

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1966 - 71

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 25th January, 1972.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B. (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, (Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister of Health and Welfare); Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS; (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Home Affairs); Mr. A. MORRISON, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A. (Econ.). (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport) and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

Prayers were read.

Mr. WEEKES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

An Account of the Transactions in Rum in the Several Districts of the Island for the Quarter ended 31st December 1971.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, I am commanded to lay the following:-

Annual Report of the Labour Department for the year 1969.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

Resolution to grant the sum of \$9,674 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 1 Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 25, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$116,215 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of Government to supplement the Estimates 1971-72, Part 1 Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1971-72 No. 26, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Mr. HINDS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

On behalf of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 7 asked by the hon. member for St. Peter is ready.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN and Hon. P. M. GREAVES and Mr. SPRINGER entered the Chamber and took their seats.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 5, 14, 16, 18, 19, 40 and 45 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting. This is subject of course to the reservation that any pressing matter under Private Members' Business will be dealt with at the appropriate time. There are only two items and one I understand is being withdrawn.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. FORDE entered the Chamber and took their seats.

2.40 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 24

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Item is a Resolution for \$280,844 which is an omnibus Resolution. In moving the passing of Head 2 - Service Commissions, Item 17 - Acting Allowances - Payment of Substitutes, I think I should give a little explanation in addition to what is already given. The amount of \$135,000 is now being requested to supplement this Head. It was originally estimated that the average expenditure per month in respect of Acting Allowances - Payment of substitutes would be in the region of \$43,000; however, during the past nine months of the current financial year the average expenditure has been at the rate of \$54,670 per month. The financial position of the vote at 31st December, 1971 was as follows:

Provision in 1971-72	\$520,000
Expenditure at	
31st December 1971	\$492,023
Leaving a balance of	\$ 27,977

The amount of \$135,000 will therefore be needed to supplement the vote based on an average monthly expenditure of \$54,000 as follows.

Estimated Expenditure 1st	
January to 31st, March, 1972	\$162,000
Less balance in vote at	
31st December, 1971	\$ 27,977
Leaving a balance of	\$134,023
Roughly	\$135,000

I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

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

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

Head 9 - Ministry of Finance (2) Valuation Division - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Under Item 14 - Temporary Staff, we are seeking a supplementary of \$29,000. The full explanation is that the sum of \$80,000 has been provided in the current Estimates to cover the salaries of temporary staff whose main duty is to maintain the current valuation list. Meanwhile a concerted effort is being made to have a new valuation list operative by April, 1972. It was considered necessary to recruit five temporary assistant valuers and labourers to supplement the work being done by the present staff with the objective of ensuring that the new list is completed by the prescribed date. Consequently a further sum of \$29,000 is required to meet the expenditure incurred in paying the salaries and wages of these officers as set out in the Schedule. The total number employed is 59 and the amount of salary is \$109,900; the amount provided in the Estimates is \$80,000 and the amount required now is \$29,000. I beg to move that Head 9 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, what we are finding is that under these various Heads the Minister is directing attention as he has in this case to a particular Item, this Item being the Valuation Division under which Item the sum of \$29,000 is required, and then he moves that the Head stand part, but there is the Data Processing Unit under the same Head for which he is asking \$13,365, and we would certainly like to hear what the Minister has to say on this Unit. I do suppose the Minister is going to get up and admit that the Government is now in a position to let us know that the money which was spent setting up the Data Processing

Unit with Computers was not spent on the best advice in that in so short a space of time they have discovered that it is too small to cater to the type of programmes that the various departments intend projecting. As if to surprise us still, while the present Unit might be said to be doing all that is expected of it under these circumstances, it is not further being fully employed for the use of the various Government Departments.

As proof of this it is within our knowledge on this side of the House that the Government is renting out the equipment, what they may prefer to call selling computer time, where you find that persons can move in with their staff and rent the computer for so many hours. Surely the Minister would have at his finger tips whether this is on a fixed rate basis or by the hour or else, and if this is the case, which we know to be the case, how many hours it has been rented out so far and how much money has been made from this. One has got to be very careful indeed, because a computer is a very specialised piece of equipment and we do not want for a single moment to find that the Government's equipment is put to undue strain or that anything goes wrong with it because the Government is trying to earn a few pennies by renting out such a thing as a computer.

2.50 p.m.

Now, in this Item the note says, "during the latter part of the financial year 1970-71, the increased demands for computerized services necessitated the recruitment of temporary staff over and above the number originally envisaged and provided for in the 1971-72 Estimates of Expenditure." We know that the computer requires specialist staff for its operation and they may be in the field of Programmers, Assistant Analysts and, you may say, Programme assistants. Undoubtedly, the Minister would be in a position to tell us if we have been able to draw on the training of those girls who have received training in the industry, let us say, at Grazettes Industrial Estates amongst other places. Has any attempt been made to draw on the experience those girls have gained in those places in order to keep our system going, or is it a case where the Government had to initiate its own training programme amongst civil servants and then had to seek replacements for those civil servants who were sent for training?

I think that when the Minister of Finance was introducing the Resolution for the purchasing of this computer, we were told that a 1401 was the type that would have been purchased and installed, and we think that is the one which is now functioning; but the cost has been so tremendous that we find there is a demand now, from what we can gather, for the 360 instead of the 1401. What then is the Minister going to tell us about all of

this? While we have it in the note here that there have been increased demands for computerized services, there is still evidence that the Data Processing Unit is being starved. It is not fed as it should be fed by the various Departments with the necessary information to keep it functioning, and that is why, I think, there have been initiated not so long ago seminars or lectures in order that Heads of Departments and senior personnel may become familiar with the functioning of the Unit and appreciate that when they are given a deadline for supplying a certain type of information they can see the reason for sticking to the deadline given to them.

Now, I think that Key Punch Operation is one of the activities associated with the computer and, so far as I can gather, our operations have not opened so wide a door or as wide a door to those trained in this particular field as had been envisaged in the earlier days. Undoubtedly, the Minister would be in a position to tell us what progress, if any, has been made in this particular respect.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I may not be able to give a report upon the Data Processing Unit, as, apparently, the hon. member would wish to hear today. He would like to get a full report on the working of the Data Processing Unit. Although I should have been briefed, to some extent to give a brief run-down on the Unit, at the appropriate time when the Estimates are being dealt with more information would be made available. This is merely a supplementary for the sum of \$13,365, and the file I have with me today deals specifically with the supplementary.

At the time of the preparation of the 1971-72 Estimates of expenditure for the Data Processing Unit, it was considered that the sum of \$15,000 would have been adequate to pay the salaries of temporary staff; however, during the latter part of the financial year 1970-71, the increased demand for computerized services necessitated the recruitment of temporary staff over and above the number originally envisaged. The following Schedule shows the temporary staff structure to date:

Date of post created	Date of officer employed	Category	Salary payable 1971-72
November 1970	May 1971	System Analyst	\$650 per month. His salary is based at \$7,150.

Date of post created	Date of officer employed	Category	Salary payable 1971-72
November 1970	November 1970	Programme Assistant	\$380 per month. He works for \$4,560 per annum.
November 1970	November 1970	Programme Assistant	\$360 per month. His salary is \$4,320.
March 1971	March 1971	Control Officer	\$360 per month. His salary is \$4,320.
September 1971	September 1971	Systems Analyst	\$625 per month. His salary is \$4,375.
September 1971	September 1971	Programmer	\$520 per month. His salary is \$3,640 p.a.

making a total of \$28,465. Having regard, therefore, to the revised figure of \$28,465, which is required to pay the salaries of temporary staff, it is necessary to seek approval for the supplementary provision of \$13,365 which represents the difference between \$28,365 and the original vote of \$15,000.

That is all the information I have, Sir, as far as this Supplementary is concerned. I suggest that the hon. member is perfectly within his rights to get a full report of the working of the data processing unit, but I am not in a position this afternoon unfortunately to give him a fuller report on how the data processing unit operates. I will however see that that he does get a report, and probably a question could give him a full report on the working of the unit.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister will try his best to give us what information has been asked for, but in view of the fact that this supplementary is for paying temporary staff, one of the things that would create the necessity for employing temporary staff is one of the problems that is brought to light here, and that is that we are selling computer time, renting out the equipment, because when the equipment is rented out, surely some of the Government staff would have to be present when it is being used by other people, and that may be a case where you might have to employ temporary staff to act in a sort of supervisory capacity, and that is why I am asking if some of this money is to pay that type of temporary staff; and if it is so, the Minister should

know something about the renting out of the equipment.

The question that Head 9 - Ministry of Finance - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 20 - Civil Aviation - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head, I had better give all the information I have on it.

The sum of \$441,300 provided in the current year's Estimates under Item 28 - Maintenance of Wireless Equipment - is inadequate to meet the additional expenses resulting from the installation of a teleprinter and three radar control frequencies at Seawell Airport. It has been calculated that the additional funds needed totalling \$4,935 is as follows:- Rental of teleprinter June to March \$1,750, supply of paper \$35, maintenance of radar control frequencies July to March \$3,150. Supplementary provision in the sum of \$4,935 is therefore being sought.

Under Item 30 - Travelling - of the \$15,100 provided under this item in the current year's Estimates, the sum of \$11,201.15 has already been spent as at 30th November, 1971 leaving a balance of \$3,898.85 with which to meet anticipated commitments totalling \$7,709. The commitments under this item are as follows: (a) transportation of Government employees, December 1971 to February 1972, \$2,820; (b) fee payable for additional transportation of staff since the opening of the Radar Station at Charnocks, \$3,894; (c) travelling allowances \$720; (d) travelling outside normal working hours as for A.T.C. staff on call \$275, making a total of \$7,709. The explanations are these. (1) The transportation of (a) is in respect of transportation of Seawell employees between Bridgetown/Seawell and St. Martins. This transportation is done by contract. (2) Additional transportation at (b) arises from the establishment of the Radar Station at Charnocks and the need for the transport to make extra journeys to and from the Radar Station. There are eight journeys to and from the Station and the contractor is seeking payment for the extra journey from Seawell to Charnocks at the rate of \$1.00 per journey. The cost per day is therefore \$8.00 additional to the contract price. These journeys have been made since November, 1970. (3) The requirements of (c) and (d) are normal commitments, and the cost covers requirements to the end of 1972. Supplementary provision in the sum of \$3,810 is therefore being sought in order to meet the actual and anticipated expenses under this Item. That is all the information I have and I hope it is satisfactory.

I beg to move that Head 20 - Civil Aviation - stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has told us that transportation of staff is by contract. I wonder if the Minister can tell us now if the maintenance of the equipment is also by contract. If the Minister is in a position to answer that point, it may help us on in the debate. Mr. Chairman, what we have got to look at is this: the note which is given is as amusing as one could ever expect to find; it suits a circus rather than a House of Assembly. For instance, note 6, paragraph 2 reads: "Calculations show that an additional provision of \$4,935 is needed to pay for the rental of supply of paper for a Teleprinter as well as to meet the cost of maintenance of Radar Control frequencies." I am very serious when I ask the Minister to explain what the maintenance of radar control frequencies could mean in any part of the world. My information is that just as you go to your radio and turn to wave band 31, 29 or else, it is just the same thing, and nobody has to pay for this. So what maintenance costs are we asked to provide for this?
3.10 p.m.

The Minister gave us some figures to bear out the cost of this, but we are saying here and now that way back in 1969 there was a contractual agreement for something like \$100,000 per annum for maintenance of this equipment. That was 1969 and the Minister can hardly come before us today without some pertinent information on a matter like this. Why have we got to bear such high maintenance costs? The equipment was the wrong type of equipment installed at the beginning, and I think I am right in saying that it is of American manufacture but have become surplus stock to the Canadians and this piece of equipment was manufactured to provide information required by the military and definitely not suitable for Civil aviation purposes, because it will be explained to the Minister by anybody who is familiar with it that the military would require much more information on their equipment by way of readings than what the Civil Aeronautics Board would expect.

You will find, Sir, that when this equipment came to Barbados it was the mobile type of equipment but it was partially dismantled and permanently affixed; I believe the Minister himself would not be in a position to tell us if the

equipment itself is what is regarded in aeronautical circles as approved type of equipment, because it would have to have the stamp of approval of what is known as the International Conference of Airport Organisations. (*Asides*). That would provide some laughter for some Ministers on the other side, but there are members of staff who are more familiar with the mal-functioning of the equipment and that is the reason why we are faced with this high maintenance cost. What must interest us in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, is who benefits from this type of expenditure. I do not want to suggest for a single moment who would, but what I am saying is this, that having military radar equipment at a civil airport is not taken so very kindly anywhere in Europe and beyond, and not here in Barbados.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that one of our problems has been merely coming here to this House asking for money for the servicing of this equipment and it has been voted. (*Asides*). Mr. Chairman, when I sit and I begin to heckle other hon. members I wonder if you will call on me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to proceed with his address.

Mr. HINDS: I cannot proceed when I am being interrupted, and I can only draw it to your attention when I am being interrupted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will deal with it under the appropriate Standing Order.

Mr. HINDS: What we want to see is that there is a training scheme instituted whereby local personnel can benefit from the money that will be spent in the servicing of this or any other equipment that might be installed at the airport. We are satisfied that the type of equipment presently in use is none of the latest or the most current type capable of coping with the problems of jet aircraft. We have been asked to vote a supplementary for the servicing of equipment, but how old is the equipment, we might ask, Mr. Chairman.
3.20 p.m.

Who maintains it? Is it maintained by any of the reputable firms in the City of Bridgetown? In other words, what guarantee have we that, after we have voted this money, we will be getting the best services in return for what we are spending? We believe, Sir, that we will soon be faced with a request or a Resolution to vote a very substantial sum of money for providing replacements, because quite a number of the component parts of the equipment are obsolete. If the Minister does not have the information, he can easily get it. When we are being asked to vote to service equipment that does not have a life-span to warrant or to merit the

expenditure we are asked to incur, then we should have as much information as possible. I would urge that this matter be looked into very carefully, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge the Minister to seek all the information that he can find on a matter such as this and bring it before the House when he is asking us to vote money on something like this.

The question that Head 20 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 34 MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS

Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move the passing of Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works. I do not know whether the appropriate Minister wants to deal with it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You can carry on.

Hon. C. C. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, an amount of \$421,500 had been provided in the current year's Approved Estimates to meet the cost of National Insurance stamps in respect of the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Waterworks Department, and the Electrical Inspection Department. The total expenditure under this item as at 30th November, 1971, was \$333,796 leaving an uncommitted balance of \$87,704. The estimates for this item of expenditure were prepared on the basis of the quarterly allocations which were appropriated by the Ministry of Finance and were computed at the old stamp values. This was the first time that Ministries and Departments estimated for this type of expenditure, and it was not possible to arrive at precise figures. Added to this was the fact that the Employment Injury Scheme was introduced by Government with effect from 4th January, 1971, and as a result the employers' contribution to the Scheme was increased by an element to finance this Scheme. I have a list with the old and new rates with the increases in detail, but I do not think that the hon. members will want to hear that.

The present rate of expenditure is as follows:-

- (a) Ministry of Communications and Works \$7,500 per week or \$390,000 per annum.
- (b) Waterworks Department \$10,000 per month or \$120,000 per annum.
- (c) Electrical Inspection Department \$300 per month or \$3,600 per annum.

The estimated expenditure of \$513,600. It is, therefore estimated that the sum of \$92,100 should be provided.

I beg to move that Head 34 - Ministry of Communications and Works stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Resolution for the sum of \$280,844 do now pass.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, there is another Resolution, but I am not quite sure whether it has been circulated. Notice was only given today, and I have to ask for leave of the Speaker to deal with it.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one 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 and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

3.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there is another Resolution which was given notice of today and was circulated, and I am asking leave to deal with it in all its stages as it is a very urgent matter, and I think we would like to have it dealt with today. If there is no objection, it is a Resolution for the sum of \$9,674 to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and it affects Head 3 Parliament, Item 20 - Office Expenses and Item 24 - Payment of Substitutes.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is a procedure that I understand which applies to dealing with Officers of the House and the amenities of the House. Certainly as far as the

Payment of Substitutes is concerned I know that since the Reporters and Typists are employed by the Debates Committee of Parliament, it would be normal for the Debates Committee to be informed if substitutes are required, who the substitutes are and what salaries are involved. Speaking as a member of the Debates Committee, this Item comes to me as a complete surprise, and I cannot therefore in the circumstances agree that it can be dealt with on a Resolution which has not been circulated to me - that may be only due to my absence - casually brought into the House like this.

Speaking as Leader of the Opposition, I may say it is an even greater surprise for me to see a Resolution asking for a vote relating to me to be supplemented about which I know nothing whatsoever. I know that the office provided for the Leader of the Opposition requires chairs and such things. I know I did have to put a desk in it myself and I can see I will have to put in chairs and I am going to put in book-cases. I know I am doing that myself personally, but certainly I know nothing and I can see nothing inside that office which appears to me to be a sudden and late item. Some three years ago when the office of the Leader of the Opposition was being discussed, I remember a large desk, a filing cabinet, a refrigerator a table and eight chairs being among the items which I heard spoken of. That office now has a large desk much used, for it was used for the purpose of electoral registration, I think it has eight chairs which appear to have been made at Glendairy Prison along with a table and it has a refrigerator. It has not got a filing cabinet, and it also has, I think, a second hand Royal typewriter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is necessary to go into all these details if you have objections to the Resolution being dealt with.

Mr. ADAMS: What I am saying is that I cannot see how you can supplement a vote for the Leader of the Opposition without telling him and asking him to vote for it without notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have made your point.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not see the stationery, incidentals, maintenance of office equipment and other office requirements in respect of the House of Assembly and the office of the Leader of the Opposition. All these matters that come under the Debates Committee. You are a member Sir, and we have to defend the general interest of the two Houses of Parliament. Upon you and I and the other members of the Debates Committee who are present in the House devolves the interest of the Senators who are members of the Debates Committee and who perhaps might object to some of these things and have something to say or

contribute in a discussion about them. The Rules of the House of Assembly are made to be kept, not to be broken and we on this side cannot agree to its being dealt with in all its stages now.

Mr. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it is very surprising to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition speak in that tone because if we had not come to see that his office is fully and properly equipped as other Government offices are, then there would be cause for some sort of debate. The Cabinet Secretary and the Cabinet are aware that the office of the Leader of the Opposition is not properly equipped. We have come down with a Resolution to see that it is properly equipped and in accordance with his status and put in order, but the Leader of the Opposition objects on the grounds which are very flimsy and not entirely accurate where the Debates Committee is concerned. The Debates Committee does not consider equipping the office of the Leader of the Opposition, so if that is how he wants it, it is all right with me. I would have thought that he might at least have shown some sort of courtesy and be somewhat satisfied that we are.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I have just been informed by the Clerk of the House that the payment of substitutes is for a particular Officer who is neither a Chaplain, a Reporter nor a typist; so the Addendum has in fact misled hon. members on this side. We saw Chaplains, Reporters and Typists and obviously we felt the Debates Committee had something to do with that. I am told it is for a Clerk of the House, and that being so, and since a Resolution to appoint him as Deputy Clerk has already been passed, we will not oppose that being dealt with. This is a question of our not knowing what it was about. As far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, I have not asked for more furniture, and I do not see how you can supplement it without notice and without asking me, quite honestly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I would like to know if there has been no intimation to the Leader of the Opposition by the Cabinet Secretary or anybody else in connection with this equipment for his office. It is hardly possible to deal with something unless there was a request.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is getting on as if he was always Leader of the Opposition. He only became Leader of the Opposition since October this year. Furthermore whatever the Leader of the

Opposition suggests it is for the Government to decide what the Leader of the Opposition will have; so that the Resolution has got to come from the Cabinet and the present request is what the Clerk of Parliament has made to the Government. The Government has gone out of its way to give him an office which the Opposition never had when they were in Opposition. The Clerk of Parliament has recommended this amount to provide furniture for him. It is not the Government trying to push something down his throat as he wants to say, and as far as we are concerned, if he does not want the money, he need not have it because it is costing the Government anything like \$16,000 to \$17,000 a year which the taxpayers can do without.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Leader of the House consider postponing dealing with this Resolution?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on the motion, but the Leader of the Opposition must bear in mind that office equipment for the Leader of the Opposition in these circumstances is not an individual matter. It is nothing for the Leader of the Opposition as the hon. member for St. Thomas. They are not giving him desks, chairs or equipment. What Government is doing is furnishing what can be regarded as another Government office.

3.40 p.m.

It is a Government Office you are furnishing, and it is one of the Government offices that you have assigned to the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition as such was not established, you would have to furnish this office before you establish the person, you cannot put a person to sit on the floor until you bring in furniture and if the Clerk has recommended that you should have a desk you must take it for granted that the Clerk at some time must have been Leader of the Opposition. I do not see therefore why the Leader of the Opposition should act as if he was insulted, whether the chairs are made at Glendairy Prison or not or it is tired looking furniture. It is admitted that all Government furniture is tired.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I inform hon. members that I do not see how we can take out one Item from the Resolution and discuss it. Do I take it now that it is quite in order for me to grant leave to discuss this Resolution? I think it is up to the Leader of the House to postpone it till later in the day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As the Leader of the Opposition has clearly explained, Mr. Speaker, he

would like to have some time to investigate this Resolution, although it affects his office and it is being done merely to improve the facilities there, and I will not press that that Item be dealt with. It may well be that later in the day we can discuss it. I beg to move that Item No. 2 which stands in the name of the Prime Minister be dealt with, and I am asking leave to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking for leave to deal with this Resolution and if there is no objection leave will be granted. That leave is granted.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME
OFFICERS) (AMENDMENT)
ORDER, 1972.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, for some time the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Commissioner of police have been complaining about the Police not getting the victims of rape medically examined and have stated that such delays cause them embarrassment in the law courts. A Committee comprising officials from various Ministries and Departments went into this matter and the Ministry of Home Affairs disclosed that the Police Medical Officer, District A claimed that due to increases in the establishment of the Police Force and the Fire Service the work load had increased considerably and was in excess of what he could reasonably be required to undertake. It was further pointed out by one of the Officials that out of an establishment of 850 policemen 650 were stationed in the Bridgetown Division which is the responsibility of the Police Medical Officer, District A, and it was agreed that assistance should be given by creating a temporary post of Assistant Police Medical Officer. Subsequently it was decided that instead of appointing a part-time Medical Officer that that post be created exclusively for the Fire Service.

At present there are 180 Firemen to be serviced as compared with the work load of the Prisons Medical Officer who attends to 65 staff and about 165 prisoners. It will be noticed further that the number of Firemen required from time to time exceed the number of Policemen attending the Police Medical Officer and it is felt that the post should be upgraded to \$1,200 per annum. This Officer's duties would include (a) to examine and prescribe for members of the Fire Service who are ill, (b) to visit any such member at his station or at his home should he be too ill or unable to report to the Medical Officer's office; a charge may be made for such visits, (c) to examine any member of the Fire Service sent to him by the Chief Fire Officer for examination to ensure whether such member is physically fit to serve in the Fire Service, and this

examination usually takes place every year, (d) to examine all applicants for the Fire Service sent to him by the Chief Fire Officer for examination. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: We on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, are well aware of the difficulties which the Police meet with in connection with these matters, the investigation of rape and medical examination of alleged victims of rape. It has always been a source of some surprise to me that a police Medical Officer whose duties as I understand it were the treatment of sick Policemen and members of the Fire Service and always have to be on call at all hours of the day and night to examine girls who are allegedly victims of rape, when the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with laboratories and Casualty Officers constantly on duty or should be constantly on duty is also available. The present District A, and indeed all the District Medical Officers, I know made no objections initially, apparently this has always been the practice, and the Forensic examination as well as some medical examinations are a part of their duties.
3.50 p.m.

We can certainly say that, with the increase in the Police Force as well as the increase in the amount of rape as well as the decrease in the amount of experience available among Casualty Doctors or the Doctors whom one finds on duty at the Hospital at such hours as young ladies are customarily in these unfortunate positions it has made the call upon the District A Medical Officer's services much greater. I myself have always been surprised that the Government can find out-District Medical Officers at \$100 a month to deal with these matters and accept these calls at a salary, I believe, of approximately \$400 a month! I should be glad if the Minister could tell me.....

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is irrelevant to the matter before the House. In fact, the matter before the House is to provide some money for the Medical Officer for the Fire Service; it has nothing to do with the Police at all; it is merely for the Firemen themselves. It is to provide for persons whom the Police may have to bring to a Police Station. The member is out of order.

Mr. ADAMS: I will just say this; If nobody listens to the Leader of the House on that side, I listen to him. He opened his arguments by

saying that you needed a Fire Service Doctor because the Police Doctor, who at present treats the Fire Service, has additional duties in respect of the examination of rape victims. I heard that. Why could not hear hear it; He gets up on a point of order making himself.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please carry on.

Mr. ADAMS: The Leader of the House said that, because of rape victims, the Fire Service needs a Medical Officer. He says you are not talking about the Fire Service at all but of the Police; but the Fire Service's Doctor is the same as the Police Doctor. (*Asides.*) The member for St. Michael South Central is saying it does not mean that you can talk about rape. Why did he not get up and say so when the Leader of the House started out by saying it?

Mr. SPEAKER: It has marginal relevance.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, it has total relevance. I stood behind your Chair and heard the Leader of the House discussing the examination of rape victims. I asked myself: What has that got to do with this? Then in a logical, well-reasoned and cogent speech he explained that the present person who looks after the Fire Service has too much work to do because of this. It seems that two other Ministers who sat in Cabinet when this matter was discussed could neither hear what was said in Cabinet nor what was said in here. I am disappointed in the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Until recently I was saying what a sensible man he appeared to be in the House of Assembly. He was sensible only in silence. The minute he gets up.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member proceed! I have made a ruling.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we agree that obviously, it is too much work on Dr. Cato to have to look after more Policemen, the Fire Service and the rape victims as well. I am surprised that he continues to work for less than \$400 a month doing all of that work. That is my opinion on the matter. I am surprised that you get a Doctor, to work, even as a Part-time Officer, for a \$100 a month looking after the Fire Service. Firemen can be seriously injured. What is going to happen when there is another big fire in Bridgetown, you have Firemen with a large number of burns, you call on the Doctor, and he will, presumably, have to

organise all of that? I am surprised that the Government expects to put this responsibility on a Medical Officer for this amount of money. We are not here to encourage squandermania, but, professional people must be properly rewarded for their services, in our view.

I know that the present Police Medical Officers are expected at three o'clock in the morning if a Fireman is burnt, a Policeman is stabbed by somebody, or a girl is raped, to get out of their beds and give assistance. I am surprised that the work can be done for this amount of money. The Government is getting medical assistance on the cheap, and is only, in my view, the quality of the present Medical Officer in and out of district A which has enabled it to be proper medical attention and not cheap medical attention as well. It is cheap only in the financial sense and not in the professional sense. This is our view on the matter on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. (Asides.) I can do without applause of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this matter is a very simple one. I, honestly, do not know why the Leader of the Opposition should want to blow his top over something which is a very simple matter, because it is a matter which is simple to every member of this House. The position is that the conditions of service of Policemen, the conditions of service of Firemen and the conditions of service of Prison Officers are identical and, in fact, whenever one association happens to be able to get for itself an additional facility, then that facility is also granted to the two other Departments. If the Police Department gets a facility, that facility will also be granted to the Fire Service or the Prison Officers as the case may be.

In this case, Mr. Speaker, the Police Department has a Doctor to attend ill Policemen. In 1965 there was a Commission of Enquiry headed by Mr. Date of Grenada, and the Commission recommended that this service should be maintained. The intention is to extend this service not only to Policemen, but to Prison Officers as well as to members of the Fire Service. This Establishment Order is, in fact, to provide such a service. It is a very simple matter, and it has nothing to do with rape cases. That part of it is absolutely irrelevant.

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

RESOLUTION FIXING THE REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES PAYABLE TO JURORS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with Item 3 of the Order Paper in the absence of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections to the Hon. Leader of the House taking charge of Item No.3, leave will be granted. Leave is granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution deals with the remuneration of jurors. Under Section 23(1) of the Juries Act, 1970 (1970-23) which came into operation on the 29th June, 1970, reads as follows:

"Subject to the provisions of this section every juror summoned and attending at any Court in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be entitled to such remunerations and allowances as may be fixed by resolution of Parliament."

Now, the Judicial Advisory Council recommended that a flat payment of \$6 a day be fixed as remuneration for jurors for each day of service and that no further allowance be fixed, but the Cabinet felt that, owing to the fact that artisans are paid more than \$6, the amount should be increased to \$10 per day instead of \$6. That is all this Resolution seeks to do. It is a means of paying the jurors for attendance at any Court at the rate of \$10 per day for each day of attendance instead of \$6 which was recommended by the Judicial Advisory Council.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, it falls upon me once again to advocate the expenditure of the taxpayers' money on a slightly more lavish scale than the Government is at present prepared to anticipate. 4. p.m.

It is the view of the Opposition that in this day and age to ask people to come out to serve on a jury and perhaps leave their business for do not forget this does not apply to salaried persons and Civil Servants, it applies to people who carry on businesses in the country, people who have a shop, and it applies to taxi drivers who in January are looking to hustle their trade - and have to go by law and be available at 9 o'clock in the morning perhaps until 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock at night, for jurors are quite often kept into the night as you know, all for \$10 is not fair. There is no ground of objection that you that day have a job which may bring in \$50 or \$60 as a taxi driver, and the taxi driver cannot tell the judge to excuse him because he would lose his job or would have to get somebody else to do it; the shopkeeper cannot tell the judge that his wife just had a baby and she

cannot look after the shop while he is away, things I have known happened in the case of jurors, and it is our view that \$10 a day in itself is not sufficient for payment of a juror.

The Judicial Advisory Council has altogether too modest a view of present-day costs, prices and values. They expect lawyers to appear in the Appeal Courts still for \$25 for important cases. I will anticipate any objections on the grounds of irrelevancy by not pursuing that further, and they may well think that jurors can get by for only \$6 a day. The Government I suppose say that if they ask for \$6 and we know the people deserve more, give them \$10 and they have done some sort of favour. I would regard \$15 a day as the minimum with which jurors should be remunerated, and that cannot remunerate self-employed persons who are unfortunate enough at times of good business to be called for jury service. Jury service may be very pleasant and the fee, whatever it is, a nice bonus for all the charming young ladies who work in the banks and who work in Broad Street whom we see upon juries now, and in a very welcome addition I may say they are; but there is also a different sort of juror for whom jury service must be something very nigh to purgatory. Immediately he sees a jury summons he must say to himself "well, this is money out of my pocket at a time when I need it."

The Opposition, far from opposing any increase in the remuneration of juries, would like to see it placed at an even higher level, and we would just like to add this, Mr. Speaker: at the present time there have been many promises about improved accommodation for juries and proper rest room facilities for lady jurors and so on. I see the lady jurors having to make do with the Civil Office in District "A". (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Peeping Tom!) (Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER: Will hon. members who are not addressing the Chair kindly observe the Standing Orders?

Mr. ADAMS: The prospect of observing where the lady jurors have their rest room has so excited the former Attorney General that he has to have a giggle about it. I do not think he will receive any encouragement from either of the hon. members on his left or right. If he wishes to return to the Bar, I will take him where he can see the lady jurors if he so desires. We have not seen these facilities which were promised when we were told that the Juries Act was going to be brought into force. Proper accommodation is still needed for juries, and the fact that juries are now mixed in sex

I do not think it is sufficiently recognised in the facilities which are given to them. We have a great benefit anyway where the common law is applied in so far as you can get people to appear as jurors and take their part in the administration of justice. Because it has always been with us, we tend to take it for granted, but to these people who are prepared to go and sit down, ladies who will go and sit down and listen to very unpleasant evidence indeed, persons with no interest in figures who have to sit down for three or four days or longer and listen to complicated alleged Treasury frauds being exposed, society owes a great debt. They are prepared to sit down and listen to things they never thought they would have to comprehend or ask to pass judgement upon, and that is exactly what we are asking them to do, and I do not think that \$10 is by any means enough in the Barbados of 1972 to be paying jurors who have to work for eight and nine hours a day. It is working to sit down and listen, and if you sneeze or go to sleep, the judge quarrels with you. If you go to sleep in here nothing happens; but if you sit down in a jury box and go to sleep, if you are five minutes late, if you do not go a morning, all of those matters you may be fined for. Sometimes I say that jurors are treated as rigidly as prisoners in many respects and \$10 a day is no reward for that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition when he deals with the question of accommodation for lady jurors. I think one of the things which delayed the implementation of the Juries Act was the knowledge that the facilities were not as ideal as they ought to be and the Government certainly has plans for the improvement of the Law Courts and the accommodation for jurors. It is a must and it is absolutely necessary, but we could not delay the implementation of the Juries Act to permit women to play their part in the administration of justice any longer.

I think the Leader of the Opposition knows as well as I do that the money which jurors are paid is not an attempt to pay them for their day's work. To serve on a jury and be part of the administration of justice is the function of every civic-minded and honest person, and no person should try to shirk that duty because a society can be no healthier than the fellow citizens want it to be. If a jury gets off guilty people non-stop, then they can expect crime. If they discern and listen to the evidence and punish the guilty and acquit the innocent, then the society in due course will reach a certain moral standard. So that the mere fact that in a trial with jurors the juries as judges of the facts are the most important members of the tribunal,

because it is on their verdict that the innocence or the guilt of the accused is established, it is an honourable part in the administration of justice, and all who are called upon to do it should do it willingly, and I know judges very often refuse to excuse people for flimsy excuses. A lot of people like to shirk it, but it is a duty that every citizen should willingly undertake because it is a duty which affects the whole community.

Let us put it in perspective. If we say give \$10, the Opposition can say give \$15. If the Government say give \$15, the Opposition say give \$20. It is a good political gimmick. Here is a Government with a Judicial Advisory Committee, and the public should know this, constituted of the Chief Justice who presides over all the Courts, with judges, with members of the same profession as the Leader of the Opposition, barristers, with solicitors on it, with members from the Attorney General's Department, and they could sit down, assess the worth of juries and their contribution to the administration of justice, and they recommend to Government \$6 as a reasonable fee without allowances, but the Government conscious of the additional inconvenience, have made it \$10. This is not to pay a director of a company who may lose a day's pay; this could not pay people in the community who are getting a certain amount per day; it cannot pay a top-notch person in town who is getting \$600 a month, because if you divide \$600 by 30, he would have to get \$20 a day. This is no attempt by Government to pay them for a day's work, but this would benefit, as it will undoubtedly, the members in the lower structure of the working ladder who work for a certain amount, so it no attempt by Government to equate a day's salary or loss of salary.

4.10 p.m.

It cannot be the Director, it cannot be the Lawyers, it is no attempt by Government to equate a day's salary or loss of salary, in addition to this the Leader of the Opposition knows that if a worker in town, whether a bank Clerk or not, is called for jury service she gets her day's pay as well, and if the Trade Union leader would allow a firm in town to deduct a day's pay from a worker of his Union who is doing service on the jury the Union does not deserve its name. I know people who still draw their month's salary when they have to sit on juries, and any employer who has a conscience and is aware of the importance of jury service and the responsibility it takes and who would deduct a day's pay or three or four day's depending upon how the person is called upon to sit is stealing from his employee. The amount of \$15.00 was mentioned but I think this is a political figure; this is not an attempt by this Government to reward the jurors with any day's pay, this is an

honest attempt above what the Judiciary, the lawyers and the solicitors recommended and a more even figure to enable people not to be out-of-pocket because this \$10.00 for a lot of the people with the qualifications of jurors is not a day's wage.

If a carpenter or a mason is on his own I suppose he can call it a day's wage, but if he is working and is called he has to obey the summons of the Court, and as the Leader of the Opposition says he can be fined or he can be imprisoned for contempt of court, but this is an attempt to save him from being out-of-pocket.

I know that it may not be enough but very few people who sit in Coleridge Street lose money but they are glad for the opportunity to see how the Courts operate and they realise that they are playing an important part in their community in a vital aspect of law and order in the community, and I submit that the Government's figure of \$10.00 is a reasonable one for out-of-pocket expenses and is not a substitute for wages. It is \$4.00 more than the Judges who sit down and judge cases with the same jurors and the Lawyers who appear in the Courts and represent the profession of a Committee recommended. I am not saying that all lawyers are on this Committee, but the lawyers have a representative on the Judiciary Representation Committee, the Solicitors have theirs, the Attorney General has his there too, so it is the entire legal profession which recommended the \$6.00 per day and the Cabinet feels it is too low and has raised it to \$10.00. Ninety percent of the jurors who go into Coleridge Street are still drawing their day's pay from any reputable firm in Bridgetown, the only person who would lose a day's pay is a carpenter or mason on his own, but if he is working for a firm and belongs to the Union he must get his day's pay. If I were a Trade Union Leader and a worker of my Union was called to attend the Court to serve as a juror with a penalty of being imprisoned if he failed to attend his employer would have to pay him his day's pay. I submit that the Resolution deserves support from everyone in here; \$10.00 is a reasonable figure to pay jurors for the noble and worthwhile service they are rendering to the community.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE LEASE OF LAND AT SEAWELL AIRPORT TO THE FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to increase the facilities offered at Seawell International Airport Government is renting the

First National City Bank an area of land of about 1,100 square feet. The area is within the terminal building of the Airport and the rental to be charged for this is at the rate of \$1,650 per annum. The lease in the first instance is for a period of five years terminating on March 31st, March, 1974, because in fact the First National City Bank has been operating at the Airport now for about a year or two and on the 31st March, 1974 the Bank will have completed its first five year term. This lease is renewable on terms to be negotiated at the expiration of the first five year term for another five years. The rate is as I said before \$1,650 per annum which works out in fact to somewhere around \$3.00 per square foot when consideration is taken of the fact that half of this 1,100 square feet of area is taken up by the Tourist Board which pays no rent either to the Bank or to Government. I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I do not have any serious objection to the lease of this portion of land of the First National City Bank because the Government is going to get a little rent for the portion of land, but what I would have serious objection to is that the Banks, especially these foreign to is that the Banks, especially these foreign American Banks, are operating in Barbados under the guise as if they are operating in their own territory and denying the fundamental rights to the people of this country. I want to make it very clear, and as this matter is being introduced by the Minister of Labour, I cannot see how the Government is going to continue to lease public lands to foreign people and not pass the appropriate legislation to let these foreign investors understand that if they are going to operate in Barbados they have to operate under the national laws akin to what the Government itself is doing.

The people who are working in the Government Savings Bank can join a Trade Union of their choice without the Ministers playing any tactics to force them out of the Union, but we find that the Banks can operate in such a way that they can hinder their employees from joining a Union. I can say this because I do not owe any Bank any money and therefore no Bank can foreclose on me for anything, but even if I did owe them any money I would regard that as a ~~purely~~ business venture. If we are going to grant facilities such as these we have to make these Banks understand that they have to comply with the normal human conditions and if the workers there decide to join a Trade Union they should have the right to do so without any hindrance whatsoever.

4.20 p.m.

A word to the wise is enough, and I feel that I do not have to say any more on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I very much welcome what has been said by the hon. member who has just sat down. We have known for a long time that the hon. member for St. Michael West was a good deal closer to our Party on matters of banking policy than he is to his own. When we speak in the House of Assembly the representatives of the Press and C.B.C. do not always accord our words the same attention as they do the members on the other side. I am glad the hon. member for St. Michael West has spoken about banks and some of the potentialities for ill doing which the great influx of foreign banks have brought to this country, because his words will be given their full weight by the Advocate newspaper. That is one thing you can be sure of. If there is one person who will get publicity in the Advocate newspaper, it is the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union. It is, after all, a well-organised union shop, so we have every confidence in that.

I want to thank the hon. member for mentioning the great differential. He mentioned it only in respect of working conditions between those who work underneath us here in the Government Savings Bank and those who work in the Commercial Banks. In a debate a few weeks ago, I remember the hon. member - if I misquote him I think he will stop me - spoke on the general lines of making the Government Savings Bank a Commercial Bank. This has been our Party's policy as expressed in a Manifesto, unless I am mistaken. The banks have to understand that not only along the lines of labour, if we are going to continue to lease them properties at Seawell Airport, but along the lines of labour conditions for their staff. They have to understand that they have to conform to the commercial requirements and the economic conditions of the country within which they operate.

The First National City Bank is one of the many banks, the United States and others, that have come to Barbados recently. You see advertisements in the International Commercial Press to the effect that Barbados is the only place with the World's biggest banks: the Bank of America, Barclays, and the First National City Bank - the three biggest. It is the only place in the West Indies with all of them. I do not know if this is still the case, but an advertisement came out recently in that connection. I maintain that over the past few years the influence of the banks in Barbados has almost exclusively been pointing in a direction against the best economic interest of the people of Barbados. The American Banks led by this one have come in; they have forced up the rate of interest that the established English and

Canadian Banks have to pay; they forced up the rate of interest in Barbados by paying large sums of money on deposit accounts and at the same time are unwilling to pay 10% or more for mortgages and, indeed, the Government guidelines did not permit such amounts to be paid. Therefore, to make a profit, the banks had to charge rates of interest of above 10% and they found that the most convenient way of doing this was to finance the sale of appliances and motorcars. They could have been financing mortgages in Barbados for Barbadian workers, members of the Barbados Workers' Union and otherwise to get a job building houses for people, but for some years it has been extremely difficult to get mortgage financed from the banks to give Barbadian masons and carpenters a little work doing some house building. Instead, motorcars are easier and easier to buy; so there has been a 50% increase in motorcars between three and four years in Barbados with no corresponding increase in the roads to accomodate them. Motor cars are far easier to buy, and the money is going into the pockets of the workers in Coventry, in Detroit, and more recently in Tokyo.

When we, on our platforms try to explain to the people that the banks are responsible for many of the modern economic ills in Barbados, it was impossible for some people to understand because it is an intricate subject to get over. If we have the Barbados Workers' Union on our side, Sir, those of us who have a little good will and commonsense in this matter of banking policy will prevail in the long run. I think that the recent permission to raise the mortgage rate of interest was a bad step. I believe the banks should have been forced, and it is possible to force them to do certain things. You can use force and you can use competition. It was possible to force them by competition, if you did not want to use legislation. They could have been forced to lend out mortgage money. I do not believe that a correct step had been taken when the rate of interest is falling everywhere in the world for the Minister of Finance to tell the banks that they can charge 9% or more on mortgages.

The First National City Bank is one of the worst. I do not believe I have declare an interest in it. I do not have any account in F.N.C.B. in Broad Street, so I can safely talk. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I will take this opportunity to remind the hon. member that he straying a little from the matter before the House.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not going to be long, Sir. I do not want to say unpleasant things at any personal level, but I have to say something that is personal. (*Asides.*) I am told that it is the only one that has all Barbadians in it. That is a fact, but

the fact is that the colour of the Barbadians concerned in it was important before they could rise to their positions. Where else in the world does a boy who leaves school without a high School Certificate, a boy who leaves school in the Third Form, merely by reason of his colour becomes a Bank Manager? I accuse this Bank of that. That is something the Barbados Workers' Union should consider, too.

Barclays Bank promotes people and has always promoted people. You can look and see the colour of their managers, but Barclays Bank asks them for School Certificates: the people are asked for G.C.E. Certificates and so on. It is not so even in this particular bank. It is a personal matter, but I would say that it is something which is observable to the public and, unfortunately, even in this day and age, is accepted. When I was at school it was well known that, if you were my colour, you had to take your examinations, try to get a School Certificate, and if you had sense enough to win a scholarship you would get one. If you happened to be white you could leave Harrison College in the Third Form and go and work in a bank with every expectation of a handsome salary and a comfortable position without the minimum qualifications required of persons in those selfsame banks in their home countries. All of these things, Sir, are considerations, and it behoves each and everyone of us to look at them when we are considering giving these banks the facilities which they have been so liberally endowed with in Barbados.

If there has ever been a bankers' Government, it is this one, Sir, I hope that the hon. member for St. Michael West will use the influence in his Party Councils to try to Barbadianise, not just in personnel, the banks a bit more.

4.30 p.m.

I have more than once in here had to mention Bermuda which is a place that has racial prejudice right down to now you can say, but even in Bermuda with all that, no foreign bank can operate unless more than half the shares are owned by Bermudans and the rate of interest is limited to 7 per cent. The former Prime Minister owned one of them and still did not take the opportunity of allowing himself to lend out the money at more than 7 per cent. I wonder if in Barbados such a thing would have happened. Sir Henry Tucker was the owner of the Bank of Bermuda at the same time as he was Prime Minister, and he was able to keep the rate of interest in Bermuda down to 7 per cent, and he was content to keep the rate of interest down to 7 percent because bear in mind that at the time he had it at 7 percent, there were

all the trashy arguments that are put up by every bank manager and believed by the advisers in the Ministry of Finance, all the nonsensical trashy arguments that money will go out of Barbados. You only have to snap a finger and say if we see \$1 million more leave this month and we will put down exchange control, and the banks will not let one cent go out. All those trashy arguments are accepted by the Ministry of Finance when they could look around and see that Mr. Seaga in Jamaica, the Minister of Finance in a Conservative Government was holding the rate of interest down in Jamaica when we were throwing up our hands and giving in, and in Bermuda it was held down when the money could easily be put in England if they did not like the 5 percent they were getting on deposit in the two Bermudan banks entirely owned by Bermudans, albeit Bermudans of a certain sort.

It is time that the entire question of what the banks are going to be allowed to do in Barbados, with the little unofficial bankers' club of managers which gets together and discuss good, bad and indifferent risks and discuss how next they are going to try to pull the wool over the eyes of the Ministry and the Minister of Finance, was put an end to. The banks of Barbados have done us no service in the last few years, and all the speeches made by the managers of the American banks that come down which indicate that history began in 1961 and that nothing was happening in Barbados before this, and all of a sudden things suddenly began to happen in 1961, serves only to flatter those who have to take decisions. Anybody who makes a study of history knows that a King gets surrounded by courtiers and they put themselves to a lot of trouble to tell him only what he wants to hear in order to get what they want done. When you have a man who is Prime Minister for too long, that happens even worse, and the banks have been among the most assiduous of courtiers; the bank managers, members of Graeme Hall Gun Club whispering evil insidiousness into the ears of those who were listening on a Sunday morning, all of that we have had to put up with in Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: All that is very pleasant, but we are dealing with the lease of land at Seawell.

Mr. ADAMS: I understand, Sir. I am becoming a bore.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is becoming irrelevant, not becoming a bore.

Mr. ADAMS: I will leave it to other hon. members on this side if they have a contribution to make on this point.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to make reference to two or three points raised by the hon. member for St. Thomas in respect to the bank in question. The hon. member said that this bank whilst it employs all Barbadians, has taken someone with a third form Harrison College education and put at the head of the Bank because of his colour. Now I wonder if the hon. member is aware of the fact that a black Barbadian young lady holds one of the highest offices in the same bank, and that office which this black Barbadian holds in that Bank is a higher office than any other woman is holding in all the banks in Barbados. So I do not think it is fair to state that they have only looked to promote white Barbadians with a low level of education. They have also promoted a black female Barbadian to the highest post that a woman is offered in any bank in this country.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order,...

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. I cannot allow your point of order before I intervene at this stage. I will not allow this debate which is dealing with a lease of land at Seawell to generate or to veer or to get bogged down into a discussion on banking policy. This is very interesting but this could be the subject of a separate Resolution. Unless the Minister is going to confine his remarks to a lease of land at Seawell Airport, I cannot allow him to reply to anything that was said by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, are you telling me therefore that if the Leader of the Opposition gets up in the course of this debate and attacks the Government on banking policy that a member of the Government is not entitled to get up and defend the Government? This is the only place I have heard that, and what I am saying is that the hon. member attacked the Prime Minister on his banking policy and in attacking the Minister of Finance he has brought in these things, and obviously if you allowed him to make these statements, you have got to allow me to answer them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Except their employment practices. Their employment practices and promotion and so on are not really connected with the bank's policy.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: It is a serious indictment that the hon. member raised here on the Government, and nobody will stop me from replying today because I am a member of the Government of which the Minister of Finance is leader, and I must reply.

Mr. SPEAKER: I just want to make the point clear that the subject under discussion is a lease of land, and while some latitude must be allowed, you should not concentrate your whole fire, a lot of which I know you have, on other matters which are very interesting. Continue.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, my contention is that you have allowed the Leader of the Opposition to make certain...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have told you to continue. Do not harp back on what the Speaker has said.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I am speaking on the question of banking policy which you allowed the hon. member to mention, and I am to state here that the very bank pays its staff better salaries than the long established banks.

On the question of increased rate of interest, I would like to say that the hon. member stated that the Minister of Finance has allowed the banks to charge a higher rate of interest for mortgages and that it could have been handled by way of exchange control, but the hon. member missed one point. He was dealing with money which is sent out of the country for investment. We have a limited amount of money in this country which we can send out for investment, but the whole rationale behind the Minister of Finance's decision is to get money brought into the country, because if money is brought into the country for circulation, mortgages will be made available; but if we do not encourage people who can get a reasonable rate of interest in the country, or if we restrict that amount which they are sending out, this is not enough to meet the economic development of this country, and the whole idea behind the decision of this Government is to encourage capital to come in. The rate of interest in other countries would warrant people investing here.

If you want to invest money, Mr. Speaker, you look for a reasonable market. We have been experiencing difficulty, and the hon. member was quite right when he said that it was difficult to raise mortgages because if tomorrow you want to raise a mortgage, it is difficult to do so and if we did not have the C.D.C. programme here, and if we did not have the mortgage finance programme, God would have to help the people of this country to get mortgages to build homes to live in at a time when everybody is trying to find some place proper to live; and we have got to find some means of getting people interested in investing their funds in the country. Whilst the hon. member may have had a point when he

pointed out that exchange control would take care of it, it is a question of how much money we have in this country for circulation and whether we would want people to invest money in the country.

4.40 p.m.

We have Barbadians overseas, we have just decided to encourage them to bank with us in Great Britain. We have Barbadians living in the United States of America who, if they find that there is a reasonable rate of interest on their deposits, they will remit deposits to this country. In our fiscal survey you will see whether such deposits have been dropping or rising, and it is taking all these facts into consideration that the Minister of Finance has made his decision and we feel it is a good decision taken in the interest of the people of this country because the people of this country are crying out daily for available mortgage money.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to follow the Leader of the Opposition in his irrelevance, but I will confine myself to the matter before this Hon. Chamber. I am not often in agreement with the Leader of the Opposition and in fact I am not so now. On the question of mortgage rates I shall make this point very simple. The Leader of the Opposition has stated that it is because of the influx of these foreign banks — as far as I am concerned all Banks in Barbados are foreign banks whether incorporated in the United States of America, the Dominion of Canada or in the United Kingdom, and I have no brief for any banks operating in Barbados, so all the banks operating in Barbados with the exception of the Government Savings Bank are foreign banks — but if these foreign banks come in here and they allow a rate of interest on term deposits over that which is allowed by other Commonwealth banks I cannot necessarily draw the conclusion that this necessarily result in an increase in the mortgage rates, because these foreign banks — and again I refer to these American banks — are not operating in places like St. Lucia and St. Vincent but at the same time the mortgage in those territories have exceeded 8%, so it is not a question of these banks obtaining this rate of interest.

As I said before, I have no brief for any bank but on the question raised by the hon. member for St. Michael West who was kind enough not to identify the American bank to which he was referring, and I am not now going to refer to it myself, but I would want to assure the hon. member that this is one of the matters which is now engaging my attention.

I know that the Constitution in its human rights provisions allows for certain associations, yet at the same time you will find people – but to me it is irrelevant whether those people are Americans or Englishmen – but even if they are Barbadians they will all have to classify in the same way if we find these people bringing pressure to bear on citizens of this country in a way perhaps that they can get around the provisions of the Constitution but at the same time coercing them against their will not to associate as freely as they would like, then it is clear that we will have to deal with those persons and I want to assure the hon. member that I am giving personal attention to this matter.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, and I am asking for leave to deal with it; it is the second reading of a Bill to make provision with a view to ratification of the Tokyo Convention.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House is asking leave to take charge of Item 5 on the Order Paper which stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister. If there is no objection leave will be granted. Such leave is granted.

THE CIVIL AVIATION (TOKYO CONVENTION) BILL, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Bill would make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention on Offences and certain other Acts committed on board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on the 14th September, 1963 and give effect to certain provisions relating to the Convention of piracy on the High Seas signed at Geneva on the 29th April, 1958; The position is that on 10th April, 1969 Government agreed that the Convention on Offences and certain other acts committed on board aircraft, which is the Tokyo Convention signed at Tokyo on 14th September, 1963 should be signed and ratified by Barbados, and the High Commissioner for Barbados in Canada signed the Convention on behalf of Barbados on 25th June, 1969 at the Headquarters of the International Civil Organisation of Montreal. In order to give effect to certain provisions of the Convention and so enable Barbados to ratify it, this draft Bill, the Civil Aviation (Tokyo Convention) Bill, 1972, has been prepared by the Attorney General's Chambers and opportunity has been taken to insert in the draft Bill provisions which would

clarify the existing law on the question of whether an Act which would be an offence if committed in Barbados is also an offence if committed on board an aircraft which is Barbadian controlled while such aircraft is in flight over the High Seas or over the territory of another state. The law on this question is very much in doubt at the present time and it is therefore provided in clause 4(1) that an act done or anything done abroad a Barbadian controlled aircraft while in flight elsewhere than in or over Barbados which if done or attempted to be done in Barbados would constitute an offence under the law enforced in Barbados, constitutes an offence.

4.50 p.m.

This Bill is really merely ratifying the Tokyo Convention and the Geneva Convention and regularising the entire situation as far as Barbados is concerned.

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

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition is not opposed to the passing of this Bill, but I should like to draw to the attention of the Chair and to the attention of the Leader of the House that the Bill which has been circulated has certain words misplaced, and it might be better to regularise them. In the title to the Bill it is stated: "To give effect to certain provisions relating to piracy of the Convention." Mr. Speaker, the words should be, "to give effect to certain provisions of the Convention relating to piracy on the High Seas." I do not know whether the copy which has been left with the Clerk has this error in it, but it would be good if the Minister would take the opportunity to correct that.

Mr. Speaker, the Tokyo Convention is significant in that it has made some changes in the law, as we understand it, governing crimes committed on board of aircrafts. I am glad to see that the Government has not only signed the Convention, but has ratified it so that it could now come into effect and has now taken positive steps to make certain consequential changes in the law of Barbados so that the Convention can have its full force and effect in this country. I should like, however, to draw to the attention of the Minister the fact that it would be, perhaps, proper and good in future, when introducing legislation to give effect to such Conventions, to include the Convention in an appendix or annex

to the Bill. One of the things from which we suffer because of our colonial past is that very few people know the treaties which affect this country. I think the Government should take the opportunity, when dealing with Convention of this nature, to publish our treaty series so that the members of the House and the public of Barbados would know the Conventions to which we are a party.

I should like to ask the Minister also whether the Government is going to go the full run of the way and sign and ratify the Convention which has been signed at the Hague. I refer to the Hague Convention for the suppression of unlawful seizure of aircraft which was signed at the Hague on the 16th December, 1970. The Tokyo Convention merely deals with certain crimes committed on board aircrafts, but it does not specifically deal with the offence of hijacking of aircrafts which is the unlawful seizure of aircrafts wherever there are. I should like to ask the Government to hasten to ratify this Convention and to take urgent steps to bring it into effect.

In this country which depends so largely on the movement of aircrafts in and out of the country, we are not in a position to treat lightly the acts of certain people who might think they could commit acts of piracy not only on board aircrafts, but against aircrafts. I should like to draw this to the attention of the Minister and to ask that the Government gives urgent consideration on, if it has not already done so, to ratifying the second Convention and to bringing it into effect as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister drew particular attention to Section 4(1), and I think that this is necessary because of the question that the territorial effect of our legislation does not go any further than our territorial waters. Whilst on this point I should like, again — perhaps the Minister can give us some information on this point. Is Government taking any steps to extend the territorial limits of this country? You will see, Mr. Speaker, that in section 2(3) there is a reference that wherever Barbados is referred to it includes the territorial limits of Barbados. As I understand it, we are still under the old English system where the territorial waters of this country happens to be three nautical miles. Most countries, including Great Britain, have extended their territorial limits to twelve miles. I think that the time is very pressing and probably long since past when we should be hesitating on this point and, perhaps, we should have some proper definition on what are the territorial limits of this country and an amending Act, if necessary.

I do not think that this Bill can be controversial. It is a good thing when our country, not by way of an accession clause which was done when we were colonies — an accession clause made on our behalf by the United Kingdom — but in its own right is in a position to ratify a Convention of this nature and to be in the forward march in relation to improving the freedom of the air and the freedom of the sky, which I think is very vital not only from the point of view of our tourist industry, but also from the point of view of the preservation of human lives.

There is one other point I should like to draw to the attention of hon. members in this Convention and in this Act. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that there is provision excepting certain people who may be political offenders, because there may be instances where the doctrine of political asylum applies. I am happy to see that the Government, in passing this Act, recognises the necessity to reserve to itself in certain circumstances and to except certain people who may have had to take measures aboard an aircraft because of the fact that they were political offenders and political asylum is being sought in this country.

There is also one other point and, perhaps, the Minister can take it up with his Legal Draftsmen. The Draft Bill refers, I believe, in Section 3 to the Extradition Act 1870 of the United Kingdom Parliament, and there is no reference to the Fugitive Offenders Act which applies to this country. The reason for this is that the Extradition Act deals with extradition between ourselves and countries other than the Commonwealth of Nations, but in relation to the return of offenders between ourselves and other Commonwealth States the relevant provision is the Fugitive Offenders Act. Perhaps the Draftsmen could look to see whether it is not necessary also in that Section to make some change. I only received my Bill, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, on Saturday and did not have the opportunity to research this point at large, but I am reasonably sure that some amending Section may be necessary. This could probably be done if a Hijacking Act is brought before Parliament.

There is another point that strikes me. I see that we are legislating by reference, again, to English legislation, English Orders-in-Council, English Civil Aviation Act and the English Extradition Act. I know that the drafting section is very hard pressed. I also know that efforts have been made by the former Attorney General to try as much as possible to improve this. I would invite the Government to look forward to

the position and to hurry on as much as it can. I, again appeal to the Government to ask the Bar Association and the Law Society to pull their weight on this type of legislation, which is non-political and noncontroversial, to have our own Civil Aviation Act and our own Extradition Act so that we will not see, as it can happen under this Act, that the United Kingdom Parliament can change their Act and by reference and incorporation it automatically applies to us. I hope that we will soon — certainly within the five years that I shall be in this House, Mr. Speaker — see these measures put into effect. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is a smile. I can assure hon. members that I will be back after the five years.

The question that the Bill be now 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. G. G. FERGUSSON: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.
5 p.m.

Clauses 4 to 9 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, there are certain words which are interposed in the Objects and Reasons of which the hon. member for Christ Church-West made mention. I will read the Objects and Reasons to clarify the point I am making. It states that "this Bill would make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention on Offences and certain other Acts committed on board Aircraft signed at Tokyo on 14th September, 1963, and give effect to certain provisions relating to piracy of the Convention...."

It should read "and give effect to certain provisions of the Convention relating to piracy". I will ask the Clerk to make the necessary amendment in the Objects and Reasons and in the Preamble with your permission. The Objects and Reasons will therefore now read as follows:—

"This Bill would make provision with a view to ratification on behalf of Barbados of the Convention on Offences and certain other Acts committed on board Aircraft signed at Tokyo on 14th September, 1963 and give effect to certain provisions of the Convention relating to piracy on the High Seas signed at Geneva on 29th April, 1958."

Subject to that slight amendment both in the Objects and Reasons and in the Preamble, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was passed.
5.10 p.m.

THE LABOUR DEPARTMENT (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1972

Hon P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill to amend the Labour Department Act, 1943. I think it is well known that the work of the Labour Department has been growing considerably over the years, and in fact a number of additional duties have been placed on the members of staff of that Department. In 1966 ten Assistant Labour Officers were added to the statute, and about four or five months ago an additional two Assistant Labour Officers have been added to the staff of the Labour Department. There are certain Acts of Parliament, one the Labour Department Act, another the Wages Council Act, another the Quarries Act, and another the Factories Act under which there are certain duties and responsibilities that revolve on the Assistant Chief Labour Officer and other Labour Officers, in particular the duty of inspecting places of work and carrying out inspections periodically. This is not only true of the Labour Department under the Labour Department Act, but under the Wages Council Act the same thing occurs, the same thing applies as well under the Quarries Act and under the Factories Act, and it is worthy of note that all of these Acts are before the House this afternoon on the Order Paper for amendment, so in fact what I say in regard to one is equally true of all.

The position is that the Assistant Labour Officers who have recently been appointed are not able to discharge the duties under the Act because these Acts do not charge them with that responsibility, they charge the Labour Officers or the Chief Labour Officer, and the purpose of this Act is to enable the Chief Labour Officer to designate the Assistant Labour Officers as officers duly accredited to carry out inspections. This would be done by writing under the hand of the Chief Labour Officer and this is what these Acts are about. I beg to move that the Labour Department (Amendment) Bill be read a second time.

Hon. A. DaC. EDWARDS: I beg to second that.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity now that the Labour Department Act is being amended in part to make a couple of comments on the Labour Department itself. What I have to say relates in the first instance to a part of the Labour Department Act; for example, a section of the Act gives the Chief Labour Officer the power to enter into premises and also to obtain information from employers relative to wages and that type of thing relating to employees, and one has come across a number of instances in which this is not being done and as a result of this one finds that a certain amount of inconvenience is caused to the workers. If one were to take the Provident Fund Scheme, one finds that a lot of workers who might have been entitled to benefit from this scheme cannot do so because the employers have not kept proper records, and as a matter of fact, it is the duty of the Chief Labour Officer to ensure that proper records of wages and working hours are kept, but as a result of the fact that these records are not properly kept it meant that quite a number of people have not benefited from the scheme which was set up for this purpose.

I also want to refer to the whole question of the quality of staffing at the Labour Department. I am well aware that in the Throne Speech there is mention that in-service and overseas training will be intensified....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member is relevant in saying that the Act says this or that, can he be relevant discussing the administration of a department? I object on the grounds of irrelevance.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already given you some latitude and I will also give him some latitude.

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, I was referring to the Throne Speech in

which mention was made of in-service and overseas training for Officers of the Department. I think that those of us who have had to deal with the department at some times feel a bit uneasy from the point of view that there is not enough training done to make the Officers in that department *au fait* and aware of industrial relations practices, and as a result matters are not dealt with in the appropriate manner. At least one would have thought that if an intensified training programme was embarked upon that the industrial relations system would operate in a smoother manner, but the Minister in introducing this Bill made mention of the fact that a number of Assistant Labour Officers had been appointed within recent months, but this of course is all tied up in the industrial development which is taking place in the country. At the same time one has got to make mention of the fact that these Officers have been in the Labour Department for quite some time and that this is a specialised department and one cannot expect to take up a chap from some other part of the service and transfer him to the Labour Department and expect him to function efficiently as a Labour Officer without understanding what the Labour Department Act deals with and what is required of a Labour Officer. I sincerely hope that the proposed investigation of a training programme for Labour Officers will soon get underway.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of where the limits are under this Labour Department Act, 1943, but what I am going to say is that we are amending the Labour Department Act I am going to take this opportunity to speak about the Labour Department and I hope that it does not lead to any conflict with the Leader of the Opposition or with anyone else. We are amending an Act which was enacted in 1943, 28 years ago, and it seems to me that in some respects the legislation of that time was more forward looking but time has caught up with that type of legislation.

5.20 p.m.

The Department of Labour, as you can very well say, over the 28 years has not blossomed out into a Department that one could look at with pride and satisfaction.

I do not know if it is coincidental, but the Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year 1969 was handed out today, and I intend to make reference to a passage which I read today. In this Bill I find that we propose to amend the Act, and the Objects and Reasons state that this Bill would amend the Labour Department Act, 1943 (Act 1943-21) to enable the powers exercisable by the Chief Labour Officer under that Act to be exercised by persons duly authorised by him for the purpose. What we are doing today is

extending the powers under the Act to the Chief Labour Officer to be given to other officers, and we have to examine the powers we are extending.

Now, the Minister, in introducing this legislation, said that other consequential amendments would follow and that the same sort of arguments would be used. He also mentioned the number of the staff in trying to relate what was happening before to what is happening today. I am not a believer that the number of the staff is really the criterion to determine whether or not you have quality. I should like to say, quite bluntly, that I am not satisfied with the quality of the staff in the Department of Labour; it does not match with the requirements of our present situation. There is no one in the Department with the knowledge to give the interpretation of the distribution of the labour force, which is the basic function of this Department. The man-power requirements of this country are things that the Department of Labour must be capable of analysing. This sort of thing cannot be done efficiently and expertly in this Department, because it does not have the people there to do this job. It has an irritating effect on any Development Programme, because you cannot develop a country unless you know the quality of the labour force.

Now, I do not intend to deal with the other Acts at this stage, because I will deal with them when we are amending them. It was reported that the Minister made a speech earlier this week in which he stated that it is his intention to codify the labour laws. Mr. Speaker, the codification of the laws does not make any difference. It will make work for somebody to codify these laws, but the interpretation of them will not be any different. In 1949 Mr. C. O. J. Matthews came here and went into the question of the codification of the labour laws and that is still a dead letter. For the sake of convenience, it may be quite easy; you could take up one book and look at all the labour laws of Barbados. I do not want to set the Minister out on any 5-year pilgrimage to have the laws codified. I should like to have the Department of Labour so geared that it can meet the requirements of the labour situation in Barbados today.

Sir, if there is an industrial dispute and the Chief Labour Officer is given the power to direct or give other officers his powers, then he should have people of quality to carry out such powers. There is no point in having in Barbados a powerful employers' organisation, a powerful workers' organisation and a weak Department of Labour. It means that the two sides will ignore the Department of Labour completely. There is no point in asking two powerful sides to go to a mediator, if you find that there is going to be one

person in the Department and after you meet the Head of the Department things will be very difficult.

I would say, without any reflection on the officers in that Department — I do not like to say anything about public servants — that when disputes arise some of the people in the Department would like to be able to handle the matter in the way that it should be dealt with where two sides are involved in disputes. To give you an example of what I mean, Mr. Speaker, I shall refer to the Report, a copy of which I believe you have. On page 10 of the Report, speaking about industrial relations — it could be an error. (*ASIDES*) I have been told that, if it were in a Manifesto, we would not have taken it as an error. I believe that this Report was sent to a Minister, but the Minister would not look upon this as his Report coming from his Department. Under paragraph 84 of the Report it is stated:

“General — The year was marked by stable industrial relations. The orderly manner in which disputes were handled was in large measure due to the vigilance of the Barbados Workers' Union, which effectively intervened when its members were involved, and to the experience and expertise of the Director of the Employers' Confederation.”

I merely read that to show that it is something written by the Chief Labour Officer. It is merely coincidental that I have this today. What worries me is that we are going to amend this Act. I am wondering if these things are written out of ignorance or bias, because in a public Report you do not set out an individual for any particular commendation. We are talking about organisations. You may be talking about the Barbados Workers' Union and not the General Secretary; you may be talking about the Employers' Confederation and not the Directors. You do not want to discredit persons, and you do not want to give them any particular praise, because you do not want to give any impression whatsoever that you are looking to these persons for support in any way.

5.30 p.m.

Now I mention that, Mr. Speaker, but I would not labour it because it could be a genuine error in writing. The written word can be held up against you. It is an art in itself and it is not an art that is always easy for everybody to acquire. I feel very strongly — and I have a lot to do with the Department of Labour, about the future of this country in this respect because we have seen people holding this post in the past, and while we

have no control over where people should go out of the Government service, it is extremely remarkable that invariably when they leave this high industrial office they find their pilgrimage either in the office of an Employers' Organisation or a big employers' establishment. I do not challenge the integrity of the persons, but I am saying that it is time that the Minister and the Government look into the kind of reward and remuneration they are prepared to give the Chief Labour Officers.

The rates that the Government pays to a Labour Officer have not been very high, and this is true even of the party to which I belong. The former Government paid very little attention to labour. Labour was one of those departments that had this dichotomy where you found labour plus something else of which labour was an incidental part. You had Ministry of Trade and Labour, Ministry of Agriculture and Labour; they have matched labour with all sorts of companies in Barbados over the last seventeen years. I do not know any other place in the world where you have this dichotomy where labour was mixed up with so many incongruous portfolios as we have found in Barbados. The man who was Minister of Trade was also Minister of Labour and you found it very difficult to get him to divide his loyalties in a matter like this. He is looking on one side to bring in trade, and on the other side you do not know what he will be doing for labour.

Mr. Speaker, we have never had a Ministry of Labour that was looking after labour as an expert job. The other point is that the Department of Labour is housed in a building that was formerly a residence, and not a residence that one would expect for such a Department, but one of those residences in which, if you want to find somebody you go through a pantry, through a bathroom around the other side and come in around the other side to meet the man at the door looking on the other side. If you want a rambling situation, go to the Department of Labour. Any time you park your motor car to go to a cricket match at Kensington, take a look inside there. It is a building that is very unsuitable. At one stage I understood the Department was going to be removed to St. Cecilia Barracks in Passage Road. It seems to be one of those offices for which they cannot find a home, and it is now being regarded as an emigration venue rather than a place where people go as a Labour Department in the true sense of the word.

I would like to say that if people are going to function in any office, you must first give them a suitable building. The hon. member for St. Lucy mentioned, and I was surprised to hear the Leader

of the Opposition say that the Chief Labour Officer is called upon under the Act to carry out the Provident Fund; he is called upon under the Act to carry out the Sugar Workers Severance Pay Act, and he is called upon under the Act to be Chairman of a series of things that have been passed by the Legislature, and what I am surprised about is to find that the same person who is going to extend these duties and the other persons are carrying out these functions in a building that is most unsuitable for the many things you have added. I hope that the Minister concerned in dealing with the Department of Labour will first see to it that not only the building but the quality of the staff is upgraded. There are ten Assistant Labour Officers and five Labour Officers, and you must know what are the quality of the people you are employing to carry out these functions. What do you want these people to do? At what level do you want them to function? Do you want them to function at the level of high decision-making in the sense that they have to put something up to the Minister, or have to meet employers or workers? You cannot expect junior people who themselves are looking through the window for a job paying better than what the Government is paying to go into any big establishment and tell the people that they are really wrong, that they had no right to dismiss a person. Some of the people are not Union members; some of them are unorganised. There are myraids of unorganised people like the domestic servants.

In the Trade Union we do not want this job of organising domestic servants and having the job of going around to the myraids of little employers who are themselves working for a mere pittance and ask them to carry out serious industrial negotiations with people who are cooking food and washing pans in a home, when they should really be in industry but owing to the employment situation, this is still a job. So those are unorganizable people and those are the people who have to seek the Department of Labour in order to get some redress. We expect the Labour Department not to be afraid to tell a Minister or a Minister's wife if she dismisses a servant without giving her all that is her due what the position is. I say that because there is too much of the idea in Barbados that you have to look and see who has done the thing before you can deal with it.

I do not have much to say on the other Acts, but this is the most important aspect of it, and it is going to affect Barbados in the future because Barbados is predominantly a wage earning community, and the Department of Labour should have real meaning to the workers of this country. Now that the Act is being amended, I say to the Minister that an opportunity should be taken to go

into the Department of Labour and see to it that the quality of the staff is upgraded that it can meet the requirements of a Department of Labour in 1972, because in 1943 when the first Commissioner of Labour was appointed, his position was equal to the Colonial Secretary and to the Attorney General, because they felt that this was so important that you could not have any person other than a top ranking official to hold the position. Now that we are giving this position to our nationals, it seems to me that it has taken a dip down, and I feel that the Department of Labour is entitled to have people of high position and quality running it. We have no less a person than the Governor-General of Trinidad and Tobago who was a former Commissioner of Labour, and his work in his own nation was known as a Commissioner of Labour and he rose from that position to Chief Secretary and now he is Governor-General. I do not think it is a position to be underrated, but one we should pay the highest attention to. I believe it has been played down because in Barbados industrial disputes have been far and few between, and industrial relations have been reasonably amicable, and for that reason it has been felt that this Department is relatively easy. For the people who head this Department and those who work in it there is technical work to be done apart from industrial relations and apart from employer-employee relations that is of a quality and character that we should know from day to day with regard to the distribution of labour and how many men and women there are in the total labour force.

5.40 p.m.

There is nothing from the Labour Department that can give you the unemployment position in Barbados; this is the type of thing that the Department of Labour for 28 years now should have been able to possess the expertise to concentrate on so that you could know how many people are unemployed. It is just like when you receive bank statements at the end of each month so that you would know when to stop writing cheques; if by this date, 25th January, you have not yet received your statement for December you would not know how much money you have in the bank. There is no point in saying that you have so many people in Barbados therefore the labour force equals X, you should know the people you are going to include in your active labour force and the ages of these people. That is the sort of information that a Department of Labour should be capable of providing at all times as an expert Department, and this is not anything that can be done by chance.

When we were examining the position with the number of people who would be eligible for

payments from the Provident Fund in the sugar industry they gave figures that were fantastic; today the Ministry does not know what the position is in a situation like this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Would you now begin to confine your remarks to the Bill under discussion?

Mr. WALCOTT: This is only an example, but all these are matters with which the Chief Labour Officer has to deal and for which he has to designate authority. Here is it that in a department like this you cannot get accurate information which would assist you and assist the workers as far as benefits are concerned; if you are going to pass laws you must feel you have the people in this department who are capable and competent to carry out these functions, if not we will face a lot of embarrassment. You will find that in the next five years if they do not do something about the staff of the Labour Department the people who are eligible to be paid now will not be paid out of the Provident Fund. You have 7,000 people and you are processing at the rate of 200 per month, so you can see how long it will take you to get around to those 7,000 people, notwithstanding those who will become eligible as time goes on. I just thought I would bring this to the Minister's attention.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there is not much I can reply to, in fact the contents of the speeches have been mostly of an advisory nature and it is not necessary for me to reply. The advice given is well taken, and I should like to assure hon. members who have spoken on this Bill that in fact the criticisms which have been voiced by them are being taken into account at this moment. Some of the advice was not correct, for example, that the Labour Officers are charged with responsibility to ensure that the persons who are employed, their wages and hours of work are well recorded, and the allegation that they do not visit is as I understand it correct, but by and large I think the performance has been of a high standard.

On the question of the manpower requirements and of suitable buildings, I think it is well known that plans are on the drawing board to improve this situation, and only a few weeks ago I came here to this Chamber to acquire additional land at Fairchild Street to house eventually not only the National Insurance Office, not only the Government Savings Bank, but also the Ministry of Labour, including the Department of Labour, in a new modern seven-storey block. That is as far as the quality of the buildings is concerned. On the question of manpower requirements, I do not know whether I will be able to do it in the context of our financial resources, but I have already given instructions to my officers to include in the next

year's Estimates a sum of money for a manpower survey to be carried out. Whether eventually in fact this is done is another matter, but this is what I shall be pressing for.

On the question of the quality of staff, I think it should be generally appreciated, and if the hon. member for St. Michael West was a member of Government he would be able to appreciate the tug of war that goes on in Government Departments for staff, and Ministers are not supposed to get into the tug of war, but I can assure you that one sure way of ensuring that you do not get a particular person is to express a choice for that person.

5.50 p.m.

We have here, Mr. Speaker, a member of this Chamber who was a member of the Public Service Commission, but he may not be aware of what goes on in the Civil Service at that end; he may only be aware of what came before him on a file. I can assure you, Sir, that the question of the selection and appointment of staff or anything to do with the staff in the Civil Service is as jealously guarded as the salaries of the civil servants, so that Ministers are not given a look in on the question of staff. Of course, I may express a preference for a member of a staff, because I am impressed that that person is of the calibre that I would require. This does not mean that someone else may not be so impressed as well. It is a question of who is going to get that person. These are some of the problems with which we have to wrestle within the Service. It is not a simple and straightforward matter, but we try to do our best.

I am aware of some of the shortcomings in the Labour Department. I generally have weekly meetings with the Chief Labour Officer in order to discuss certain problems relating to the Department and to reorganise and improve the Department. I intend to continue these meetings so long as I am responsible for Labour, because I shall be pressing continually for improvement in any Department over which I have some responsibility.

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

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is in the interest of the expedition of the Business of the House. As far as I know, there is no ruling that

Bills must be taken seriatim, and there is nothing in the Rules of the House to prevent four second readings from being moved and four Bills being considered in Committee. I would respectfully suggest to the Leader of the House and the Minister in charge of the Bill that they save yourself and the Chairman of Committees a quadruple trek, and that the second readings being given. We are quite happy to give a second reading to all of these Bills and let them all be considered in Committee at once. It is bound to save time and the convenience of the Marshal, yourself, and the Chairman of Committees.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, admirable as that suggestion may sound and old-fashioned as I may appear to be, I certainly would not fall for that suggestion. I should like everything to be done in the old way. It has been tested and nothing has been found wrong with it. Probably the hon. member has some other engagement or commitment, and he may well be excused at this stage, but we would rather remain here and proceed along constitutional lines as has been done from time immemorial.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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. FERGUSON: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

WAGES COUNCIL (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 7 be the next Order of the Day.

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

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Wages Council Act, 1955.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 on this Bill.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 8 be the next Item on the Order Paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Order of the Day is Order No. 8 and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Factories Act, 1956. 6 p.m.

THE FACTORIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Factories (Amendment) Act, 1972, be now read a second time.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Minister is in a mood today to receive advice, and I think this is an appropriate occasion that I should lend my voice to the supplications which have been made so far. The Factories legislation in this island is still very outmoded and it is deficient in many respects. Anyone who is familiar with legislation of this nature and has been following what has been happening in this type of legislation in the modern industrial world will recognise that it is about time

that we have a comprehensive review of the Factories legislation in the Island. The reason why I am making this point is because those of us who come face to face with industrial accidents recognise that not only is the legislation not being seriously enforced but also that the legislation is seriously deficient in not covering certain accidents which are occurring, and I think the time has come when certainly, for instance, the legislation should stipulate that all machinery of a certain dangerous nature in the Island should be properly fenced. On the new industrial estates in particular, I should like to draw to the Minister's attention that we are finding instances where accidents are not only not reported to his Department in breach of the Act, but that representatives of some of the people who have been damaged are being prohibited from visiting to see if they can bring common law action so that the people can benefit.

I should commend to the Minister in modern thinking on this subject, legislation in Austria, for instance, if we want to look outside the Commonwealth, and I should also commend to the Minister amending the Act to give a right to the Trade Union so that their representatives can act as part of a Committee of inspectorate and have a say along with members of his Department, and if the employer wants to be there as well, he can come along. But I think at the earliest opportunity during the present Minister's tenure of office should be taken on this point, and I am sure that he will find that the Union is probably right up on their legislation having particularly attended most of the I.L.O. meetings, and if he wants the facilities or any of the knowledge at the disposal of the Opposition, we consider a matter of this nature sufficiently non-political to offer all the help we can. It is not recognised usually in a country that the Opposition has as much an interest in seeing that people's safety, health and welfare are sufficiently protected, recognised and safeguarded. I should really appeal to the Minister. I know he is new to his Department and to this particular portfolio, but I appeal to him with the greatest speed to overhaul this legislation which has gone out of the door in England. We follow England in so many things that even when England has moved forward, we are still left several years behind. It is really a sad commentary. For instance, in England there is a new Factories Act and it may take this country another twenty years before we seem to get a bit of movement to look at the problems occurring.

I believe in the West Indies and in Barbados in particular we have sufficient people who can do this sort of powered thinking, and I refuse to accept that we really have not got the brains, we have not got the manpower or the time. What we

really need is a bit of organisation and trying to use the facilities available to us. So I appeal to the Minister next time he is coming with an amendment to this Act to come with a comprehensive Act dealing with the matter properly and thoroughly and not with giving a Labour Officer power to authorise somebody else to carry out a function. I want to see the real bone, the real substance and the meat and not merely the frills of the matter dealt with.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, of course being a representative of the workers one would obviously come into a number of situations in which there is need to draw the attention of this House to. I would hate to say that the point which the hon. member who has just sat down has raised about the establishment of a National Committee of Safety in factories was a point which the Barbados Workers' Union raised about three or four weeks ago in one of its columns in the Advocate "The Union Speaks", and maybe he should have given credit for the place from which he took the idea, but nevertheless it is an extremely good idea in that this is something which we feel is of tremendous importance, because when one goes into a factory, one is sometimes appalled at the conditions which exist in these factories, and one is furthermore appalled at the fact that under the Act it seems as if the Labour Department has the power to make sure that the conditions which obtain there are good working conditions for workers, but at the same time nothing seems to be done about it.

Now the act for example gives the Chief Labour Officer the right, and I am quoting from Part III which deals with the safety general provisions, and this is subsection 3, to prohibit the use of any factory or part thereof for the purpose of that process of work until such works have been executed. This relates to a factory if a particular fatal accident has taken place, and we know, for example, of a case which happened at the Barbados Foundry some time in June of last year where a worker was actually killed through the fact that proper safety provisions were not made for the particular work he was carrying out, and up to this day nothing has been done to right that situation, and it may very well be that something else may happen to another worker. One cannot understand how the owners of this factory were not prosecuted. Under the law the Labour Officer has the right to prosecute such people and I would be glad if the Minister could tell us this evening how many prosecutions have been undertaken by the Ministry of Labour in order to carry out the terms of the Act.

Now I feel that the people who are vested with the power to overlook this whole question of safety in factories should adopt a more vigilant attitude, and at the same time while it is all right to say that you have a number of factory inspectors, the factory inspector must be a person who is aware and *au fait* with what goes on in a factory. When he goes into a factory he is able to assess a situation and come to a conclusion as to whether the conditions which obtain there are conditions which one would expect to obtain in a present-day factory. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Act also states that an employer particularly when he has machinery which can cause damage to a worker should lay down certain rules and regulations as to the operation of this machinery. I am sure that if you go into most of the factories which are in operation in Barbados today, you will not see any regulations displayed in any prominent position or anywhere else in the factory, and this is why I say that the factory inspectors have got to be more vigilant when they go to these factories and observe that the laws are not being kept. One can only say that if all these things obtained that one would be sure of having better conditions in the factories. I must confess that I obviously have to agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West that there is need for an updating of the legislation and the sooner this is done, the better.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think I should join the members on this matter because it is very vital to Barbados. Barbados is moving from a predominantly agricultural economy into a more industrialised economy, and more people are going to work in factories and with machinery, therefore we have to make ourselves aware of the consequences of change.
6.10 p.m.

I am very pleased to hear the hon. member for Christ Church West, and I would say that all his association with the Barbados Workers' Union in his earlier practice was not in vain because he still remembers some of these major things. The hon. member for St. Lucy has mentioned an incident which took place last year, but I know of an incident which has taken place in a sugar factory where a man had to come down a ladder, and for some inexplicable reason he went into a teche with syrup and nobody can explain how he got into this position. I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West that this legislation should not merely be a question of adding more Labour Officers, but there is something antiquated about the way in which the minds of officials in Barbados think when it comes to a fatal accident. They have the idea that a fatal accident has to be something criminal in order for a prosecution to be brought and if it is not anything criminal then it is termed

bad luck, fate or an act of God, and I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West that there seems to be a flaw in our legislation because there does not seem to be any authority to proceed in these cases unless something criminal is involved. If the Police evidence does not reveal that there was anything criminal the Coroner is nothing more to do with it, the Police Department makes a report and that is the end of the matter. We had an example at Seawell Airport where a man was cut up by the blades of a Liat Aircraft and there were a lot of bogus excuses.

As I said earlier, the Inspectors in the Department seem to think that if poor people are involved in anything there are to be hounded down, but some of these other people have big reservoirs with mosquitoes as big as pigs and they do not ask them anything, so this is the kind of mentality you have operating in the Labour Department. If you go into some of these factories around here you will see a lot of things which you can tell that the people work in danger of their lives and this should be investigated and an end put to it. The people in Europe and especially in Germany take great care in preventing fatal accidents. I know that a few years ago the Germans instituted legislation making it incumbent upon the authorities to see to it that more than one type of person can go inside a factory and investigate. I feel that this legislation we have here is somewhat antiquated, and you find that some employers feel that some of it is unnecessary and not worthwhile and that is why all these accidents take place at factories.

I feel that more emphasis should be placed on training these Officers, but after they have had their training it does not make sense to transfer them to another department where they will not have to put this training into practice. But again you have to be very careful in selecting Officers for training because there are some people who will be ready to jump in the p... before it arrives at Seawell but they are not interested in being trained, they only want to see another country. There is no point in trying to work this Act unless you are going to modernise it. Some of these Inspectors are not so much interested in carrying out inspections, instead they are looking around to see where they will be able to get a job the next time or otherwise.

6.20 p.m.

All they are doing is going with a loud, open voice. Mr. Deputy Speaker, as the hon. member for Christ Church has said, this is a new area. The Labour Department has always been an unattended area, and that is no reflection on the Minister or past Ministers, because I see some of them in this Chamber.

In the past you had the Ministry of Labour and Housing, the Ministry of Agriculture and so on. The Minister of Housing is looking for more votes. The Minister of Agriculture is looking for more votes. The Minister is still a politician, and he may say to somebody; "The Unions will see about that, so what are you worrying your head about." The Unions do not run the Department, and we are not responsible for any of the Ministers. We have to spend money in trying to investigate a workman's case, because the mentality of the employers and workers is such that, after a man is dead and anybody attempts to say how the accident occurred, all of the workers in the same factory will get together and say: "Why do you not hush your mouth? The man is dead already; you will soon be made a foreman; do not go and give any evidence, because it is none of your business." In the circumstances, it is impossible to get proper evidence in such cases.

In this particular incidence, it was a man who went into a hole 12 feet deep by 12 feet square with a piece of wire; he attempted to light a cylinder head with gas in it, and he was burnt to death. Anyone who looks at that accident would see that there should have been an automatic pilot to light the cylinder. The man lost his life as simple as that. He had a piece of wire with an old vest tied to it trying to light the cylinder. Mr. Deputy Speaker, those are some of the things that we have seen taking place in Barbados. On the other hand, the workers in Barbados are not accident conscious and they are very ignorant when it comes to the question of accidents. They do not believe that accidents will occur when they have been doing something every day; they are not conscious of accidents like people who were born in industrial societies.

I agree that all of this machinery should be fenced. Some of these machines were fenced, but on arrival in Barbados the people took them off. When it comes to repairing the machine, some workers say that it is easier to get their hands certain places when the machines are not fenced. We know that some workers are ignorant, and they will say that it is easier for them to repair the machines. All of these things will have to be considered. I hope that the Minister will look into these matters because we do not want a crisis in Barbados. As I have said before, Barbados is a crisis community, and it looks like it will require 60 men to die in a factory before we can do anything about it. I trust that the Minister will do something about this Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that the Minister will allow himself and some of his officers to be exposed by participating in international affairs

where they will find people at a decision-making level with an understanding of these issues. When officers are not exposed to this sort of thing, then they must get on like underlings and mediocre people when faced with serious issues. I hope that the Minister will endeavour to give these officers the widest exposure possible to international affairs.

Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, so far we have heard a lot about the flaws in legislation, but I should like to point out that very often there is also a serious flaw which makes the work of the Government very difficult. It is a flaw in the attitude of Barbadians. If we do not have the correct attitude of people in this country towards legislation and towards their lesser fortunate brothers, then we will not be any wiser regardless of how much we upgrade and improve legislation. When all of this is done, we will still find that the legislation has to be carried out by Barbadians. If the Barbadians, who have to carry out this legislation, do not adopt the correct attitude towards their brothers and sisters, then we will find ourselves back in the same position.

Now, in Barbados there is an attitude in which some people tend to behave in this manner: I am in my small corner and you are in yours; my pot does not boil at you, and if I can get through I do not mind what happens with you no matter how much you may suffer. This attitude affects the man at the bottom very disastrously, because if he cannot pull the correct string or he cannot find the money to get something done, he will find that when his rights are abridged nobody wants to hear him. While we are talking about the flaw in legislation relative to the Factories Act or other Acts coming under the Ministry of Labour, we find that this attitude pervades the Barbadian society. One thing I should like to stress here is that not only do we have to upgrade our Acts to keep pace with the modern trends and changes going on in other countries, but we have to make a direct effort by way of encouraging Barbadians to have a correct attitude especially in their responsibility towards their fellow citizens in this country. Unless this is done, we are not going to get the type of achievement which we would like. We in Barbados seem to think that, even when we make laws and we say they should apply equally, people in certain positions should be treated one way and people in other positions should be treated in an entirely different manner. Very often you find that it is this frame of mind that makes people refuse to apply the laws, even though they are inadequate at the moment.

In many of the instances which have been mentioned about workers this evening, we find

that, even though the law has been inadequate, the law could have been enforced, but it was due to this indifferent attitude on the part of the people who have to enforce the laws. We cannot change Barbadians overnight, neither can we dismiss these people and replace them by other people overnight, because we may be bringing in people with the same attitude. We have to accept that a great effort has to be made to make these people who have to discharge these responsibilities aware that the needs of the people should be correctly represented. They must also be made aware of the fact that, whatever legislation the Government introduces, it must be carried out in the manner the Government wants it to be carried out, otherwise we will be introducing legislation without getting the desired effect which we want to achieve.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is easy to understand why hon. members, who have spoken on this Bill, have spoken with such passion. It is a matter of life and death; it is a matter where the very lives of people are concerned. I agree, generally speaking, with most of the sentiments expressed here this afternoon. Of course, I am unable to give a ready reply to the statistical question which the hon. member for St. Lucy asked; in fact, I will have to get notice of that question, if I am to answer it.

6.30 p.m.

I am going to take the hon. member for Christ Church West at his word. I know that in their manifesto his party claimed that they were going to expand, further and extend, and this afternoon I could not help thinking that the hon. member for Christ Church West was expanding on our manifesto where we said that legislation would be introduced to give better protection to workers engaged in dangerous occupations and to safeguard the interest of young workers exposed to excessive mental and physical strain. Be that as it may, I am sure he has ideas of his own on this subject, and I would want him to know that I am not such a person as to believe that the fact that it is coming from him or a member of the other side means it is not worthwhile trying, and any suggestions he may care to pass to me as Minister responsible for this subject I will take and give due consideration, and if I find them worthwhile and necessary, as I have no doubt I can, I will act upon them. There is not very much more for me to say except again to commend this Bill to hon. members.

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 9 be the next Order of the day.

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

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

THE QUARRIES (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1972

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Quarries (Amendment) Act, 1972, be now read a second time.

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

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item is a Resolution for the sum of \$9,674 of which notice was given today and for which leave was asked to deal with it in all its stages today. It

was eventually agreed to by the Opposition, and I am asking leave to deal with it at this stage if there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1971-72 No. 25

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of \$9,674.

As the Addendum sets out, under Item 20, the amount provided under the current Estimates to meet the cost of stationery, incidentals, maintenance of office equipment and other office requirements in respect of the House of Assembly and the office of the Leader of the Opposition has proved to be inadequate. An additional sum of \$8,474 is now required to meet expenditure under this item for the remainder of the financial year. This Resolution seeks the provision of this sum.

Under Item 24 — Payment of Substitutes, the amount provided under this item for the payment of substitutes for officers of the House, Chaplains, Reporters, and Typists has proved to be inadequate.

Due to the greater number of officers absent on leave during the current financial year than was anticipated, it is therefore necessary to supplement this item by the amount of \$1,200.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th February, 1972 at 2.30 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. Speaker adjourned the House accordingly.
6.50 p.m.