member to withdraw that.

Mr. ADAMS: I said if he said it did not happen, Sir, I have given a qualified statement. If he said it did not happen, that is a qualified statement. I have made a statement, somebody is purporting to contradict it and I am saying that if he specifically contradicts that, he is a liar. That is what I am saying; and there are other names. I can give him the names of an outstanding supporter of the Democratic Labour Party who had his photograph taken at the end of June 1971 and to my regret, because he has been away at sea, appeared on the electoral register in the monthly list for July, canvassed like a dog against me, voted, and his name is not there now.

I am going to tell you something now, Sir. I am the sort of person who is going to write to that man and tell him that his name is not on the list. I am not going to work for him; I am going to work for the other man again. I am not going to work for this one; but I will let him know that his name is not on the list, and that it is his own party that has taken it off.

4.10 p.m.

He is also a resident of Fisher Pond district and a member of a big active family. So there are certain occasions where it behoves you to listen carefully to what people say. I sit down over here and although I know the reputation of the people we have to listen to from the other side, I suspend all disbelief until I check certain statements. There are people who like rushing into print and do not understand just occasionally there are citizens of this Island, as the hon. member for St. James and myself at a press conference who are very careful about making certain allegations. The only trouble is that in this country we have a kind of press and a kind of public opinion that have an attitude of ministerial truth and Opposition allegations. I believe that the Ministers are fully as capable of telling falsehoods as we in the Opposition — sometimes more capable, because they have more to hide. I believe that there is no monopoly of

truth in any political party in this Island. I would tell you this: whether or not Minister I treat everything said by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central with the greatest reserve, once decent follow though he may be in some regard, but I believe very little he says, and it may be me who is wrong, because I have learned from experience.

Now this matter of registering voters. All that has happened perhaps with these names on the St. Thomas list is that the Chief Electoral Officer, a conscientious and hard working man, I am not saying otherwise, has not understood the purpose of Section 9 of the Act. He does not realise that if somebody's name gets on to the register but he has no record of having taken his photograph, he is obliged by law to leave the man's name there until somebody objects to it in the form laid down by the Act, that is, within a certain date of the publication of the annual register or as the case may be. I think that may be all that has happened; but where a Civil Servant has misunderstood the law or has been misinformed, because I cannot say I believe the Attorney General's advice would be such that if I had been Chief Electoral Officer I would believe in it as gospel; he may have been mis-informed and he has done certain things and because he has 100,000 voters to deal with, it has not occurred to him that I am only dealing with 250 and I will know about all of them and know about all of them.

I went to the Chief Electoral Officer after all of these contradictions appeared and I said, what about Mr. So-and-So! This is the owner of a plantation and I do not believe he voted for me in 1971 and he did not vote in 1966 because he was registered in the wrong constituency. He was registered in St. James; so he got on to the list in 1971 and I was told by the Chief Electoral Officer that the computer made a mistake. The man went and had his photograph taken, got on the list, but with a wrong number. The computer made a mistake, so they struck him off the list, and yet these people will suggest that the allegations which I make are without foundation. I only wish sometimes on these relatively small matters that the public could understand the difference between truth and falsehood, and understand that in this fifteenth year of Democratic Labour Party rule there are certain individuals who have got so corrupt in spirit that they believe all they have to do is say something and that is a satisfactory answer to the public.

These matters will be investigated by the Chief Electoral Officer who is a conscientious man and the Attorney General is not going to

publish any release saying that in St. Thomas a number of cases has been found where persons who claimed to have been photographed and who were on the register have been deleted from the register notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of the Representation of the People Act. The Attorney General is not going to say that; that will never appear on the front page of the Advocate, true though it is unless I put it there.

Sir, this Resolution needs to be passed. The people in the Electoral Office do not now have the assistance of the enumeration system which at least used to fix voters in their correct districts. From the time we have had ID cards and abandoned enumeration, you have had a situation where people that do not know the districts intimately are seeking to register voters, and therefore they tend to put voters in the wrong area in border districts. I live in Enterprise, Christ Church. It is a matter of pure chance where you are registered to vote if you have that address. If you go in and have your picture taken and give your address as Enterprise Road, it is pure chance whether you are registered in Christ Church East, Christ Church South Central. If in Christ Church East, whether you vote at Oistin; if in Christ Church South Central, whether you vote at Oistin; if in Christ Church East whether you vote at Little Hopewell or St. Christopher.

On the morning of the last election from 6 o'clock I was out carrying my wife and myself to vote at Oistin, carrying the lady two houses away from me to vote at Little Hopewell, carrying my maid to vote at St. Christopher, carrying two girls who live just a little way from me, one to vote at Little Hopewell and one at St. Christopher. All these people should have voted at Oistin and I had to make four separate trips to get all their votes cast.

In St. Thomas, the district of Welchman Hall has a main road running through it. On one side is Brian Road and to the other is First Avenue and Second Avenue Vault Road, Highland Tenantry Road and so on. I would venture to say that of the people who live in Brian Road, before the exercise which I personally carried out in 1974 with the assistance of the Chief Electoral Officer, one-third voted at the wrong station. Of the people in Vault Road perhaps 20 percent registered at the wrong polling station; but I went around, sent in all the wrong addresses and they were corrected. There are only three persons at Lion Castle who should vote at a particular station, the rest should vote at another. They appeared from both electoral lists in 1971 and

representations were made then, but it was only year before last that I was finally able to get it cleared up. These are the evils in that, and they are caused by the ID cards system indirectly because once you put upon people the necessity of going somewhere to be registered as voters you remove the check that exists in every country I know, which is a check by enumerators. That is what we should have. Enumerators should go around; they should verify the addresses of people, they are a powerful control against electoral fraud because they can go and inquire, where is Shirley and be told that she went to England in 1970. She has been absent from the Island for five years, therefore her name comes off the list. This is why the enumeration system is required and you will not get the enumeration system unless you amend the Representation of the People Act so as to put on registering officers the duty of registering voters in their correct districts. Once your registering officers know they can be punished by making somebody travel from Jackson to Clifton Hill as happened to a man in Jackson in whose house voting was carried on last time. His home was a polling station but he could not vote in his own house under ID's; he had to find himself going to Clifton Hill to cast his vote for Mr. Boylston. It shows incompetence. We cannot get away from that, I repeat, unless we support this Resolution. After all by supporting the Resolution is only expressing the wish of the House of Assembly to the Minister responsible for elections and is only giving a general hint to the draftsman, and of course will not necessarily have any effect in the Cabinet itself because the Cabinet will shape it in whatever form they like; but until you have some compulsion on registering officers to put people at their correct districts, you are going to have all these abuses, people driving about in polling areas unable to find their name.

I am conducting an exercise now. People bring me their ID cards; I got one from St. Michael South Central and ask where do I vote and whether I can find out for me. I asked but nobody could tell me. One man had his ID card but his name could not be found on the list.

4.20 p.m.

It is found in a list for St. Michael North Central, around the Carringtons Village district.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the hon. member that he has three minutes more.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I have come to the end of my speech and I am glad that you have subtracted the time for the interruptions from my speech, but I am sure that hon.

members cannot other than support the Resolution. We never had it before in Barbados, it is an unpleasant by-product of the ID card system, an indirect by-product, and until we have this we are going to get it worse and worse in the future.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the Government cannot support the passing of this Resolution for these reasons. The Resolution calls on the Government to consider the introduction of relevant legislation to provide compensation for electors. On those grounds the Government cannot support the passing of this Resolution. Whereas any other thing the hon. members probably complained of, some of them could have occurred owing to the fact that you are voting in 24 constituencies for the first time, but the Resolution as moved by the hon. member for St. James speaks of the Registering Officer. I want to draw to his attention that the Registering Officer of a constituency has no power under the Act to authorise any elector to vote at any polling station on election day. The Registering Officer of a constituency is involved in the mechanism of the registration of voters only while a Returning Officer is responsible for the conduct of elections in the constituency.

In the 1971 general election hon. members will recall that the Chief Electoral Officer issued circulars to all persons whose names appeared on the Register of electors informing them of the respective constituencies in which they were registered and the locations of the polling stations at which they were to vote in as much as the constituencies were increased from 12 to 24 and the polling districts were increased from 110 to 212 and we were voting for the first time in single member constituencies. We have no direct evidence of any one who was denied the right to vote, as these circulars were sent out to all those persons whose names appeared on the register, and the register has in all the people who are entitled to vote.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir, the Leader of the House appears to be reading a statement from a file. According to the Standing Orders a member must not read his speech. If he intends to read from a file I would ask Your Honour to ask the member here and now if he intends to make that report a document of the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am on a point of order, you cannot have a point of order on a point of order. From the speech which he is reading he has already perpetrated inaccuracies.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is your feeling. Please take your seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Your Honour, I happen to be a Government Minister and I happen to be Leader of the House for the time being. I have a right to read from the files.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the Minister has now confirmed what I have said, that he is reading a reply from a file to a debate dealing with a Resolution. He is not making a ministerial statement, he is reading a speech from a file.

Mr. SPEAKER: He as a Minister of the Government has the right to read from a file.

Mr. BOLDEN: Under what Standing Order, Sir, may I be told? If he is a Minister of the Crown, we are in debate, he cannot read a statement.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the procedure in Government, for the benefit of the hon. member, is this. When a question is asked, the appropriate Minister.....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, we are not dealing with a question, we are dealing with a Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that he is in order to read.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Whenever a question or Resolution is asked by the Opposition it goes to the appropriate Ministry. The Permanent Secretary and his staff deal with it and it is sent eventually to Cabinet after it has been dealt with by the appropriate Minister. The comments of the various people concerned have been sent to Cabinet, and I am reading verbatim exactly what the position is. As a Minister I have the right to do this.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we have to get the procedure right. In the first place we are in Private Members' Business. The time has either been extended or we have passed the time for Private Members' Business. The member is reading a statement from a Government file in the midst of a debate which has been instituted by the hon. member for St. James.

Mr. SPEAKER: A member may make reference to his notes.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not reading a speech as such, I am giving extracts which are

suitable. The matter has been carefully considered by Cabinet and we cannot support the Resolution. I am quoting certain extracts of the Cabinet Paper in order to give accurate facts to the House. Does he want anything better than that? It is not a speech as such, these are extracts from matters which were dealt with at Cabinet with the advice of the Chief Electoral Officer. That gives an idea of the hon. Member's thinking, he wants a lot of hearsay nonsense. As a Minister I have a perfect right to read any speech, any document from any file. All the Government files would have to be left in here as documents of the House if the hon. member is right. I do not understand what the hon. member is saying.

4.30 p.m.

I only want to let it be known at this stage that this imposes a charge on the Government and should not have been even allowed. Therefore we cannot support it. Compensation for electors? It should never have been allowed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I happened to be the Minister in charge of elections in 1971, and I also happened to be Minister at the time when the new Representation of the People Act was placed on the Statute Book. It is an excellent Act, the best I know anywhere, and I am extremely proud of it.

What can one say of this Resolution, except that it was conceived in ignorance? In the first place no Registration Officer authorises anyone to vote; and this Resolution calls on the Government to pay compensation to a person who has not been able to vote and who has been so advised by the Registering Officer. No Registering Officer authorises anybody to vote. The person is authorised to vote when his name appears on the Register of Electors.

In 1969, 1970 and 1971 the Government used a register that was in operation for the 1966 General Election; and the 1971 General Election Register differs from other registers in this very material respect, in that whereas in 1966 and in the years previous to 1971, we had to have a register at a particular time; but from 1971, on the hon. member's vote, we will always have a register. It will always be in existence under this Act. The Register of Electors is being constantly updated.

It has to be updated every single month. The Act makes provision for this. Up to 1971 you had an enumeration in 1966 which was the last before 1971. We had an enumeration immediately before the elections, and do not

have an enumeration again until immediately before the next elections.

The procedure was modernised in 1971 and each Registering Officer has to publish what is called a monthly list. I think that the background of this information is important to this Resolution. A monthly list is published after the 15th day following every month, so that the monthly lists as published for February are published shortly after the 15th of March which gives the Registering Officer enough time to complete the list for February.

The monthly list is set up and published in various places inviting persons whose names do not appear on the register, or whose names have been incorrectly registered to come and inspect those lists; and if your name is not on the monthly list you should go and make representation to the Registering Officer.

This is only after you have compiled earlier with the provisions of the Act, that you had registered or had your photograph taken and had been issued with an identification card. If you had done those things and your name does not appear on that monthly list you have a right to make your representations. Then your name must appear on the revised monthly list which is published a few days after that. So if your name did not appear on the first occasion on the monthly list you have a second opportunity for it to appear on the revised monthly list. When the revised monthly list is published in this same place where the monthly list was published you have another opportunity to go and make sure that your name is there if it was not there the last time.

Let me make it clear that no voting can take place on names appearing in the monthly list or the revised list. The process goes on every single month from January to December so that before the end of January the following year all of the supplementary registers for the 12 months are married to the base register, the register for the year 1975.

That is how the system operates, a superior system to what operates anywhere. Every single elector in Barbados has ample opportunity 12 times in a year to make sure that his name is on the register; and if he does not do that, he cannot be heard to say that his name is not there.

That is only part of the problem, Mr. Speaker, because the Registering Officer has by law to do these things. It is a provision in the Act

and I am going to read it. Section 28 says:— "A Registering Officer or an enumerator who wilfully or without reasonable excuse omits to register the name of any person qualified to be registered is guilty of an offence and is liable on summary conviction to a fine of two hundred and fifty dollars or to imprisonment for six months or both."

But, that is not all. Sub-section 2 goes on to say:— "A registering officer or an enumerator convicted of an offence under subsection (1) shall, in addition to any penalty prescribed by that subsection, forfeit his right to payment for his services as a registering officer or an enumerator, as the case may be."

But that still is not all. It goes on to state, "and, subject to subsection (3), shall be incapable during a period of seven years from the date of his conviction —

- (a) of being qualified as an elector or of voting at any election; and
- (b) of being elected a member of the House of Assembly."

So any registering officer who does these things and knows that he is doing the things set out here by the other side is subject to all these penalties — to a fine by the courts — not by the Government, not by the Democratic Labour Party, not by the Cabinet, not by the Chief Registering Officer, but by the courts of this country. He is liable to a fine of \$250 or imprisonment, or both fine and imprisonment, to have his salary forfeited and in addition to all of this to lose his civic right to vote in any election for a period of seven years or to be elected to the House of Assembly for such a period.

These are sanctions in the laws of Barbados. Are you going to tell me that a registering officer who knows that all these things are hanging over his head will take action in not putting persons' names on the register?

The Act also makes provision for the removal of people's names who appear on the register. The Leader of the Opposition spoke about pursuant registration. Under Section 9 the Act says that a person registered pursuant to this Part shall remain registered unless and until his name is deleted from the register because (a) he has died; or (b) an objection to his registration has been allowed.

We will not worry about (c) which deals with the foreign service, but (d) says if he has

become disqualified for registration as an elector under this Act or any other enactment imposing disqualifications for registration as an elector.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The Hon. Minister talks about Section 28 and what the rights and liabilities are. Throughout the argument, or the debate, I.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I want you to refer to the exact point.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the point raised under Section 28 when he dealt with the liabilities of the Registering Officer. What I am drawing to the attention of the Chair is that he is talking about omitting to register, and we are talking about persons who have registered and whose names do not now appear.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am now on the point where a person's name can be removed from the register. If he has died; if his objection to registration has been allowed, or if he has become disqualified from registration under Section 11 of the Act. A person shall not be qualified to be registered until he has complied with the provisions of this Act and the Regulations. Under this Act the Regulations state that for a person to be fully registered he must have his photograph taken and an Identification Card issued. If that does not happen, even though he is on the register, he is disqualified to register, and under Section 9(2) his name can be removed from the register under these conditions.

The Act makes provision for these things. I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition was not here to hear me on this matter, but I am glad he has now taken his place. I have no doubt that he has heard me while I was speaking.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister has got into deep legal water here. The failure to qualify for registration and being disqualified for registration are two separate things. It is well settled in the courts that even if you were not qualified and you are registered, the fact that you were not qualified to register does not make you a disqualified person. Perhaps the legal point is too high for the Minister to understand. But I will take him to any court in this land, and I will get an opportunity of hearing his reply. He will get an opportunity to see who is right.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: He can be disqualified in several ways, Mr. Speaker. If he loses his civil rights he can be disqualified as well.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour being 4.45 p.m., that has brought us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business now resumes. When the suspension was taken we were dealing with Order No. 5 and, as far as I can recall, the Leader of the Opposition was addressing the Chair.

Mr. ADAMS: I am finish, Sir.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I had risen to make my reply at that time.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I would like to draw to the attention of the Leader of the House that he does not have enough members in here to form a quorum. You had better call in your members.

NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL
SECURITY (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1976.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are dealing with Order No. 5. The Hon. Minister is making his final reply, and no other member can speak afterwards. (*Asides.*)

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: The hon. member for St. Michael West claims that they do not want to make a quorum. They can walk out. Order No. 5 deals with the National Insurance and Social Security Bill. There is just one point on which I want to speak about. It is the question of the insurance of seamen, which has been raised by the hon. member for St. Michael West, and the hon. member for St. Thomas also supported it and made some comment on it, and, quite frankly, that is my view as well.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the Minister having risen to make his reply when the luncheon adjournment was taken.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member rose, and I interrupted him to let him know that it was exactly 2 p.m. I have just asked if there was any member of the Opposition who wished to speak. Nobody rose, and I am sorry you have lost your right to speak. I said that it was his final reply.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, as regards the insurance of seamen, we in the Ministry have been pursuing this matter. The most recent thing is that we have taken up the matter with the Ministry of Health and Social Security in Britain. We have sent them a copy of an agreement, or we are awaiting from them a copy of an agreement whereby seamen recruited in Barbados would pay national insurance, unfortunately, not in Barbados, but in the United

Kingdom. We pursued this with the experts we had here, and they felt that that would be an easier way of getting around it. They would pay the national insurance in England, and the families or dependants of those people would get some kind of compensation similar to families in England. It is only a matter of time. I understand that the reply is very nearly ready. We can enter into this agreement with the understanding that there will be a reciprocal agreement between ourselves and the United Kingdom in this matter. The seamen will be covered in Britain and their families, though resident here, will be subject to any compensation that might accrue.

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

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

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

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

Clauses 1 to 3 were called and they stood part.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES, each seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the NATIONAL INSURANCE AND SOCIAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) ACT 1976.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76
No. 32

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, we revert back to Order No. 1. I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

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

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

4.50 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76

No. 32

MINISTRY OF LEGAL AFFAIRS

HEAD 6(1) AND (2) LEGAL AND GENERAL

HEAD 6(1) AND (2) LEGAL AND GENERAL – WAS CALLED.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head 6(1) Ministry of Legal Affairs, Head 6(1) and (2) Legal and General, Item 14, Grants to Public Institutions in the sum of \$38,574, I will give a little more information than is set out here, for the benefit of hon. members. The sum of \$97,925 included in the current Estimates under Head 6(1) and (2), Item 14 – Grants to Public Institutions as Barbados' subvention to the Council of Legal Education was calculated at the rate of 7.383% of the Council's Revised Estimates for 1974/75 which amounted to \$1,326,358.

However, in July 1975, the Director of Legal Education notified this Government in a letter to the Prime Minister that the Council had approved the Estimates of Expenditure for 1975/76 and that Barbados' contribution had been assessed at \$121,872 being 7.618% of the total recurrent budget of \$1,599,792. The revision of the percentage resulted from the fact that Belize and Montserrat were no longer contributing to the budget of the Council; and this is the main reason for this supplementary of \$23,947 which is \$121,872 minus \$97,925. That is one portion.

Further, the Director also noted at that stage that the Estimates did not include provision for salary increases for the academic senior administrative or non-academic staff, and that an additional appropriation would be needed after the salary revision had been determined in the light of revised salaries which might be approved for similar staff of the University of the West Indies. Then the Director requested that consideration be given to provision of additional funds to enable the council to meet the obligation in respect of increased salaries, and the present level of which was estimated at \$192,000 for 1975/76, and Barbados' share at the rate which I have mentioned, 7.618%, is estimated at \$14,627.

Well, Sir, that explains how we arrived at the sum of \$38,574, and that is what we are asking to supplement this vote.

Sir, I beg to move that Head 6(1) and (2) Legal and General – stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I want to be very short on this. As Shadow Minister of Legal Affairs, I do not indeed want to direct my remarks immediately to the speech of the hon. member or to the grant to a public institution, but I want to refer very shortly to something concerning this Department which was canvassed in the House a few days ago. My attention has been drawn to the fact that it seems that not only in the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South East but my own speech was also taken as an attack on the administration of justice in this country on that occasion, and I know we must not recognise the presence of the Press in here, but I would appeal to the Press to indicate that my remarks about persons getting several years in gaol when they were not represented by lawyers, was directed towards the necessity of more legal aid, it was not in any way, not in the slightest meant to be an attack on the two judges who are at present presiding at the Assizes. I never said so during my speech, I don't believe that that construction would have been placed on it were it not followed by the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South East who I supported in respect of what he said about the system – the dock and the prisoners, and also what he said about the Prosecution; and if there was any suggestion, Sir, I would be extremely glad to disclaim it entirely, if there was any hint of hostility towards the sentences or any reflection on the judges, nothing such was mentioned, Sir.

I absolutely and unreservedly withdraw any suggestion in any part of the speech, that I meant something like that. It was solely directed, towards the desirability of having people defended by Council.

What is the point of passing this grant to have a lot of lawyers unless you are going to give the lawyers something to do anyhow, Sir, and just in ending on that theme, I would say this: the judges themselves are assisted by the lawyers defending prisoners at trials, because nobody knows everything, and the mightiest judges make small errors sometimes in unfamiliar cases, especially I think, where the prisoner is undefended, because if the prisoner had a lawyer

he would be directing himself to every little aspect of the case if he is a good lawyer, and should be able to set the Bench right on all the issues that it has to determine. He should be able so to do; and I think it would be found, Sir, if you analyse the successful appeals in the Court of Appeal, that there are more appeals that are successful where prisoners were undefended than where they were defended. In other words, on the whole, where the prisoner has a lawyer the judge is less likely to make a mistake than where the prisoner has not got a lawyer, — I would say a decent lawyer; a decent lawyer who will not do what some lawyers are supposed to do, hide things from the judge and the jury so as to have them in reserve as an appeal point. I mean a decent lawyer who will put everything that he knows of the law applicable to the case, before the judge and the jury; and, anything that I said was solely directed to legal aid, and I hope that the Press will find itself in a position to give as wide a prominence to this as it gave to the original remarks.

The question that Head 6(1) and (2) Legal and General — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

HEAD 9(1) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Head 9(1) General Administration — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, in so far as Item 3 — other personal allowances is concerned, the position is that the sum of \$10,380 was provided in the 1975/76 Estimates to meet the cost of entertainment and house allowance for the Director of Finance and Planning and the Permanent Secretaries of Finance and Planning and for their *locum tenens* for one month in each post. During the financial year each of these officers was granted vacation and duty leave in excess of one month, and these allowances were paid accordingly to those officers who acted for more than one month on each occasion.

5.00 p.m.

I beg to move that Head 9(1) — General Administration — stand part.

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

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

HEAD 26 — MINISTRY OF TOURISM INFORMATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

(1) GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Head 26 — Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations (1) General Administration — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26 — Ministry of Tourism, Information and Public Relations (1) General Administration, stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Sir, I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not discuss the understanding of the Ministry of Tourism and Public Relations about its duty and industrial relations. This Ministry, as I understand it, is responsible for the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and the general administration of the Corporation, therefore, comes under the Ministry.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is discussing Head 26 (2) Public Relations.

Mr. FORDE: On the last occasion the hon. member said that under Head 26(2) he was dealing with the information service, and I want to be quite sure because I want to talk today about the general administration of this Ministry and the understanding about the Minister in 1976 of industrial relations in Barbados.

Now, Sir, I believe that we have subscribed to various international conventions and that we recognise in Barbados the right of trade unions to bargain and negotiate on behalf of their workers, and I think the Government is the biggest single employer of labour in this country, and the Statutory Boards which are quasi-public are under a bounden duty to set a proper standard of industrial relations for other employers in the country to follow. I submit seriously to this Committee that the Ministry of Tourism and Information is failing to give proper guidance to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation which comes under its administration in how to conduct collective bargaining in this country. It is shocking that they should enter into an agreement with a recognised workers' union and several weeks have passed and they cannot perform that agreement. I think it is a shocking example of ministerial interference on Statutory Boards beyond the call of duty, and I cannot at all sit down in Committee without registering my disagreement with the manner in which the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation is being run today.

The Minister denies that he interferes into the day to day running of the Board. That cannot be so. Almost every week some member of staff is being suspended or sacked on short notice, and in many instances adequate reasons are not being given. That is what is happening and there is a tremendous amount of uneasiness on the staff of C.B.C., and it is only because in Barbados one has limited avenues of employment that you can get people not having the guts and gumption to stand up to this foolishness that is happening. They seem to be afraid to talk for themselves or to call a strike at C.B.C. I do not understand why they cannot call a strike at C.B.C.

I read the article written last Sunday by the Barbados Workers' Union and I am disturbed as a Barbadian in 1976 to see that he is going to have to write in the paper not about an employer who has come in here from North America, not one of the died in the wool employers whom we understand we had in colonial days, but a so-called socialist progressive Government administering the broadcasting station paid for by the people of this country. That is a serious indictment against this Minister. I am sorry he is not in his seat. If he is going to put it off on the Establishments Division, he cannot hide behind that because he must have guts to stand up to the Prime Minister and make his position clear. If he failed to give adequate instructions to his negotiating team before they sat down with the Workers' Union, then he has failed in his duty, and it is not good enough for him in this day and age to come into Parliament asking for money to run his Ministry, his industrial relations happen to be in tatters. It is unsatisfactory and this Committee should make it quite clear to the Minister that we expect that he will treat his staff much better than they are treating them at C.B.C.

All sorts of new brooms sweep clean. A lot of people believe they have a lot of power in this country. The Conservatives believed they had a lot of power in the twenties and thirties and before. I have read some of the speeches in the annals of this country where I saw the past stalwarts went down as saying they could not have a certain type of person voting in this House and doing this sort of thing, and I want to tell the Corporation Board...

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to draw your attention that there is no quorum.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, will you please request that the Bell be rung?

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

Mr. FORDE: I am glad to see there is a quorum. I would like the Minister to hear this because I want to hear him reply. I am saying that we are talking about industrial relations in 1976. I would have thought that if there is one thing that all political parties in Barbados agree on, it is that the concept of collective bargaining is recognised in this country's laws, and it must be recognised in its practices. I believe that every political party is under a duty to agree to this, and I believe that no political party should sit by, regardless of whether it forms the Government of the country or the Cabinet of the country and expose the process of collective bargaining to this type of undermining that we are getting today from this Ministry. It is an unhealthy sign and I am asking the Minister of Labour who is here to use his good offices to teach the Minister of Information and Public Relations something about industrial relations and to call C.B.C. Board to the heels. It is playing the fool with people's employment, and it is lucky that the Barbados Workers' Union is so mature these days that it does not resort to the strike action as a first resort. If our industrial relations was in a state like Trinidad and Tobago they would have closed down C.B.C. ever since, and no Minister or anybody else could have gone up there and talked about it. We are lucky in a way that nowadays the strike action in Barbados is used as a last resort.

If you look at the times on which the strike action has been used in Barbados, it has been very seldom used over the last ten to fifteen years, and I have been having a close look at it. I agree it is something to say for the strength of the Union that it could use methods of persuasion, but there comes a time when I believe that even if it is a Government institution one must call a halt to this foolishness. If they have made a bad agreement, they must send stronger people to bargain. If you cannot go and sit down and bargain round a table with a man and you get outsmarted, and you are then going to appeal to the Cabinet and tell me that the Cabinet has a duty in the national interest, if the Cabinet is saying that the C.B.C. negotiating team and the C.B.C. Board have not got the intelligence to negotiate properly, then sack the Board.
5.10 p.m.

If the Cabinet is saying that the CBC's negotiating team and the CBC Board have not got the intelligence to negotiate properly, sack the Board. Part of the problem is too much yardfowlism on the Board.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the CBC Board has only power to negotiate salaries up to a certain amount, above that it is the Cabinet. The hon. member ought to know that, he was on the Public Service Commission and all that.

Mr. FORDE: It has nothing to do with the Public Service Commission, the hon. member is speaking about the provision in the Act in which the \$9,000 is fixed, subject to the confirmation of Cabinet. The Board should have known this and they would have known how they can negotiate. Suppose a Board of Directors in Bridgetown takes the attitude that their Chief Personnel Officer and their Managing Directors have power to negotiate with the Union but subject to the Manager, or the Board negotiates subject to its shareholders. We would be completely undermining industrial relations. Is the Government asking us to have strikes? I believe the Minister ought to be dismissed. He is running the CBC as though it is his special fief.

They sent me some message this morning by their Secretary asking me to come and discuss the one-party system on television on Friday night. The answer is no. I must be a crass idiot that I would go and sit down with Happy Bryan and my friend Asquith Phillips on a Friday night programme by a message sent by the Secretary. I am telling the Manager to cut out this stupidity he is doing. He should open the public platform. Why when I was making a crass fuss in this country about women's rights and on one limited programme I was on for a couple of minutes and they were told I was not to speak again? Regardless of what Freedom House puts out freedom of expression in Barbados has been restricted on Government agencies, and it is a sad day in Barbados if the next national newspaper is also controlled by Government. Tell them the way they sent the Secretary to telephone me I send the answer the same discourteous way. As a matter of fact, I send it with great courtesy in the highest Parliament that my answer is no. I am not here for that type of short-term invitation. I will go and discuss anything with the Prime Minister or the Leader of the House or any of the members, on CBC, but I will not think to go and sit down and make a political platform for Happy Bryan or Asquith Phillips. He is joking. I do not want a platform, I get enough publicity when I want it, but I am very concerned indeed and hurt by the attitude manifested by this Board in 1976 in industrial relations and I am calling on the Minister of Labour to teach the hon. member for Christ Church North Central proper industrial relations and to run a course for the Board of CBC and the Manager, to read to

them the ILO Convention and make them respect collective agreements in this country and tell them to stop using political clout at the expense of the people and give them freedom of expression.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I did not want to enter this debate because when I am dealing with a matter and I believe that I know how to deal with it you cannot really force me into action. I have been reading something in the Trade Union Act when it started in 1939 and it is very interesting to read the debate which was very brief, comparatively speaking, in this Chamber in 1939. Very few people then knew anything about the Trade Union Movement and I believe it is so today. Those of us in the Trade Union Movement are aware of our problems. The hon. member for Christ Church West has some knowledge of industrial relations, but even in his Party we do not expect any support from his Party on these matters. His Party has been an opponent of the Barbados Workers' Union for the last 21 years.

Mr. FORDE: The hon. member means proponent, Sir. On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: They have been opponents of the Barbados Workers' Union for the last 21 years and we are not worried about that, we do not look for any friends. What caused me to rise is what the Hon. Leader of the House has said, and I want to correct that. It is so wrong and misleading that I will have to correct it. It has no meaning legally or otherwise. This mad rushing into trying to rationalise action that you cannot rationalise. There is too much of this rationalisation of people's behaviour today. Some people think when you are in the Trade Union Movement you have to rationalise an action of a worker because it is a worker. Some people think when you are in the Government you have to rationalise the action of a Minister because it is a Minister, saying that the Cabinet, this mystique that the Cabinet deals with salaries over \$9,000 a year. The Government does not negotiate salaries for any person, not anybody at the CBC.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, I merely said that CBC had no power to negotiate salaries over that.

Mr. WALCOTT: I would like to show where he is wrong. He repeats it. People getting over \$9,000 are now employed at CBC. This is not a question of appointing somebody over \$9,000, the Act says "The Corporation may appoint and

employ at such remuneration and on such terms and conditions as they think fit a General Manager and a Secretary and such other employees and agents as they deem necessary for the proper carrying out of the Act, provided that no person shall be appointed Manager without the prior approval of the Minister."

5.20 p.m.

The corporation shall have power to dismiss the General Manager subject to the prior approval of the Minister. It does not say that they cannot dismiss him; but the final word will be for the Cabinet. No salary in excess of \$6,000 a year shall be assigned to any post without the approval of the Minister.

Now these are things that go right through the Act. No appointment, whether permanent or temporary shall be made to any post in excess of \$6,000 a year — that has been amended to \$9,000 a year — but so far as the substance of the Act is concerned it remains with the prior approval of the Minister.

These are general things pertaining to C.B.C. and to all statutory authorities, so that C.B.C. is not unique. So, the point that the Minister made has nothing to do with general negotiations. I am not going to deal with negotiations any more at this stage because I would like the hon. member to know that a strike is a very important thing for a trade union. When a trade union calls a strike it brings everything into being, and you do not take strike action for the sake of strike action. You take it when you have examined all the angles.

Now in this matter we have given the public some idea of what it is about because it is a public corporation and we consider that the public must have an opportunity of examining what the trade union is doing, and not what somebody wants from C.B.C.; but it is important to examine the conduct of the negotiations between the trade union and the corporation, if the union acted in an industrial manner or in a jungle manner that nobody could have expected C.B.C. or anyone else to deal with us.

C.B.C., in accordance with an agreement, cannot do certain things by themselves; but they are informed that that is what they are called upon to do, and they are given three months notice. If the Minister does not know, we know that if proceedings take place between the Ministry, C.B.C. and the Union within seven days the minutes are sent to the Ministry.

When these negotiations were going on — I do not want to deal with it here but a

representative from the Chief Establishments Office in the person of the Chief Establishments Officer himself attended, a man of the calibre of a Permanent Secretary.

The union has no doubt. The hon. member for Christ Church West should know that when you are dealing with a good case it is different from when you are dealing with a bad case. You do not have to bluff your way through with a good case. You take your time with a good case because there is no problem. You know that your opponent will come to his senses at some time or the other.

On this matter of negotiations with C.B.C. we have absolutely no doubt about the justice of the case in so far as negotiations are concerned.

The union has no intention of relenting on the agreement with C.B.C., we have spent time in learning our lessons. We know the meaning of ratification and approval.

This House does not negotiate on behalf of the Government. Therefore if the Government signs a treaty with A.P.C; it signs it. The trade union is different from a person. The trade union is not a person looking for a job. It is not a person that the Cabinet can employ anywhere. You cannot make members of the trade union Ministers. You all must get the idea that as General Secretary I hold a different position in my life as a person and in my official position as General Secretary of the Union from anything that any member of this House might think; because I am employed by the Barbados Workers Union.

I am a member of this political party, but I am not an employee of the political party. The political party cannot give me instructions about what to do in the trade union. Twenty-one years ago on that side they wanted to give me instructions but they never knew what it was made up of; and I went my way for the last twenty-one years. I do not take instructions from anyone. There is no person that I have to ask what he considers is right or wrong. I have to make up that in my own mind and I face the consequences. In 1966 I faced the consequences. Hon. members over there laughed at me in 1966.

An election does not mean the same thing to me as it means to the hon. members over there, because my base is different from theirs. It is not based on this ephemeral idea of asking somebody to vote for me so that I am going to do anything to get a vote from you. I do not have to do that. You vote for me on the basis of this is what I stand for.

I have always been a socialist. I have always stood for certain principles and I remain there. I do not have to come in here and pretend. I do not owe anybody anything. I have learned to do without. I can face people. Nobody can knock at my door and call for anything. I have never carried away anybody's money. I would never have to ask a lawyer to come and defend me for stealing. He may defend me for beating somebody or somebody beating me.

The hon. member for St. James is always saying that he can challenge me to a fight; but I do not worry about that. The other day I was ready to go and lift his head; but I forgive him because it is only a little bit of froth, and I do not worry about that.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order. How does lifting my head come into this Resolution?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Last week he and the Leader of the Opposition wanted to pretend that I ask questions about roads and did not know where they were. It is a good thing that I have a sense of humour, but this is a serious matter because it relates to a type of erosion in the industrial life of Barbados and it is a two way street.

The day you reach the stage in the public sector — there are more people working in the public sector than in the private sector. If you get a breakdown like this in the public sector it can be a tragedy. The hon. member for Christ Church West made a statement that it is an easy thing to have a disruption in the public sector. The Government will have a very difficult task.

You have seen in the Caribbean disruption going on, problems going on, not only strikes, but sabotage; and you have a situation now where there is an agreement that does not work. You do not subscribe to the agreement. What happens if the Government does this in one area and the union says that we will do it in another area? We will wait on you. Remember, some of us can wait.

In my life I have waited for a long time. So far as this matter is concerned we have put the matter to the Chief Labour Officer. We have told him that we do not agree with this matter. I do not propose to deal with the matter in any further detail at this point because I do not consider it necessary at this stage; but I wanted to answer this point because of the temptation to

give the public the impression that the Government has done something wrong, that something is wrong. If C.B.C. has a right to negotiate with the Union, that has absolutely nothing to do with the limitation of salaries. 5.30 p.m.

The limitation of salaries is a matter for the negotiating authority, and it has nothing to do with the appointment of anybody to any post. They were paying people more than \$10,000 a year when we started. We can shatter the nonsense about not dealing with people over \$9,000. It is genuine negotiations if you are dealing with people and you are going to increase their salaries, and if it is the Government's decision that salaries for certain people should not go above a certain amount that has nothing to do with \$9,500. It has something to do with the monetary policy. You can say that the limit should be 25%, 30%, 40%.

Now, when you get these things taking place, this is where the breakdown takes place because sometimes there are not the right people in the right places who are capable of knowing right from wrong, or who are big enough to say that they made a mistake. If C.B.C. made a mistake that is their internal business. They must learn to deal with their internal affairs in a proper manner, and they should not make their internal business a public affair.

The Question that Head 26(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 26(2) — Public Relations — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 26(2) stand part. The notes are very explicit.

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

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

AYES: Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON; Hon. A. MORRISON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES — 9.

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$90,037 do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.
5.40 p.m.

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

AYES: Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES — 8.

NOES: Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. H. deB. FORDE — 5.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Money Resolution in Committee of Supply.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF GUARANTEE
BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE OF
PAYMENT OF \$5 MILLION TO BE
BORROWED BY BARBADOS DE-
VELOPMENT BANK

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Order with which the Government intends dealing is Order No. 2 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the guarantee by the Minister of Finance of payment of the principal sum of \$5 million to be borrowed by the Barbados Development Bank by the issue of National Development Bonds.

Sir, I am asking for leave to deal with this in the absence of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. (*Asides.*) The hon. member might not know this. It is only out of courtesy that I did that. Already I am seized with the power of Deputy Prime Minister. If you have forgotten it, I am Deputy Prime Minister. Already I am seized with the power. It is only out of courtesy I said so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave has been sought to deal with this Resolution.

There being no objection, leave is granted. The Hon. Leader of the House may proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as hon. members would know, this is a money Resolution in truth and in fact, and that being the case, in accordance with our constitution the concurrence or approval of the Senate — the Other Place — is not necessary, therefore the latter part really, "approved by the Senate" and so on, I am asking that that be taken out in that it is not necessary, so as to amend the Resolution at this stage in order to bring it into line. I hope hon. Members would agree with that. It is just regularising the Resolution as such.

Sir, I beg to move that the Resolution be amended by deleting all the words "and that the Senate be invited to concur therein and if concurred in,

Resolved that His Excellency the Governor-General be asked to assent and take the necessary steps to give effect to this Resolution."

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

The Question that "those words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question" was put and resolved in the negative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as the Addendum sets out,

The Minister of Finance in his budget speech to the House of Assembly on 27th April, 1971 stated *inter alia* that in pursuance of his policy to maximise the mobilisation of local resources and at the same time provide a stimulus to the investment of Capital in productive enterprises, he proposed that National Development Bonds be made available to investors. These bonds will be issued by the Barbados Development Bank.

2. The bonds are issued under the provisions of Section 12(1) of the Barbados Development Bank Act 1963-48 under the following terms:—

\$5,000,000 7% National Development Bonds at par due 1982-86, the proceeds to be used to finance development projects in accordance with the functions and the purposes of the Bank in the following areas of operation:

- (a) Tourism projects, including ancillary projects;
- (b) Manufacturing and processing industries;
- (c) Co-operative;
- (d) Small businesses.

Sir, this resolution seeks approval of the guarantee.

The position, Sir, is, the Board of Directors of the Barbados Development Bank have agreed in principle to a second issue of National Development bonds for the sum of \$5 million (Barbados) to be guaranteed by the Government of Barbados under the provisions of Section 12(1) of the Barbados Development Bank Act, Chapter 32. The approval of the Minister of Finance is required for the issue of the bonds.

Section 10(1) of the Act provides that the Minister may guarantee payment of principal and interest on authorised borrowing of the Bank subject to the approval of Parliament.

The General Manager of the Barbados Development Bank has submitted a copy of the prospectus of the second issue of National Development Bonds. The Bank has been in consultation with the Minister of Finance and Planning and, it is proposed that the bonds will be issued on the following terms: \$5,000,000 7% National Development Bonds at par due 1982-86; the proceeds of the Bonds will be used to finance development projects in accordance with the functions and purposes of the Barbados Development Bank Act, as set out at Sections 4 to 7 of the Act.

5.50 p.m.

At the end of September, 1975 loans by the Barbados Development Bank to finance projects totalled \$5,636,208. The Bank at 30th September, 1975 had a loan commitment of \$1,231,854 involving thirty projects. The Financial Statement of the Bank on the Bank's operations as at 30th September, 1975 with comparative figures to 31st March, 1974-75 were already laid here in Parliament and copies circulated. In the Bank's first issue of National Development Bonds, bond holders were exempted from the payment of income tax on interest on holdings up to a maximum of \$20,000. Section 9(1) of the Income Tax Act, Cap. 73 gives the authority.

It is proposed in this case that there will be similar exemptions under the Income Tax Act in

the case of people holding bonds up to a maximum of \$20,000. The purposes have been clearly set out here and it is only for these specific purposes that the money will be used by the Barbados Development Bank.

If there are any further questions I will try to answer them, but this is the second issue of National Development Bonds at the rate of 7 per cent on this occasion, and that is the normal procedure which is adopted in order to accelerate and finance certain projects at this time.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, if you please, for some time now there has been what is more than a rumour and what I can authoritatively state is more than a rumour, a report to the effect that the Barbados Development Bank is about to become a major shareholder in Barbados' major publishing enterprise, namely, the Advocate Company Limited, owners, proprietors and publishers of the Advocate-News newspaper. On the last occasion when an opportunity was given for the Prime Minister to be confronted on this issue in the House, he was challenged by me to deny that the Barbados Development Bank was contemplating taking an interest in the Advocate-News, and he failed to deny this, and as Minister responsible, I think I must accept the absence of denial and the absence of denial to the many reports which have appeared in the newspaper as confirmatory evidence that the Government is planning to buy the Advocate, to put it in popular parlance. There is an abundance of rumour.

One person I am told who went to the Prime Minister and said "Skipper, why don't you start the Democrat again for the election" received the reply, "we are going to do better than that."

Now, Sir, the position of the Opposition, let there be no doubt about it, is that the participation of the Government of Barbados in any form whatsoever in the purchase of the Advocate-News newspaper or any other established newspaper would be a serious retrograde step, a step towards one party state, a step towards the control of information available to the people of this Island, a step away from our much vaunted freedom, a step in the direction which all right thinking Barbadians must surely deplore. A firm of accountants wrote to

the Board of the Advocate-News some time ago indicating this offer and their letter, for example, had some abominable proposition in it to the effect that the pensions payable to ex-members of the Advocate Staff would become terminable on sixty days' notice. What a vile idea.

After an unfavourable article appearing in the West Indian World in London the Editor of that newspaper appeared in Barbados. I do not know whether his trip was paid for by the Ministry of Tourism, but he certainly appeared under the sponsorship of the Minister of Tourism, and soon subsequent to that we saw a more favourable article appearing in the West Indian World to Barbados. Well we know that the Minister of Tourism is a very accomplished today. Is that unparliamentary, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would prefer you to use a different word.

Mr. ADAMS: He is very accomplished at working his way into the confidence of persons formerly opposed to him.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, I want to draw to his attention that this money is for specific purposes.

Mr. ADAMS: I would know he would get up and tell me that, but the whole point is that we are voting this money for these purposes so as to release other funds to the Bank for the purpose of buying the Advocate. The purchase price of the Advocate is \$5 million and this Resolution is for \$5 million. The Bank has a duty to carry out these purposes whether or not this Resolution is passed. These are the purposes for which the Bank was set up, therefore it is clear that to buy the Advocate you have to make additional funds available to the Bank and you make them available for lawful purposes, and then you seek to twist section 5 of the Act to make other funds available for buying the Advocate. I am not an idiot, and the Hon. Leader of the House should be the last man in the world to consider that he can pull the wool over my eyes in such a respect. Of course the purposes for which the development loans are to be raised are ostensibly these purposes, but all the money is going the same place. It is like the General Revenue Balance. The Government has a million funds — Labour Welfare and a whole set of funds, but all of them are in the General Revenue Balance, and if you spend the Labour Welfare Fund only on purposes for which it is set up, you do this by the device of keeping separate accounting for the fund, but the money is not kept separately. The whole Labour Welfare Fund only has \$72,000 in

investments although that fund stands at \$2 million, so clearly, and I would expect the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union to know this better than me, the balance of the money has just drifted about in the General Revenue Balance and only appears as a paper amount. The same would be true of this.

In the accounting for the Development Bank in the future you will see that the investments which are made for these purposes will be set in one place and these funds will be set against them, and elsewhere you will see that the Bank pursuant to section so-and-so also invested its money in shares of the Advocate-News Limited. Anyhow, Sir, I was interrupted. This gentleman Mr. Arif Ali, having delivered the goods in a favourable article in the West Indian World is now down here in Barbados ostensibly to research for a book, but it is widely believed, to displace Mr. Robert Best as Editor of the Advocate. It is widely said that something which I put forward here as a joke in the House, that Carlton Brathwaite was going to be Chairman of the Board of the Advocate, could not be true, but I am told that seriously by a high-up at the Advocate that that is what they understand, that he will represent Mr. Bull who is one of the buyers. It is Mr. Bull, Mr. Gruson and the Barbados Development Bank. I could not believe my ears. I said to the person, no, you must have heard me say so in the House, and the person said, you made a speech in the House and I said that is why they should destroy you and all like you, because if the Advocate cannot report its own business when it takes place in the House, then it deserves whatever fate is held out for it. 6.00 p.m.

The Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union must know that members of the Democratic Labour Party, maybe not in this House, have said that good Union members in the Advocate, called the names of some, are to go. I do not know what Mr. Glyne Murray's position is with the Union, but I have heard it specifically said Mr. Glyne Murray is to go, Mr. Best is to go, Mr. Grosvenor is only to be offered a five-year contract so that he could be put out and have a few years to wait before he gets his pension. All these things are being bruited freely about in an atmosphere which I think is the most poisoned to the freedom of Barbados that I have ever encountered.

I would just point that one thing out to the Union, pensions terminable on 60 days' notice, and ask the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union if he could be associated with a Government that took over an organisation and imposed such a condition.

We are glad to be able to say that the workers of the Advocate have put forward a plan, I believe it is paying 5¼ million dollars — I do not know all these details — to buy the newspaper from its present proprietors. I understand that they have asked the proprietors to retain a holding of one third, give the workers a third, and I am informed quite reliably that there is a bank which is prepared to back the workers' share and offer a third of the shares to the public. Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that the Barbados Labour Party had absolutely nothing to do with this proposal, but it is a proposal which we welcome wholeheartedly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member is not speaking on the Resolution before us. If you want to make a speech on the radio and broadcast your views, do so. The hon. member should know better.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a case where I say I am speaking on the Resolution, because I say the Barbados Development Bank plans to buy the Advocate, the Minister of Finance responsible for it was in here and he did not deny it when called on, and that must make it relevant. The Minister of Information was also here. It has been in the newspapers, you have whole ministerial statements about what has been in the newspapers, you repeat what you read in the Advocate, you repeat letters which are published in the Advocate. Our rules say that no Minister can be asked if a report in a newspaper is true, but ministerial statements produce these newspaper reports, and there have been newspaper reports that the Barbados Development Bank is buying the Advocate and they have not been denied, so it is madness to say that it is not relevant to say this. I am warning the Government against using the money raised under this Resolution to release other funds of the Development Bank to buy the Advocate.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that there are four items here which are outlined on which this money is to be spent.

Mr. ADAMS: Small businesses, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: So I would like you to confine your speech to that.

Mr. ADAMS: With great respect, I have to talk about the Barbados Development Bank and its funds. I may be saying it has enough funds already for these purposes and it should not be raising these funds where we all know what its purpose is. Small businesses, Sir, they have

money they have not spent yet. The Advocate is only a small business, Sir, for all that we see it very large. I am just saying this, Sir, I do not know who is concerned or who is interested. This is an election year, I am just saying that we will have in our Party no repeat whatsoever for any arrangement entered into by the Barbados Development Bank with regard to buying the Advocate. If we have to pass legislation to annul any contract, if we can lawfully do so, we will. It is the worst thing I have ever heard come out of this Government. I have never heard worse.

People want houses all over Barbados, Barbados wants some hotels building to give people employment and get away from the apartment idea. The Minister of Tourism cannot help promote apartments, he has apartments. He had a hotel, he ceased to be interested in hotels, but the whole thrust of the present policy in tourism seems to be away from the building of hotels to a greater extent than I think desirable.

Manufacturing and processing industries. We have the Central Bank's word for it that the number of people engaged in manufacturing industry was no greater two years ago than it was in 1969. All these things are here and we see that we are supposed to be raising money for these projects, but if the money of the Barbados Development Bank which it at present has on investment is taken and put into a newspaper, the people of Barbados should rise up upon this occasion, and I am prepared to rise up with them. This is not Russia where Pravda is to be owned by the Government. As a matter of fact, I will tell you this. I do not even believe that the Russian Government as such owns a newspaper, because I believe Pravda is owned by the Communist Party and Izvestia is owned by some other Party.

If the Democratic Labour Party wants a newspaper let them restart the Democrat and put somebody else in the hot seat to lose his seat in the House of Assembly or become bankrupt or whatever happens, because they cannot run a newspaper without libelling somebody. The Democratic Labour Party will have done the most immoral act of political banditry ever seen in these parts. This is not a case of an alien newspaper being bailed out to save the workers, nothing is wrong with the Advocate, it makes a million dollars a year, I understand. The Advocate is helping to bail out the Times in London and the Sunday Times, a big paper coming down here selling for \$2.00 and \$2.50. Well, the Advocate is helping to contribute to that. It is not a paper where the workers are in fear of their jobs because it cannot run, it will be bought for propaganda purposes pure and simple.

I have refused to call a certain gentleman, Dr. Goebbels' name in here because I have said Dr. Goebbels was an intelligent man, but scaling him down, any idea of taking the Development Bank's money released by this Resolution to destroy what remains of the freedom of the Press in this country will be an act that every one of us in here should be ashamed of. The joke is that it cannot even make any difference, because the people's minds are made up already. Hon. members should know that, there is nothing you can do between now and election time with the Advocate to change anybody's mind.

Anyhow, I am just going to end by saying this, Sir, if any deal goes through and Thomson sells out to the Barbados Development Bank, those shares will be offered for sale to members of the public. We in our Party will have nothing to do with the destruction of Press freedom in this country by the imposing of shackles by a Department of Government on the Advocate newspaper. It is bad enough to have it with the CBC, to have a man so ignorant, and I do not mean Tom Clarke, he is a bully, but ignorant is not quite the word for him. A man so ignorant running CBC and telephoning and saying "cut out this and do the next" and now you must have him running the Advocate as well? Sir, I cannot speak about something like this. When I see decent people like the hon. member for Christ Church East having to sit down and associate himself with something like this, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West, people of a generation that knew what it was to be decent in politics, and being led by the nose by a little superannuated ex-officer of the Indian Army venting his petty spites, I cannot talk.

We are not voting for this Resolution either, no matter what the purposes are, unless we can have an assurance from the Government that the Barbados Development Bank is not planning to buy the Advocate. In the absence of such an assurance we will have to take it that the rumours are true, that these funds are being used to release other funds to buy the Advocate, and that therefore the Opposition in the interest of all the people of Barbados should not be asked to contribute to such an abominable decision.
6.10 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I wish very briefly to support the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. I would wish that this \$5 million was going to create jobs, increase the purchasing power of persons and contribute to proper development. I understand at the moment that the Advocate Company Limited makes roughly \$1 million a year for the Thomson

Organisation, and perhaps the Development Bank is looking at this aspect of the matter believing that they should use the country's resources to go into this sphere of operation.

I do not know if it comes under the heading of processing industries, but I believe that a Government has to be candid. I believe that there is a time when a Government cannot afford to be silent. Now, it is a fact that people have been saying whether rightly or wrongly, that the Resolution for monies to be spent for the purchase of the Advocate Company Limited will come by way of this Resolution.

I think that the Minister, as a Minister of the Crown has a duty to disclose what he knows at this stage, not in general terms such as we have heard, but the specific projects for which the money will be used when raised from the commercial banks. I think that the Minister should be candid and give the House an assessment of the viability of these projects and why they are considered necessary in the national interest for the Development Bank to have these funds available for these projects.

There is nothing wrong in general in spending money on tourism projects, and manufacturing and processing industries. I believe that most of us accept that for some time to come we will have a mixed economy, and for a considerable time as far as I can see it. Despite the very strong protestations that I have heard from individual members and the various political parties in this country, I think that prior to 1961 or since 1961 there has been no really genuine socialist document based on a rigid formula.

I read with great interest the statement of the hon. member for St. John in which he said that this was a trend of socialism, and as I understood his trend of socialism it was the greatest testament that I have seen for a long time for the continuation of the capitalist system. It seemed to be a pragmatic approach and thinking which was being labeled as socialist, but his brand of socialism ruled out several things.

So I conclude very seriously from the trend of the Caribbean and the trend of Barbados that despite the fact that statutory corporations such as the Development Bank are being created and despite the intervention of Governments from time to time in industries, that they are accepting basically for various reasons of economy, external pressures and the fear of repercussions from the middle class in Barbados, that the Government accepts that it cannot become a socialist Government.

That is not to say that a Government will not use certain institutions such as a development bank to intervene in spheres of the economy which do not call for really direct intervention. That is what I want the Minister to tell us. I can understand intervention in the shrimp industry. The shrimp industry, after all, had to be rescued; and you will recall that when the Resolution came down to this House it was only after the hon. members of the Opposition had been speaking very strongly on the anomaly of Government guaranteeing funds for a private corporation and taking a certain interest at that time in the corporation that the Prime Minister — that was the only occasion that I have seen him come over and sit with the Opposition — came and sat at the back of the Opposition, asking us to postpone further consideration.

The Government of course would never accept that the Opposition had any influence on such an important decision. What I want to say now is that we at that stage gave vital advice as to the nature of the guarantee for a Statutory Board because the Opposition genuinely felt that this was contributing to a development that was worthwhile for the future and adding to the foreign reserves position of Barbados.

Let me say here and now that I am one who happens strongly to be against foreign domination of the newspaper world of the Caribbean. I have said so openly. New Zealand has a Newspaper Act which limits foreign ownership of the Press; but New Zealand is democratic to the extent that its Government recognises that that does not mean that the Government itself must become an owner of the Press, because the temptation always is for a Government to restrict true Press freedom. That is what I want to make quite clear.

If you see a difference here, it is a difference that I thought the hon. member for St. Thomas has been making. You are not going to take off the evil of Thomson and throw that off and then fall into the cardinal mistake of restriction of the Freedom of the Press.

I seriously suggest that the performance of C.B.C. in the sphere of Press freedom leads to the reasonable conclusion that if the Barbados Development Bank itself owns shares and is to participate in the equity of a newspaper it will likewise restrict Press freedom in the country. There is nothing in the performance of the Government's ownership of the broadcasting

station which convinces me that the Government is serious that it wants genuine discussion of issues in the country on the radio station or indeed in the Press.

6.20 p.m.

It is one of the problems that one finds in developing countries; politicians who are anxious for their jobs, who want to hold on to power regardless of whatever happens, who feel that there should be no change from themselves, that they are the beginning and ending of all wisdom, and they always want to control what is written. (*Asides.*) I hear the Minister of Lands, Housing and Labour say that this Resolution has nothing to do with the Press. I will take him back to the Resolution very soon, Sir. Let me ask the Government to give us an assurance that, in guaranteeing this loan for the Development Bank, it is not releasing funds for the purchase of an interest, minority or otherwise, of the *Advocate*.

There are a lot of people coming down to Barbados, who are living on the west coast, who want to intervene and influence the decisions in this country, but I tell them that they had better be careful. I am bothered when I understand that we are moving from the hands of Thomson into the Deputy Editor of the *New York Times* and various other private investors who have the American Government and the Israeli Government first and foremost in mind and not the national interest in Barbados.

There is no reason why, if we are genuine about co-operatives in this country — this is part of the Resolution, Sir — the Government should not encourage a genuine co-operative movement among the workers in this country in industries which are locally owned. If they are very serious about workers' participation, they should encourage them. The Government must not feel that at every drop of a hat they must get into the action in everything that is going, particularly if it looks like a good thing for putting forward the programme of the political party in power.

I think we should be sufficiently matured in the democratic process of Government today that the Government does not have to own Presses, Radio Stations and that sort of thing and believe that this is in the total interest of the country as a whole. Say what you like about the political process in Jamaica. Tell me what you like about the little bit of shooting going on in Jamaica and so on, but I would say seriously that in Jamaica today, and indeed for some time, there is genuine dissent in that country which leads to a truer form of democracy than I see in the Caribbean.

If the Development Bank is going to restrict further the development of true democracy in Barbados, it will be a serious matter. Do you know the pressures in Barbados? The pressures are that you are frightened to say anything against the Democratic Labour Party because you might not get a job; you might not get something done for you; you have to become a member of the party whether or not you believe in its philosophy. Do you know the Lebanese, Syrians and Israeli who join your party simply because they want to believe that they have some pull? That is what I am talking about, if you want me to be candid. Do not tell me that I must not speak about Jamaica. There are all sorts of people who jump on the bandwagon, and they have no genuine interest in Barbados. We are getting them in the form of United States citizens who come here and.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is straying.

Mr. FORDE: I was speaking *sotto voce*, Sir. This is a matter on which I would like to lecture the hon. member for St. Michael North and the hon. member for St. Michael South. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order ! Let us hear something more about the National Development Bonds.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect some hon. members to be able to understand the trend of what is happening in their country until after they have died and reincarnated and it is written in a book for them to see that the political factors that were influencing development at this time were X and Y. It is obvious to me that if the Development Board is going to go into partnership in the *Advocate* with people from the *New York Times* and other west coast people that the Government should be conscious of the fact that these people are using Barbados for the wrong reason. If the hon. member cannot understand that, then he is living in a fool's paradise. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. Minister has the right to speak later. Please do not interrupt! Standing Order 6 has not been suspended.

Mr. FORDE: We would believe that we have a country. One of these days the very associations that the Government believe are favourable to them will work contrary to their own interest. Foreign investors have a habit of playing one force against another. I would prefer to see the economy of Barbados based on the full

co-operative efforts of Barbadian citizens, who have a stake here and believe in this country, who have no place to run — they cannot run to Wales — than to see it based on people who come here for a couple of years and want to safeguard their own interest. I have no other country to run to, Sir. I have married a Vincentian, but I have not got citizenship of that country. I must live here, work here, and die here, and that is why, when I speak of things of this nature, I expect the hon. member to try and follow my arguments. He is close to the throne; he is one of the biggest advisers; he has a lot of influence in the *primus inter pares* there. He must try to read the times correctly. Do not come in here with any partnership in this particular field.

There is nothing wrong in political parties having their own newspapers, but I am against the use of public funds for furthering the narrow political interest of any political party. I apologize to the House, if I have wasted the House's time. I would ask the Minister — he is going out. Gracefully, I hope, Sir, on promotion, I understand, to Venezuela, but if the Minister would get up and give me.....

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the matter before us. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. What has happened to the hon. member? Please confine your remarks to the motion.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Hon. Minister to give an assurance to this Chamber that processing industries involved does not mean the acquisition of shareholdership of the *Advocate*.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. The speeches I have heard justify what I have always said in this House about this society. It is a gossip-mongering society pure and simple. All I have heard from hon. members is gossip and rumours. One member of the Opposition some time ago got up and said he wants a One-Party State, or that the Government wants a One-Party State. This is a Government that, for the last five years, held a 2/3 majority.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have never heard any member of the Opposition say that he wants a One-Party State.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw that. It was the member for St. Michael South East, a back bencher on the Government side. He said he wanted a One-Party State, and immediately all over Barbados it was felt that the Government

wanted a One-Party State. The Government had a 2/3 majority since 1971, and if it wanted a One-Party State it could have abolished the Opposition and got a One-Party State. Suddenly on the eve of an election, because they are looking for an election gimmick, it is said that the Government wants a One-Party State. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I want to hear about the Development Bank.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: The freedom of the Press could be destroyed on what basis? I believe in the freedom of the Press. I believe and this Government believes that there should be freedom of the Press. This is enshrined in the Constitution.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would ask the hon. member....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You allowed them to talk about the freedom of the Press all afternoon, and now I am talking about it you are asking me to stop!

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been trying to get members to speak on the Development Bank which is before us.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member was allowed to speak for the whole afternoon on the *Advocate*. I do not see anything about the *Advocate* in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I told the hon. member that, and he came back....

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member left the *Advocate* and went over to the *Democrat*.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister may continue.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do you mean that the Government is not allowed to reply to the arguments put forward by the Opposition now? I am not talking about gossip. I am stating facts. The Government of Barbados believes in the freedom of the Press.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, let us be absolutely accurate about the nature of this Resolution. I did not speak on the freedom of the Press, except incidentally. I spoke about the Development Bank buying the *Advocate* newspaper. I did not initiate any debate on the freedom of the Press.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am making a categorical statement. The Government of Barbados believes in the democratic process and has supported it even although it had a majority to abolish the Opposition. Now, because a back bencher makes a statement there must be a headline "The Government Wants a One-Party State." Nonsense. (*Asides*) We have before us a Resolution which sets out the purpose of this guarantee. Let me show you the society in which we live. If I wanted to manufacture things, I could say that the money would buy a house for a Minister; I could say that I hear it is to buy a yacht for the Prime Minister and so on. That would be gossip. I could start rumours, too. When you listen to the speeches of the Opposition, can anybody seriously say that there is anything in this Resolution in connection with the *Advocate-News* or any newspaper?
6.30 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of elucidation, Sir. The hon. member is skirting the argument. The hon. member can shorten this process by himself since he is in the Cabinet, giving the undertaking that the money is not to be voted for that purpose. That is all he has to do.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is what I am coming to. Here is an innocent Resolution. All the purposes set out here are quite clear, honest and upright, and you hear now, Mr. Best is going to get fired, he does not know what is going to happen to Glyne Murray, Mr. Grosvenor has a five-year contract, and a million and one rumours. When you talk about politics — some day I am going to breathe a breath and a sigh of relief when I can escape from a Chamber in which every single motive of the Government is misinterpreted — and especially in election year — to suit and to fit into gossip going around Bridgetown for some political advantage.

If I did not feel I was able to make a contribution to this — sometimes when I listen to this I feel as if I am going through thick, slimy mud, and somehow or other I am praying for the day when I can get clean again, because you cannot come into this Honourable House with an innocent Resolution setting out honest, upright purposes, tourism projects — and then you hear about this army colonel from the Indian Army who used to go in for hotels, now he has gone in for apartments. You cannot even discuss a tourist project unless a Minister is involved. Even although tourism is one of the vital planks in the Barbados economy, you hear from the Leader of the Opposition — you are not dealing with this army captain and this body, and propaganda, Goebbels had more sense.

When you come into politics with this type of — I do not know what to call it — you must feel dirty, you must feel unclean. Here you are discussing a subject — even assuming that they come in with rumours and all these fantastic ideas they come with, you still have to bring in a man's career, a man's ability, you accuse him of dishonest motives in that he is pushing apartments — you mean in this Honourable House you cannot debate something at the level of statesmanship?

You mean we have got to go on, and then you expect politics to be clean and politics to improve? When you are discussing a Resolution for \$5 million and you get people accused of ulterior motives, their intelligence is belittled, their racial background is referred to, and all this — you expect politics to be clean? Don't people feel dirty? I feel dirty. I can tell you, sometimes I feel dirty and I go home and get a nice warm bath; it cannot clean my soul but at least it can clean my back.

Now let us go on. I can give an undertaking that none of the money advanced here today, categorically, is for the purchase of any Advocate.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, if the Minister would give way. That is not what we ask for. We asked for an assurance that the Barbados Development Bank is not interested in taking any shares in the Advocate. Not why this money is going to be used for it. We ask for a genuine assurance. We do not want any cheap lawyer tricks in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Leader of the House, I suppose, in summing up will give the assurance. Will you allow the hon. member to continue?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Finally, Mr. Speaker, when you look at this Resolution — you mean a bank set up in an economy in which they claim there is unemployment, in which there is need for productive activity, a Government comes to Parliament to raise \$5 million at 7% in bonds for the following purposes, tourism projects, including ancillary projects, manufacturing and processing industries in a country in which agro industries are becoming important, and we are going into areas — cooperatives which again are important — we have an expert in the Ministry of Agriculture, a gentleman called Mr. Wiggins looking into cooperatives both in schools and small businesses — and you have a small business association — and you come in with these projects to push \$5 million into the economy, and all of a sudden the Advocate is attached to

this, and, not on any proper information. It is rumoured; they say the Jews are coming in, the Syrians, the Italians, everybody. Now this makes you sick because you do not know....

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, I am telling the hon. member that that is my information, and if he wishes my source of information I can disclose it to him under the Official Secrets Act.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of elucidation, the hon. member is making people believe that one goes outside and rakes rumours from the gutter. If the hon. member is discharging his duties to hon. members, he will get up and say what is the position.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into this because I heard you say that the hon. member would give an assurance. (Mr. SPEAKER: If he so desires.) Not only if he so desires. I will tell Your Honour, there is nobody in here on a witness stand that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition can cross-examine, and then ask him to answer the question. He has to leave that for Coleridge Street. There is a distinction between here and Coleridge Street. He spoke about lawyer tricks. Well you cannot bring those lawyer tricks in here. There are too many of these lawyer tricks that you bring in here in this dramatic way of getting on. That is for when you are appearing before a jury. This is no jury and we over here will vote the same way when you are finished. This dramatising is all right for out there in Coleridge Street when you are not sure how the jury will come on, so you put your hand on your head and dramatise. There is no point in raising these things.

You do not have to be Leader of the Opposition to get rumours in Barbados. Rumour in Barbados is the cheapest thing you can get; it sells at any price. Everybody around here has heard that the Advocate is being sold out. That is no big thing. A man wrote a Resolution and sent it to me himself saying: "Be it resolved that we investigate the rumour and the idea about buying the Advocate." The Advocate being sold out is no big thing; the Advocate was sold out so many times and you are behaving as if this is the first time. Do you know how many owners the Advocate had already? Why is it that the members of the Opposition are making this big thing about the Advocate being sold? When Thomson bought the Advocate it was owned by the Gales, and it has been going around the corner many times.

I heard the hon. member for Christ Church West talking about the profit that the Advocate

made. These members of the Opposition have been very silent about the profit position of these companies when we were having some struggles with them in asking for more money, and nobody would tell the public that we are dealing with people who make money. They held that back. We have had some problems with the Advocate.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation, the hon. member should know that the Advocate Company Limited is a public company and that its accounts are published and are available for inspection by him, and if he wants me at any stage to look up the records for him without charge, I am willing to do that.

Mr. WALCOTT: We have three accountants at our disposal, and there is a chartered accountant that we have at our disposal, so it is not a question that we would not get advice. All I am saying is that if this public statement is now being aired, I hope I will hear more of these public statements about other companies when we have to deal with them, and we do not hear members saying that the Trade Union is suppressing anybody and preventing them from developing. I only mentioned that because our name is being used. I do not think that hon. members who spoke on this are worried about the sale of the Advocate; they are worried about the purchaser or the prospective purchaser. I think in England which is a bigger and more powerful country than Barbados, the Daily Telegraph supports the Conservative Party because the conservative people have money. But they are doing as if this is a *force majeure* situation. I would agree with the hon. member if the Advocate did not want to sell the paper and the Government was looking about for a paper to buy as if a paper is food; but hon. members must ask themselves a question. Is the paper on the market? If the paper is on the market and if the Government gets into the paper business, it would be like the Opposition. The Opposition is in the newspaper business; they own a paper, small it is true, but you have to start small. I heard a rumour that the Nation wanted to buy it. I would not make any big thing of it if the Nation wanted to buy it, because if the Nation can get people to support them and put up the money, they are entitled to buy it. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say they would give the workers shares. Sometimes you can take shares in something, but that is about all you get. It is what dividends you get after they give you shares.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know that Barbados can accommodate a lot of newspapers because all the small newspapers are numbered. They have

to manufacture stories to sell in order to make something. The only paper that has been surviving for some time is the Advocate and I believe I can really understand the fears of the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition has a real fear to be in the Opposition and hear that the Government is likely to take over the only newspaper or the most important newspaper in the country. That is a real political fear and therefore the hon. member is right to sound his note. Obviously if I were in a party that had six members or five, I would have that fear too because I agree with him that Governments nowadays are not sweet; they are oppressive and you may feel that this is the last weapon.

The Leader of the Opposition is so sensitive about the press that even today he was begging for something to be put on the front page. He said: look you did not put this on the front page last time, but I want to make it clear and what the hon. member was saying in effect was to get this on the front page because I know you do not put what I say on the front page. That was in essence telling them to go now and put this on the front page. We had a man called Front Page who used to work at the News. One can therefore understand that the hon. member is very sensitive to the newspaper.
6.50 p.m.

I think it is more a fear the hon. member would have about the political aspect rather than if the Advocate is for sale. He asked for an assurance, but the hon. member should know what the Minister said. I will tell you this, if I were over on the other side, in the absence of the Minister of Finance today, how would you get an assurance? That is if you want to draw out the Minister, it is just like when you were talking about the CBC and the Union. A Minister cannot tell the House, if negotiations are going on to buy the Advocate are not concluded, they will be only, as the Trinidadians would say, "mamaguying." How can you give any person an assurance about something that you are not sure about? You have entered negotiations to buy the newspaper. If the hon. member asks if it is a fact that the Government has entered into negotiations to purchase the newspaper, therefore you might not get an answer, so it is a different matter from saying that you have that kind of fear.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should not worry himself about matters like this. If the Government intends to enter into negotiations for the purchase of the Advocate the Leader of the Opposition will have to accept that because they are the people who

can do it. There is no cardinal principle laid down that no Government can enter into negotiations with the Advocate or anybody else about the buying of a newspaper, and he knows that. He made a sweeping statement about Mr. Burnham today, but he knows in Trinidad the Trinidad Government has authority for running 610 or one of the radio stations, and I do not think you can say that Eric Williams is the same kind of man as Burnham, because he has not nationalised oil, and George Weekes wanted him to nationalise oil.

Too much is made, as I said already, of the freedom of the Press. The hon. member should know, the mere fact that he spoke about getting on the front page, the hon. member for Christ Church West would know there is no such thing in the kind of democracy we have in England, here and all about, where people pay for advertisements, there is no freedom of any Press. People write what they feel like writing, there is no freedom of any Press. The Advocate publishes what they feel like publishing and what they do not feel like publishing they do not publish, so there is no big thing about that. If it is something about you to publish, because it is the hon. member for Christ Church West they may go a little easy; if they have me to deal with they may go a little tougher. If they feel that it is something that can show me up because I am in the Trade Union Movement they will blow it up, and therefore give the Trade Union a bad image. For example, the newspaper gives the Trade Union a bad image because sometimes you get strikes, in a general way, but in a specific way it does not mean that you do not publish anything that the Trade Union says, so there is not any freedom of the Press like you can have the way that everybody gets something out of it. Some people get more out of the Press than others, and that is the thing. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition, just like me, I am man enough to say anything of the newspaper because many years ago I tore up the Advocate at a May Day Celebration and therefore I do not have any respect for the newspaper, a newspaper does not write itself, a newspaper is written by people, and it is from the position that people take that a newspaper is written. A newspaper is not written by the hand of God, so it is nothing divine, so a newspaper is nothing more than the people who control it, it is from what position they operate that the paper comes out, so the paper is as free as those who operate it want it to be. If you go conservative, if the people who are conservative write the paper, the paper is going to give you the conservative side.

The hon. member spoke about Pravda and Izvesta, which are papers in Russia, so they will

give you the Russian point of view and you will never know certain things because from their point of view they do not want the people there to know certain things so they do not publish them. Freedom of the Press is something that is measured by the people who control it. I think what the hon. member's fear is that if it gets into the hand of the Government as the authority of the State you are likely to feel that it will get out of hand. I must appeal to the Hon. Minister of Education. The hon. member spoke about a one-party state, but I do not think the hon. member needs to worry about this. The hon. member who made that statement is leaving Parliament, he is finished, so why hold on to it? I do not think a one-party state is anything to do with what he says, I do not think the climate in Barbados will ever support in a general way a one-party state, no one group of people will get in, people in Barbados like maybe two parties to have fun and perhaps one party will have about ten but everybody is given the chance to make his fun.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour being 7.00 p.m., this sitting now stands suspended till 8.00 p.m. 7.00 p.m.

On the Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was dealing under Government Members' Business with a Resolution for \$5 million. The hon. member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair. I do not see him in his place now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you making your final reply?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes, Sir.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak. I have a right to speak. From outside I heard the Hon. Minister of Education talking about how dirty he feels when he comes in this place; but it seems to me as if the hon. member takes certain positions at certain times. When things start to hit him hard he regrets being here and he thinks that by going home and having a bath that he is washed clean of all the things to which he is a party.

I have often said of this particular Minister that on occasions when it suits him he speaks about Ministerial Government, and when it does

not suit him he denies Ministerial responsibility. The argument of the Opposition has been that the Government, according to rumours, is seeking the right to issue national development bonds to the tune of \$5 million which would relieve funds of the Barbados Development Bank for the purchase of the Advocate Newspaper.

I heard him say that he will give an undertaking when the time comes. Nobody is talking about this specific amount as set out here. What one has got to understand is whether or not the reason for bringing this Resolution for \$5 million is to relieve funds of the bank, as you say in accounting, transferring \$5 million from one column to another column. That is the simple question that is being asked. Are you going to transfer \$5 million from one pigeon hole to another pigeon hole and then put \$5 million from somewhere else into that pigeon hole? That is all that we are asking.

We say that if you are not going to be involved in the expenditure of \$5 million in the Advocate Newspaper, then the Opposition will vote for this \$5 million because we believe that Barbados has reached a stage where Barbadians must support national development of the economy.

It is indeed strange, Mr. Speaker, that this evening we have dealt with several Resolutions asking for money for which the Minister of Tourism is directly involved, but he is absent from the Chamber. We see tourism projects including ancillary projects. I heard the Minister without Portfolio in introducing the Resolution say that the Addendum speaks for itself. What better could have been done than for the Minister to get up and say under tourism projects, including ancillary projects that we hope to lend money for this and that? Let us know the plans which the Government has got.

But, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that we have a Minister of Tourism who, in my considered opinion, puts out information about a big Tourist Industry; but everybody outside the Tourist Industry is telling you that it is one of the worse in the history of Barbados. I have heard him say in here that there will be more tourists coming into Barbados than there were members of the population in the years 1975 and 1976. About four or five weeks ago I was at District "B" Police Court at a licensing session. I spoke to a man who is in the Hotel Industry, and I said to him that things should be good now. Another hotelier asked me what made me think so. I said that the Minister of Tourism said that this is a good year. He said: "Do you believe

anything that man says?" I did not know that there was somebody else like me who do not believe it.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote 100 per cent for this Resolution if I am sure that this money is really going into national development. You talk about manufacturing and processing industries. Is the Government prepared to take some of this money and lend it to the dairy farmers of this country to acquire shares in the milk plant at Pine Hill Dairy? That would be better than acquiring shares in the Advocate.

Let the Minister of Agriculture deny that Pine Hill Dairy is making a whopping profit when the year comes, but the dairy farmers are all going broke. It would be what you call national development if the Government advanced money to the dairy farmers to buy shares in the Pine Hill Dairy.

Let the Government deny that small businessmen in this country have got to go through hundreds and hundreds of avenues to produce projections etc. in order to get money from the Development Bank. If the Government is going to take part of this money and set up a system whereby any businessman of Barbadian nationality or a company of Barbadian nationality, if it wanted to go into business can go to a particular department and get the work done at minimum cost and then call at the Barbados Development Bank I will vote for it 100 per cent; but telling me that you are going to guarantee this money and put it in something like a newspaper is contrary to my thoughts of national development.

Leave the newspapers to those persons who want to be in the newspaper business. I do not believe that a Government has any business in a national newspaper. Let political parties have their own newspapers. That is their business; but let the people be given the right to read different sides of a political argument, all shades of opinion and let them decide for themselves what they want to do.

I would support the Resolution, but I have not yet even heard from anyone on that side a denial of the Government's intention to be involved in the operation of the single daily newspaper in this country. I believe that we have greater things to do in this country. I believe that the Government should be looking at the number of industries in this country which are operated by non-nationals, which enjoy tax free concessions for 10 years, which have easy access to money, but which pay low wages, and at the

end of the nine or ten year period pull up and leave.

8.10 p.m.

I believe that money of this sort should be used to encourage Barbadians, I do not mean those Barbadian Companies that are registered in the Cayman Islands. I am talking about Barbadian Companies and Barbadian businessmen who get involve in business in Barbados. I have always said that, the first day anything which looks like a calamity hangs over this country, the Minister of Tourism will leave as he came on a boat. There is one thing I have known throughout my life about Britain. Britain always stands by people of that ethnic group and colour who were born in Britain. To give you an example, when they were talking about the Immigration Bill in Britain, they were trying to devise ways and means of keeping out black people. They came up with a formula for patriots. Do you know who the patriots were? Those people who have had long ancestral connections with the mother country. An Australian, who could say that his great grandfather was born in England, had the right to go to England at any time. The South African, whose grandfather was born in England, could go to England at any time, but the aborigines in Australia could not go to England although they were Australians.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still waiting to hear about the Barbados Development Bank Act. You have been given a little latitude, but do not overdo it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think you would like me to lend you the instrument which the opticians have provided for clarity of reading.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I should like to tell the hon. member that I appreciate his speech more than that of the Minister of Education.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order!

Mr. BOLDEN: I see here "2 (a) — Tourism Projects", and that is what I am dealing with. I have not got to (b), (c), and (d) yet. I am saying that the term "patriot" has a specific meaning, and the Minister of Tourism would enjoy the status that as soon as any cloud of disruption, calamity, or whatever it is, overhangs Barbados, he can run back to Britain like all the other companies that came to Barbados. As soon as the economy starts to waver, they will run out of Barbados. We have had examples of that. The companies were closed down one by one and

they have gone back to their parent country in North America, or wherever they came from, leaving empty buildings scattered around Barbados and thousands of people out of work.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if the \$5 million is to be utilised, it should be given to true Barbadian Companies — people who cannot pull out because they have no other place to go. You will be batting on a better wicket and, therefore, it is in our interest in the Opposition to support a Resolution of this nature. If it is a question of taking \$5 million out of the Barbados Development Bank and put aside to be involved in a newspaper, then we cannot support it. I have heard on numerous occasions that the Barbados Development Bank had some \$15 million which had been loaned to it by the American Government for industries, and the money has not yet been loaned out. That is why we are asking for the assurance that this \$5 million will not be used in the wrong way. (*Asides.*)

Late last year I had a telephone call, and I was told that certain members from the United States were in Barbados investigating why it is that the Barbados Development Bank did not loan out the money. It means that there is money in the Development Bank. If there is money in the Development Bank, why do you need another \$5 million? That is what we are saying. Mr. Speaker, I hope that somebody on that side would really put the record straight. (*Asides.*) I hear in an aside that it is not true. Tell us why the Barbados Development Bank has no money and you need \$5 million now. Tell us that you have a number of projects; name the projects that you want to get off the ground; say that you need \$5 million and that is why you have come here. Do not come in here and say that the Addendum speaks for itself. The Addendum says what is written here, but we cannot look behind the printed word.

Mr. Speaker, we have not been given the accounts of the Barbados Development Bank. I believe that if the Government were playing it straight, they would have handed us a copy of the last Audited Statement of the Barbados Development Bank so that we could see what is the balance and so on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Probably the hon. member was not in here when I spoke on the matter. I said most emphatically that the Bank's Report and Financial Statement for the year ended 31st March, 1975, were laid in the House on the 30th December, 1975. I have said that already.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not have a copy. I wonder whether the Minister would tell me what was the net balance in the Bank as at that date and the loans being processed up to the end of the period when the Resolution was brought in. We would then be able to see if the Bank has no money and what it needs. That would allay the fears of everybody. We would know that the Bank needs \$5 million for a certain purpose. That would be rather helpful to us. Mr. Speaker, can you give me a minute to look at this document? (*Asides.*) The late Mr. Corbin said: "Do not rush the brush; the whole house has to be painted."

Mr. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the matter before the House. Let us get along.

Mr. BOLDEN: I would give way if the Minister would tell us what is the total amount of loans being processed at the moment at the Bank. We would then know for sure that this money is really for certain projects. I would give way to the Minister, if he is going to tell us that I see here that there was \$1,435,039 in Working Capital at the end of the year. I wonder whether the Minister would tell us what was the amount of money involved in the loans being processed at the moment under these specific heads? Mr. Speaker, if he would tell us what happened at the Bank, it would relieve our fears that the Bank is not really getting involved in the *Advocate* newspaper.
8.20 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Yes; the Minister got up.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was looking in your direction.

Mr. BOLDEN: I do not want to argue. I asked if the Minister would give us the figures. I asked a question as to if the Minister would tell us the sum of money involved and the number of loans, etc. which are being processed under the Heads which the Resolution is for.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I gave it already in introducing this measure and I made mention of this but probably the member was not in his place.

At the end of September, 1975, loans by the Barbados Development Bank to finance projects totalled \$5,636,280; the Bank at 30th September, 1975, had a loan commitment of \$1,431,854 involving 30 projects, and the financial statements for these years from 1973 to 1975 have all been laid, including the last one of which I just made mention, up to 31st

March, 1975, and it was laid in September last year.

The position is that there is nothing, Sir, to indicate that the Barbados Development Bank has any intention, or has entered into any negotiations at any stage with the Barbados Advocate News or intend purchasing any shares or issuing any shares in that respect. There is nothing on the file to indicate that. I do not know where all this thing has been dragged from.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I feel happy with one reservation. The Minister said there is nothing in the file to indicate that. If the Minister is saying that the Barbados Development Bank or the Government has no intention of getting involved in the newspaper, I would feel doubly assured because I always like to take that Minister's word.

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of arguments this evening from the other side in respect of this \$5 million being sought to substitute money being used by the Development Bank for financing the purchase of the Advocate-News. We have heard that the cost of the Advocate-News is \$5 million and that this \$5 million is to be used for the purchase of the Advocate-News. We have also heard Opposition members ask for an assurance

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must give way on this. Nobody has said that this \$5 million is to be used as such. They have said that this \$5 million is to release funds.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made.

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member must have been sleeping when I said that it was contended over there that this \$5 million is to be substituted for funds used for the purchase of the Advocate. This is what was said over there. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is, the fears of the Opposition; if they had the ability to debate properly and to think wisely, they would ask different questions; they would not ask for assurances. They would come in here well prepared to do the job that they are put here to do, by asking for a breakdown on the loans accrued or under consideration by the Barbados Development Bank for the year 1975/76. That is what the Opposition would have asked for and they would not have had to be asking for assurances that the Barbados Development Bank

is not putting money in the Advocate or for the purchase of the Advocate. The other thing is, Mr. Speaker

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member probably was asleep when I was speaking, because I clearly asked for a statement of accounts at the end of the year and the total amount of money involved and in projects under A, B, C and D which would assure us what money is needed by the Bank after adding that money approved, together with the balance. That is what I asked.

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I know that I would get the hon. member for St. Joseph getting up like a yo-yo. The point is that the hon. member asked for the amount of loans and the amount of the balance in the account. That is what he asked for. He asked for the amount of loans approved. If he wanted to ascertain whether the money was going into the Advocate he would ask what businesses were approved for loans, which is a matter of public knowledge; as long as the loans are made it is the right of every member in this Chamber to be furnished with that information if he wishes it, or a substantive question could be asked by the Opposition if they wanted to find out what was happening with the money in the Development Bank, but not to come in here to speculate, saying that money is not being guaranteed here by this Chamber for the purpose for which it is set out in the Addendum.

That is the point I think that the Hon. Minister of Education has been making. He made the point that as soon as a reasonable Resolution comes in, people become speculative and they want to attribute all sorts of motives to the Resolution.

There is no need for attributing ulterior motives or bad motives to a Resolution when you can ask the appropriate questions and get the answers. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that it is set out clearly in the Addendum, and the Leader of the House did state this, that this money is being used for these purposes which are national development purposes, and therefore the hon. member if he votes for this he is going against the assurance of the Leader of the Opposition it means that they do not consult, because he said he is going to vote for it. The only reservation the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said they have is that they were not going to vote for it was because they were not given an assurance. If they were given an assurance, they would vote for it.

The point I am making is that the hon. member for St. Joseph said that if this money is going into national development, that he would vote for it. I am contending that it is going into national development because this is what the Addendum sets out clearly. There can be no doubt about that, and

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member seems to have lost track of the entire argument. What the Leader of the Opposition said is that unless he is given assurance

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, he cannot get up on a point of elucidation and say what the Leader of the Opposition said. I will not give way to that. He cannot get up and say what the Leader of the Opposition said, when the Leader of the Opposition is there sitting down. I will not give way to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you giving way?

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Speaker.
8.30 p.m.

I will not give way to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you giving way?

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, since the hon. member wishes the Leader of the Opposition to explain what the Leader of the Opposition said, I will explain what I said quite clearly. We are not voting for this Resolution unless we have an assurance that this is not a masquerade, masquerading behind the ordinary projects of the Bank in order to release funds to buy the Advocate.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation, what I said was that if I am shown the balance sheet to see the net balance at the end of a period and then I know the amount which is involved in the loans which have been approved to date, I can see that the Bank is broke and needs this money for lending to Barbadian companies, then I will vote for it, but not if the money is to be taken out of one pigeon hole and put into another, and this is to guarantee \$5 million to buy the Advocate.

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the hon. member

did not say so, but he said so after he said he would support it if it was going into national development. I am saying they are not *ad idem*. They do not consult and you find one person pulling to one corner and the other pulling to the other corner. (Mr. ADAMS: In other words we are like Caddle and Frank Walcott or like you and Sleepy.)

(Hon. F. G. SMITH: Don't bring me into this. I have been peaceful all day.)

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the House has set out what the money is for, national development, and anybody who votes against this would be voting against providing employment for some of the unemployed in the country and for promoting the development of small businesses in this country. The other thing is that we have heard cried about small people seeking assistance through the Barbados Development Bank. I thought the hon. member for St. Joseph would have asked what is the position when it comes to agriculture and so on and the \$900,000 which has been with the Caribbean Development Bank. He wanted to know if that money has been used or if they have made a policy decision.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, if the hon. member wants to ask his party questions, let him ask them. He should not put to me what I should ask. I have my time and method of taxing the Government and I know when to attack them. Let him get up now openly and ask the Minister these questions and not depend on me to ask them for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS: I said that because the hon. member knows there is money in the Barbados Development Bank to be injected into agriculture. He said that if we were coming here to guarantee money to be used in agriculture he would support it, but the point I am making is that there is money already provided by the Caribbean Development Bank for the Barbados Development Bank to be used in agriculture, so why should he get up and ask for money for that purpose. All we would want to know is that it is used. So do not ask something which is irrelevant to the Addendum.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, believe me I never wanted to enter this debate at all. However, Sir, the hon. member for St. Andrew who has just sat down has given me cause to rise. He speaks, Mr.

Speaker, of a Resolution being reasonable. Now I want to say firstly that a Resolution cannot be considered more reasonable than the persons who are supposed to be promoting this. Now if this \$5 million were to be used for generating employment in the community, the Government would not have hesitated in advancing that, and up to the present we have been given no particulars with respect to any number of persons to be employed in any industry to be assisted, enabled or helped in any respect whatsoever. In the absence of these figures, in the absence of such suggestions coming from Government members resulting from any survey that is related to the unemployment situation in this country, we in the Opposition have got to accept that it going to be used for purposes other than those which I have related so far.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I happen to be in the printing business. I happen to have some association with the publishing business and I believe I would know what a small business would be, and I have heard considerable emphasis placed on what this Addendum sets out. Mr. Speaker, any hon. member on this side of the House or any other part of the world for that matter is entitled to argue on what is placed in the Addendum to this Resolution. Even the Hon. Minister of Tourism would know and have to admit that the acquiring of a newspaper could and would be interpreted as being ancillary to tourism as a project as such. (*Asides*) I hear laughter.

Mr. Speaker, you know it is surprising that this is education and it arouses laughter, not from the Minister of Education but within him, and what we are saying is that a Minister of Tourism must see himself doing everything possible to educate, as he would say, the people at home and abroad as to the true meaning and fostering of these tourism projects. In other words, a way of selling tourism to the nation is evidently by way of newspaper publication. Let those hyenas, if any there be, laugh on. What we are saying Mr. Speaker, is, what is printing but manufacturing and processing! You may go further. The Addendum sets out cooperatives. It can certainly be held out that on the acquiring of the Advocate it will be run on a cooperative basis.
8.40 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, if we started tomorrow to tell the nation that we are going to foster the spirit of co-operatives by acquiring the Advocate, having a joint co-operative, could there be anybody, and would there be anybody to sound a voice on this? It would capture the nation, I

am suggesting, but a \$5 million business in terms of the multi-national business is a small business. But we have to look further. The Barbados Development Bank is already provided with ample authority for investing from time to time as it sees and thinks fit in any projects for the national good or as the case might be. It would mean therefore that unless the Bank is without ample funds — and there has been no demonstration of this, so we are entitled in all seriousness to accept the fact that the Advocate is up for sale — the Democratic Labour Party having lost the Democrat would like now to be able to put something over out of the taxpayers, so to speak, and intends to use the Barbados Development Bank to acquire the Advocate and then to make the staff and other people believe that they are sharing in a joint development and what not.

There is not a single Minister — and remember, nobody can believe any Ministers of Government today, nobody in Barbados can believe them and is going to believe anything they say, the people of this country have had enough of ministerial droppings and what not in this country. Nobody is prepared to believe anything they say, so this is what we are asking even in the face of this. We want them to come and tell us that this Resolution and the money that we are being asked to guarantee for the Barbados Development Bank is not to revamp the Bank's finances, to reimburse the Bank or have anything to do with the acquiring of the Advocate Newspaper. If this were forthcoming it would have placed the entire debate on an entirely different plane, it would have been seen in an entirely different light, but that cannot be so, because I still believe that there are some Ministers who have not sold all of what is called conscience, I still believe this, and I believe that sitting as they are, as we see them there, there are still Hon. Ministers who would still be tempted so to speak to tell the truth that there is behind this Resolution, coming as it does at this time.

It is not a case, Mr. Speaker, where we have been told of projects in this particular grouping, this particular sector, which are to be assisted, and that resulting from that assistance we expect to employ, we expect to produce, we expect to export, we expect to earn this or that in return, there is nothing like this coming from the Government benches. This Hon. House is being asked to guarantee this loan. What is the purpose of our being asked? What is the purpose of the Development Bank seeking to have this money made available to it at this particular time? I believe that the Minister charged with this

responsibility, charged with coming before this Hon. House ought to have at his disposal enough information to let the Opposition, to let even his own Government members understand that it is a worthwhile project, that it is an undertaking that is healthy, that it is an undertaking that holds out prosperity to the nation. But how is it, Mr. Speaker, that even up to this point all of this is lacking? Nothing in support of this has come from the Government benches. In the light of all this, what are we left to assume about a matter of this sort? What are we left to understand? Is it a case where there is a programme of educational promotion or educational advancement? Is it a case where information has been forthcoming that we are going to upscale farming to such an extent as to involve and employ large numbers of the unemployed who are now left and have been left for lots of years now to be roaming the streets looking for something to do? Why does the Government not bring forth this type of information in support of a Resolution such as this?

If the Government is in possession of these facts, let the Government bring them to bear and the Opposition would be compelled to support a motion of this magnitude. In the absence of this we can only come to the conclusion that the Government is attempting once more to blindfold the entire nation. The Government cannot stand up before the Opposition, before the nation as a whole and justify its attempt at guaranteeing this \$5 million loan at this particular time. We have heard, we have witnessed, we have seen, every member on the other side is jumping to the defence of all this. If the Government had a cast-iron case the Leader of the House would have put it to the Hon. House and I am sure the Government's case would have been left to rest there, but it is not so, almost every hon. member has had to jump up and say something attempting not to justify, not to satisfy, because this Government is so contemptuous of the nation the Government sees itself as not having to satisfy or justify any action on its part where the national interest is concerned.

8.50 p.m.

We cannot in the light of this, Mr. Deputy Speaker — I am sorry. I mean Mr. Speaker. We have been at it for a long time and even at this stage we would all be so happy if we could say so with a feeling that comes from deep down that Your Honour has been duly elected according to the Standing Orders of this Honourable House.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not required now. Let us hear about the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we do not want to rub this in. We have no need to do this. I know that you do not listen to asides although some hon. members are trying to interrupt somewhat. I am sure that you feel exactly as I feel about this Resolution. You have sat there and you have listened and you have followed each hon. member's contribution; but you cannot be convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt that there is not considerable merit in what come from the Opposition benches up to the present time that this Resolution seeks in truth and in fact to back up the action of the Barbados Development Bank, not in prosecuting, not in doing those things that they ought to do.

The Hon. Minister of Housing — we are confident that if this \$5 million or part thereof was to be intrusted to his Ministry for the development of housing he would have shouted it loud and long before this Resolution had reached this House for debate. It would have been known in every national newspaper throughout the world that national housing would depend to a considerable measure on this Resolution throughout the parish of St. Michael and perhaps in other districts as well.

However, what we have seen and what we have been seeing for a considerable time is that the various Ministers are more prepared to debate by way of Press releases and T.V. programmes whatever they intend doing than in this Hon. House, so that the elected representatives of the people have little or no opportunity of discussing these measures; but that is not the case this time. There is no question of any money going to relieve unemployment as such, going to build more houses, to generate employment or to increase and improve the spending power of the people.

All that it means, however the Government may try to gloss it over, however they try to camouflage it, we know and understand very well indeed that the Government is seeking to have something in addition to C.B.C. on which you must see at least two Ministers' faces each night. I really do not look or my stomach will get sick. (ASIDE: The hon. member for St. Andrew is not a Minister).

Mr. SPEAKER: I am still awaiting something on the Development Bank.

Mr. HINDS: What we are saying is, how strange it is that the Leader of the House who took charge of this has not given more information.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity yet to give more information.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am awaiting the hon. member's point.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker I cannot teach the Leader of the House how to run his Ministry; but if the Leader of the House is in possession the type of information which the Opposition has been seeking all along, all that he needed to do was to divulge the information completely and absolutely to the members of the Opposition; but this is not the case.

We have been told about tourism projects. If the Minister for tourism has taken to his heels for the greater part of the day, he has good reasons because we know what he is a very busy Minister and has a lot of trouble with C.B.C. and things like that. It is strange that if the Minister has in his possession the knowledge of some of these tourism projects to be embarked upon that this information has not been advanced in support of the guaranteeing of this \$5 million.

The Minister has allowed the debate to go on up to this present time on a matter of this sort.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must interrupt at this point. The moment of interruption has arrived. It is 9 p.m.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a non controversial matter on behalf of the hon. member for Christ Church West who has asked leave of Your Honour or the Clerk to have this question asked.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage we will do it as set out in the Standing Orders. Standing Order 6(4) says: "Any other business, if unopposed, shall then be disposed of, and the Order Paper for the next sitting fixed."

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I really assumed that this business was obviously opposed. It will call for more speech and a reply by the Minister. I perhaps prematurely assumed that Government Business had come to an end at this point, at the stage at which Government Business comes to an end.
9 p.m.

At the moment at which Government Business ends, I will ask for permission, if it is proper, to give notice of this question. Otherwise, of course, it will have to stand over.

Mr. SPEAKER: Leave is being asked to give notice of a question.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, as this matter is very important, I am going to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 19, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the Hon. Leader of the House, your function is not to support the Government with nonsense. The Leader of the House has, undoubtedly, been stripped of his wits at this point. What is he asking us to do at this hour and at this stage?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Standing Order 6, Rule 5, I say that I oppose that motion.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I oppose yours, too.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Normally, Mr. Speaker, I think a few minutes of grace should be allowed.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that the moment of interruption is nine o'clock.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Do you want to ask your question?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I have opposed that.

Mr. SPEAKER: If someone has opposed it, then there will be no further business.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 10th February, 1976, at twelve o'clock noon.

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

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OVER C.B.C.

Mr. ADAMS: Speaking very briefly on the adjournment, Sir, it has been reported to me that this evening C.B.C. news reported this sitting of the House almost exclusively in terms of disorder and Your Honour's suspension of it. Now, I have not heard it, therefore, I cannot say that it amounts to a breach of privilege or not, but I would ask the Leader of the House to have regard to this matter and examine the news report to see whether today's proceedings in the House of Assembly which, although they may have touched the borders of acrimony from time to time, were of a high standard, in my respectful opinion, and contained many contributions which are significant contributions to public debate in this Island on both sides of the House. Let him see whether it is a fair report of the House that an incident, which I had actually forgotten when I received the report, had occurred. I said that I had never had any clash with Mr. So-and-So. I actually denied having a clash that could give rise to a suspension, and it was only after it went on for a little bit that I realised what the person was talking about. If the House of Assembly was reported in those terms, then I do not think it was a fair report of the contributions made by hon. members on both sides of the House today. I would ask the Leader of the House to look into the matter.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I think he is quite in order, and I will have the matter investigated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope that it will be investigated and some action be taken on it, because if Reporters can come in here and cannot carry out truthful reports of the proceedings, they will be banned.

The Question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 10th February, 1976, at twelve o'clock noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
9.05 p.m.