

THE
House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1971 - 76

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th December, 1973

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

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Acting Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY; Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare) and Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology).

Prayers were read.

COMPLAINTS ABOUT PUBLIC ADDRESS SYSTEM

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN:

Mr. Speaker, before the business of the House commenced, I noticed that all the microphones had bent heads. I do not know if this is in disgrace, shame or what, but at the last meeting of the House, we were told that there were no microphones and I think that this House which pass so many Resolutions to do things for other departments should have its microphones put in order. We pass Resolutions for the running of the country and we should be heard audibly in here. There are some of us who have strong voices while others do not, but the affairs of the House should have priority and I feel that this should have been done. A whole week has passed, and I am sure that if some interested parties had taken the trouble to look into this matter that by this Sitting, we would have had the use of the microphones, so I hope that this matter will be settled at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The position as far as the microphones are concerned is this, that the Government Electrical Inspector has paid a visit to this Chamber and has recommended that the wires be placed in metal or P.V.C. conduits so that rats or other animals do not destroy them as would appear to be the case on this occasion. The Clerk of Parliament has taken the necessary steps and I have received two estimates so far for placing the wires in metal or P.V.C. conduits. These estimates are for over \$1,000, and the estimated time for the completion of the work is at least three weeks because the floor boards would have to be taken up and the metal or P.V.C. conduits properly installed. The contract has not yet been awarded, and I very much appreciate the sentiments of the hon. Member, because this is very trying to all hon. Members concerned. I can assure all hon. Members that active steps have been taken to restore the whole amplifying and recording system in due course.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, may I also make a suggestion, that we get the Public Health Inspectors in to put down rat poison?

Mr. SPEAKER:

I have been informed that this has already been done on the instructions of the Clerk of Parliament.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Leader of the House would consider the question of how long we would be required to work under these circumstances, because certainly after a trying period like last week I am sure that all hon. Members would have suffered from sore throats because of the shouting they had to do in order to be heard. I would have thought that since 1970 when I saw what was going on in here and I voiced the opinion that those who were carrying out the work were doing it like amateurs that something would have been done by now, but It is constantly being tampered with without proper specifications and designs for Parliament. I condemn this waste of money because I see that contractors are coming here each week, we are spending money and Parliament is not getting any better service. I have already condemned the plywood which has been used in here, and if rats can eat out the wires it is sufficient to know that the work has been done with poor quality wire for high prices, because there are houses in this country which have been wired for more than 40 years and the electrical systems are still working today despite the rats.

It is a shame to think that in less than three years one can be told that one has to take up the floor boards to fix the amplifying system again for which a contractor had contracted to do the work, and this is why I constantly ask what sort of contract is being designed between Government and contractors. I think Parliament should look carefully at the contract under which this work was done and if there is a possibility of recovering damages from the contractors it should be done forthwith. Those who have to award the contract should look carefully to see who was awarded this contract and see that the same contractor is not re-employed, because we will not get a good system. It is time that the people of this country understand that the taxpayers' money must be spent in a businesslike manner.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, I have been enquiring about what temporary arrangements have been made to meet the situation, and judging from what I hear it is quite likely that a long time may pass before we get the public address system working again, and I would like to know if thought has been given to installing a temporary system. I would like to suggest that it is not a difficult matter to set up a public address system within this chamber, and until such time as this can be remedied serious consideration should be given to installing a temporary system because it is a serious strain on Members to have to shout so that the Reporters and others can hear what they are saying.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask too that if these floor boards are to be raised, that the opportunity be taken to fit the carpet properly, because it is not only unsightly but also dangerous?

Mr. SPEAKER:

All the suggestions will be taken into account by the Amenities Committee in due course. The only problem is that with the festivities around the corner I can see the Committee meeting at the earliest very early in the New Year. Everything will be done to ensure that the amplifying system is put into use as soon as possible.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Mr. SPEAKER:

I now have the honour to lay upon the table of this. Hon. Chamber the Accounts and Statements prepared by the Accountant General for the months of May and June, 1972.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Loan Contract between Barbados and the Inter-American Development Bank relating to the expansion of the Barbados Community College.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the Barbados Harbours (Amendment) Regulations, 1973.

Messrs H. deB. FORDE and W. C. B. HINDS entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the lease of the property at "Bradfield", Country Road, St. Michael, to the Young Women's Christian Association.

On my own behalf I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$244,030 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1973-74, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1973-74, No. 30, which form the Schedule to the Resolution. 12.20 p.m.

Also I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Racing Service Business (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964.

I am asking for leave to deal with this Bill in all its stages later in today's Sitting,

Also I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, 1971.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Hon. Leader of the House is seeking the leave of Members to deal with a Bill to amend the Racing Service Business (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964 in all of its stages today. The Bill has already been circulated and gazetted, and if there is no objection leave will be granted. There being no objection leave is granted.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question in the name of the hon. Member for St. Peter re the teaching vacancies at Erdiston Teachers' Training College.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport

Are there any teaching vacancies at Erdiston Teachers' Training College? If so, in what areas?

2. Were these posts advertised?

3. Were applications received from suitably qualified persons?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is in the affirmative, will the Minister state why such persons have not been appointed?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question in the name of hon. Member for St. Peter re the swimming pools.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

In view of the present energy crisis, and the necessity to save water, will the Minister state what steps have been taken in respect of swimming pools which use water from our Island's main source of supply?

2. How many swimming pools are there in Barbados?

3. How many use water from our pipe-borne system?

4. What (in terms of gallons) is the average daily consumption of each swimming pool?

5. How does the consumption by these pools compare with the average daily domestic supply consumed by householders?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question which stands in the name of, the hon. Member for St. Peter re the grounds of All saints' Boys' School, St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport

Is the Minister aware that the grounds of All Saints' Boys' School, St. Peter, would require considerable preparation if the children are to participate in outdoor games?

2. Will the Minister take early steps to have some work done on the school grounds so as to encourage the children and others to engage in such outdoor activities as well prepared grounds would permit?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question in the name of the hon. Member for St. Peter re the large quantities of chocolate products in various forms imported into Barbados and other Caribbean territories.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is Government aware that large quantities of chocolate products in various forms are imported into Barbados and the other Caribbean territories for consumption, annually?

2. Is Government aware of the fact that the main properties employed in the manufacture and processing thereof are raw materials produced abundantly in the Caricom Area?

3. Would Government explore the possibility of having such Caricom partners as are producers of raw materials other than sugar, conduct a feasibility study to determine whether or not a factory should be established in the region for supplying much of the finished chocolate products which are now imported; and with a view to providing employment for some of the young people of the region?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question in the name of the hon. Member for St. Peter re the lands for burial grounds at St. Philip-the-Less Anglican Church, at Boscobelle in the Parish of St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware that the two burial grounds at St. Philip-the-Less Anglican Church, at Boscobelle in the Parish of St. Peter have reached saturation point and there is no more space wherein to dig graves to bury the dead?

Will die Minister take steps to relieve this situation immediately by urging Government to acquire such lands or make such other provision as may be found necessary under the circumstances?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question in the name of the hon. Member for St. Peter re the condition of Gill's Road, off Church Street, Speightstown, St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications and Works

Is the Minister aware that Gill's Road - off Church Street, Speightstown, St. Peter - is in a bad state of repair?

2. Is the Minister aware that the said road is subjected to flooding - partly by receiving excess water from the main highway and otherwise?

3. Will the Minister take urgent steps to relieve these situations?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That appears to be all the questions the hon. Member can give notice of at this stage. There is an outstanding Question re the electrical service for the parish of St. Peter. With the leave of this Honourable Chamber, leave may be given to the hon. Member to give notice of the question.

The Question standing in the name of the hon. Member for St. James re the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Is the Minister aware of the fact that the Barbados Marketing Corporation lost a great deal of produce through spoilage during the last six months?

Will the Minister state

(1) the reasons for the spoilage; and

(2) the value of the produce lost?

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Racing Service Business (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964, be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that,

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Severance Payments Act, 1971, be now read a first time.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE GRANTED TO HON. P. M. GREAVES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the hon. Member for St. Michael North West be granted six weeks of absence with effect from the 11th December, 1973.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second it.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 12.30 p.m

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform you that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 170, asked by the Hon. and Learned Leader of the Opposition is ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORDt "Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 138, 139 and 144 asked by the hon. Member for Bridgetown are ready.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is not in his place and he has asked me to say that if there are any Questions which are answered today that they be held over until he is in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The answer to Question No. 170 asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be held over until the next Sitting. It is my recollection that two Questions were ready last week. They will be added to those for this week.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6 and 42(5) be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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. F. G. SMITH:

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 to deal with the money Resolutions on the Order Paper for today's Sitting.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

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

1973-74 No. 27

The Resolution for the sum of \$373,184 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Resolution, as hon. Members will recall, the Government is setting up a Coast Guard Service. The coast guard installation is being set up at Oistins Town, Christ Church. The Government in establishing this Coast Guard Service and installation is fulfilling what was agreed to some time ago and for which a Resolution was passed in the sum of \$650,928. This will be remembered by all hon. Members.

This amount, by virtue of further investigations, has proved insufficient to meet the expenses which are due to increased cost of material etc. It was not possible at that time to estimate the cost of the strengthening and protective materials etc. suggested by the United Kingdom Naval Experts and further discussions revealed that additional costs would be \$4,320.

However, Sir, we have since disregarded this recommendation which appears not to be absolutely essential for our needs. The position is, Sir, that it was also discovered that costings had not been included for shipping and insurance of the boats and life rafts for air and sea rescue purposes, making a total of \$109,220.

Then we revised the cost which will now be (a) U.K. content less shore installations; Originally, \$1,718,567.36, now \$1,741,686.53. U.K. content, building, \$85,000, now \$52,418.02. U.K. content, furnishing, \$15,000, now \$25,000. U.K. content, workshop equipment, \$15,000, now \$19,898.78. U.K. content, crane, \$50,000, now \$67,680. U.K. content, radio station, \$120,000; that remains at \$120,000.

U.K. content, fendering, mooring, \$8,000; that also remains at \$8,000. Life rafts, etc., \$8,000, now \$22,400. Local content, building, \$192,000, now \$433,720.98. Building supervision, original estimate, \$28,000, now \$12,929.95.

The whole point is, Sir, that the construction of these boats has gone on apace. The first boat, I understand, was handed over in the U.K. and our High Commissioner in London was present at the handing over ceremony. This boat will be down here soon, I expect at the end of this month, while the other boats will be delivered in June next year, a total of three boats.

Installations at Oistin's Town have also gone on apace, and one result is that land is being reclaimed which can be utilised to the great advantage of this area. 12.40 p.m

If there are any further questions - any questions whatsoever - I will be pleased to answer them, but I think the setting up of a Coast Guard Service here is essential, apart from the fact that we have a rescue service operating in the vicinity of Seawell and with our increased tourist traffic and tourist trade being built up, we have been fortunate in the past that we have not had any accidents as such but we need a service to take care of the 32 jets coming in a day. I do not think that the Coast Guard Service can prevent anybody coming in here like our enemies as such, but it would reduce pilferage and smuggling and a lot of blackmarket that has been going on. So that the Coast Guard Service will serve many purposes apart from providing rescue operations for various services coming into Seawell Airport.

We will be coming here shortly with a Bill for the purpose of providing staff but this is supplementary at this stage and the figures mentioned in the original Estimates are not in keeping with what it actually will cost.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the consideration at the time when this Resolution first came before

the House for the purpose of establishing a Coast Guard Service, certainly in the light of the economic situation as it is today, one would have thought that the Government would have had second thoughts about spending this money at this time on the establishment of a Coast Guard Service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we were promised quite sometime ago a White Paper on the establishment of the Defence Force. I do not know whether this comes under the Defence Force but as yet we have not had any such paper. From the figures given in this Resolution it shows that there is over 50% increase since we passed our Estimates in the month of March this year, and my Party and I feel that the time has come when there must be some cutback in Government spending, and here was an opportunity on the part of the Government to start by cutting back here in the establishment of the Coast Guard Service.

I know that the Leader of the House has spoken about pilferage, smuggling and blackmarket but we have never had any sort of incident of smuggling or pilferage or blackmarket as he has mentioned. To what extent this goes on in Barbados that there is this present need, we do not know. I think we must look at the priorities here and see whether we should have a Coast Guard Service at this stage of our economic development or whether this money could be better spent for the purpose of providing social services wherever these may be necessary at this stage.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I share the view of the hon. Member for the City in that I feel that the Government cannot now justify its attempts to spend this sum of money on establishing a Coast Guard Service as is anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, what is amusing, are the figures which the Leader of the House quoted. Now these boats of which he made mention are to be supplied by a British firm and I think I am right in saying that a contract was entered into for them. As a matter of fact we know that tenders were called for and it is also known that the cheapest tenders were accepted in the particular case. How wise a decision that was on the part of the Government we do not know. I know that after a contract has been entered into, a person can come back to this Government and get more than the other people who were their competitors. However, tenders were asked for. Mr. Chairman, we do not like the method that has been adopted in this case. We do not think that this is a reasonable way of doing business and we ask the Government to reconsider the whole matter as such.

Now we know, Mr. Chairman, that the equipment that has been ordered for these boats is referred to as sophisticated equipment. It will be equipped with radar and all sorts of electronic navigational devices. Our information is that the type of equipment to be supplied is of the highest quality. We are informed

that it is the best standard of equipment available anywhere and we have no doubt about this, but what is worrying us is that we have not had any indication from the Government as to what plans they have for the training of personnel, and my information is that by the end of this month two of the boats should be in Barbados. I know that two are already completed and by the end of February, 1974 the four boats should be in Barbados. 12.50 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, what we are particularly worried about, if they are going to establish this Coast Guard Service, is the manning of these boats. Is it a case where we are going to have this expensive equipment and these specially equipped boats then to have to start training people? I am sure that there are Barbadians who are presently in the British Navy who could be urged to come home and render some sort of service in at last helping to discipline the personnel of our Coast Guard Service and whatever other services we are going to establish. We cannot believe that the Government could be serious in approaching a matter like this in the way they have set out to do so. They have given us no information, except to come and ask for money from time to time, on exactly what is involved. We are hoping that they are not going to set up a semi police marine service and expect that the Coast Guard Service is going to be a Police Force at the same time, because that has been tried in Trinidad and it has been seen that it just cannot work and that is why they use small boats in their marine branch of the service for patrolling the Gulf of Paria.

One thing we have to be very careful about is this. Are we going to have a Coast Guard Service manned by civilian personnel? We have to realise that discipline at sea is of paramount importance and one cannot expect that you are going to take civilians and put them in boats and just expect them to respond to the commands of senior officers or whatever they are, unless we are going to have, like in some other armies, all Generals, and I hardly think that that will be the case. There are also, I am told, some retired Naval Officers, Barbadians, who have retired from the British Navy but who would be willing if they are asked to come and help get the service off to a good start for at least the first three years.

The question of Petty Officers and Ratings. These are matters which I am sure we have got to look into most carefully. We have got to decide if they are going to be Merchant Marine Men, and I believe I am right in saying that at this time we should warn the Government. We know they are presently being advised by a Mariner, a Merchant Marine Man from Israel, and it would be well if Government did not allow itself to be pushed too far in the direction of Israel at this particular time. I am sure that all Members of Government would have to support any such suggestion. We do not know if it is the intention of Government to have the same officer who is presently advising the Government on marine matters to be placed in some particular position of command when this service is established, but I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we expect to see something like a semi military service, and it is the intention of Government to absorb some of the members of our Police Force in this service. I understand that part of the Harbour Police Force is likely to be absorbed in this establishment. I do not think we have a Defence Force as such which would offer any guidance, we do not have any regulations or

anything to guide us with respect to our Coast Guard Service, and while we believe that certain monies which have been entrusted to certain officers who are more or less charged with the responsibility of seeing the service established, and while we have every reason to believe that the accounting of money has been of the highest standard, we still feel that much is lacking and that the Government has not taken perhaps some of its own Members into its confidence in a matter such as this.

For instance; if the Government intends to absorb any part of our Police Force, this brings us to the point where we must ensure that this is done to the good of all. I will make mention of the Police Band here now who are called upon to entertain tourists at Sam Lord's Castle every Wednesday night, but the local people do not get the benefit of hearing the Band at places like the Esplanade or Hastings Rocks. We are warning the Government that if they are going to absorb any part of the Force we are looking forward to seeing that the policemen's services are not utilised only for a select few on board tourist ships or at these various hotels. It is not good enough to take the taxpayers' money and spend it in a manner, in which we see the Government trying to do.

The question of technical assistance with which to start off this Force is one items which the Government has got to look much wider afield than we have seen them look up to the present. We could hardly believe that there is anything in the American Navy that we would wish to import into our local setup here, but there is one thing we would like to warn the Government about. There are too many thousands of hungry people in this country at the present moment who cannot get a day's work for various reasons. The Government itself is buying up a lot of plantations and not cultivating the land, and if the Government would take some of this same money and help the people produce food to serve the nation instead of wasting a Coast Guard Service at this time they would be doing a better job. Help feed the nation and let us see if we can export some aboard.

1.00 p.m

That is what we really want to know at this particular time. I do not know that there is smuggling to the extent that we need all of these ships. Is it that Barbados has now grown to the extent that it is 661 square miles instead of 166 square miles? Why is it necessary to have these boats patrolling the coast?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, Mr.

Chairman. Provision was included in the Estimates in the sum of \$650,000. It is not a question of the principle of the Resolution being challenged. This is merely a Supplementary Resolution to Supplement what has already been accepted in principle by this Honourable House. There is now no question of whether the money should be spent.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the Government had promised us a White Paper on this letter, and the Government is now changing its position. The Government does not care one thing about the people in St. Peter, St. Lucy, St. Andrew or St. Joseph. This Government does not care whether those people starve or walk naked. Why does not the Government take this money and spend it on the polytechnic where boys can be trained to repair pipes?

Mr. Chairman, waterworks is under the portfolio of the Minister of Communications and Works, and we can establish that for ever three months it has been reported to the, Waterworks Department that pipes have been leaking; the reports were recorded at the Waterworks Department, and nothing has been done in the matter. We are asking the Government to take the money allocated for the Coast Guard Service and use it for teaching boys how to mend pipes. The Minister is now telling us that the \$373,184 is merely to supplement what we have already agreed to in principle. Everybody can read and write in here. Let us have a Government White Paper on this matter, so that we can see what the Government intends to do on a matter of this magnitude.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, that the day will come when we will be able to establish a Coast Guard Service. We know that these boats will have to be built by way of a contract. I am not a lawyer, but I think that there should be something in the contract to the effect that the price should hold good for a certain period. Only a few months ago this contract was given to the boat builders, so how is it that there is a 50% increase? I know that the Government had promised to establish a Coast Guard Service. We understand that the Government has entered into a contract with the boat builders, and we know that expensive equipment will be installed in these boats.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At this stage the hon. Member has used up his time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the Government of this country has always set out to fool the inhabitants. As I have said before, time is running out, and the Members of the Government must not think that they can continue to fool the people. When the Government was dealing with the question of Independence, the

Opposition asked for a White Paper. I can remember a Minister telling us that Independence would cost Barbadians \$500,000. Today it is costing us \$3.2 million or more. We are asking for the White Paper which was promised the people of this country on the setting up of a Coast Guard Service. In the first instance, the Government asked for \$650,928, but we are now spending something like \$1.02 million and we have not yet seen a White Paper. What will be the recurring costs of this exercise? That is what we want to know. The Members of the Government should not come here, from time to time, asking us to vote money without giving us a White Paper setting out things in detail. (Asides.)

I do not mean the "Defender of the Faith" over there, because he has lost his senses a long time ago. He will try to heckle me, because his friends are in the Gallery. He has joined Robinson Crusoe.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I have always behaved in this House as I have been behaving today, and.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order. The hon. Member made no slurs about anybody.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that he has joined Robinson Crusoe. They want to get washed up at Oistin's Town again, but the time will come when the people in this country will not take this type of treatment any longer. Where is all of this smuggling I have been hearing about? If people are smuggling, it is due to the fact that the cost of living is so high that they cannot buy things legitimately. When you enter into an agreement with people to supply certain goods, it will be necessary to have a contract. Where is the contract? We do not know what is going on. We are merely asked to vote money all the time, and we are going to record our displeasure by taking certain action when the time comes.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, we have already taken a decision on the question of establishing a Coast Guard Service. The money asked for in this Resolution is to enable the Government to honour its commitments. If the Government does not honour its commitments, then it will lose the money already paid out. A number of things have changed since the inception of this matter. There is the content in the United Kingdom and also the content in Barbados. Labour, the cost of steel, the cost of cement, and the cost of almost everything has gone up tremendously since this matter was introduced in this Chamber.

So far as the question of a contract is concerned, the hon. Member, who spoke last, is aware of the fact that certain clauses are included in contract. 1.10 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order. Hon. Members cannot refer to me as knowing something which has not been presented to me. I have said that this Chamber has not had the privilege of seeing the contracts or the White Paper, and built into a contract are provisions, and if it is a fixed contract, we would like to know. The Hon. Minister cannot use his knowledge of something that has not been shown to us and then say that I am aware of it.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, what I am speaking about is general knowledge. The hon. Member should know from his experience in legal practice that they are framed in such a way as to protect the tender from escalating costs.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I would not like to get up so many times. On a point of order, if the information of the Hon. Minister is that there are several contracts, I would like to hear what kind of contracts the Government has drawn up.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

What I was saying earlier is that there has been an increase in the costs and as a result of the increases, this Resolution is necessary. We hope that the money now being asked for will be enough to meet the needs. We know that all over the world, prices have been going up. In Barbados they have been going up, some which can be explained, and some which cannot be readily explained.

In the United Kingdom prices have gone up and we are faced with the question of whether we want to lose the money we have already paid out by not honouring the contract, or if we should not honour it in a slightly different form. We have a period of five years to pay the money for the setting up of this Coast Guard Service. Already this year the Government has come here and talked about what is involved in the setting up of the Service. I am not in a position to say why a White Paper has not been presented; but I have every reason to believe that the White Paper will be presented in due course.

It seems to me that we have to vote this money, and I do not feel that there is any need at this time to

dilate on a matter already agreed to in principle by the House. These problems already existed when this matter was brought to the House, and it was then that these matters should have been brought to the attention of the House,

Mr. Chairman, the problems which have been aired here today should be dealt with in a different manner. We do not need to talk about the necessity of having a Coast Guard Service in relation to providing food. No one will deny that there is the necessity to provide food or to step up agricultural production; but these are matters which can be dealt with specifically and not in relation to the setting of a Coast Guard Service. That is trying to confuse people by trying to relate the setting up of this service to other matters which can be dealt with on an entirely different basis.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I must support my colleagues on this side of the House. As we see it, Mr. Chairman, what we are concerned with is, what are the priorities at this particular time? If the Government is going to claim that one of the priorities high on the list is the setting up of the Coast Guard Service because of pilfering and increased traffic at Seawell Airport and that it may assist in the event of any accidents we may have at Seawell Airport, we cannot support this.

In the absence of the promised White Paper we cannot agree to this. We took the Government at its word that they would present Parliament with a White Paper. Now they have come back and asked for an additional \$373,184, and the Minister has not had the courtesy to say why the White Paper has not been laid. Now, they are asking us to support them by voting this additional amount. What kind of watch dogs of the people's finances would the Opposition be, if we allowed something of this nature to go through? We have found on several occasions this failure to keep promises made by the Government, not only in its Manifesto, but in statements made by Ministers on the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot just take the taxpayers for a ride. As my colleague said, there is so much to be done in the field of agriculture, in the Ministry of Health, in the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, that there is need for more money in those directions. Those are the priorities as far as we are concerned.

What kind of nonseise is it to come here talking about pilfering as if it only started in 1973? I think that it is at the airport and the seaport where you get problems of pilfering. This Government is not a Government of priorities. They build buildings as a matter of prestige- We heard the Prime Minister say that we will have an army. I am told that they have appointed a Commanding Officer. I am reliably informed that the Commander of this so-called Navy has already been appointed, and we have heard absolutely nothing.

The Addendum says that as a result of the increased costs in building materials, equipment, installation and shipping, the provision in the Estimates has proved to be inadequate.

I would imagine, Mr. Chairman, that if the Government is going to set out to spend a sum of \$650,000, that there would be a contract drawn up. If we sit here and say nothing, they can come back and say that we need another \$50,000 because of the energy crisis, and the taxpayers will be called upon to pay this additional sum of money. 1.20 p.m.

We need a definite statement from the Government as to what is the policy on this Coast Guard Service. That is what we would like to know and that is why we must oppose this Resolution. We do not oppose the principle of setting up a Coast Guard Service but we oppose the indifferent way the Government treats the people of this country. Right now there is very little money in the Treasury, there are the old age pensioners in Barbados getting just \$8 a week.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You are out of order.

Mr. CRAIG:

Don't shout at me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You will take your seat.

Mr. CRAIG:

I say don't shout at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Will you take your seat?

Mr. CRAIG:

I told you do not shout at me, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

If hon. Members do not understand what I mean when I speak, I will clarify it. I am saying that the subject of the old age pensioners at this stage is completely out of order, and you will discontinue your address on that subject.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I am talking on a money Resolution which means the passing of money out of the Treasury and if I make remarks that the old age pensioners' money should be increased rather than use \$373,184 to set up a Coast Guard Service, you cannot rule me out of order. I do not accept your ruling. I am dealing with a money Resolution for \$373,184 and I am stating that the old age pensioners get \$8 a week and rather than taking out that money again to spend on a Coast Guard Service something should be done for the old age pensioners, and you rule me out of order. Where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise. Might is not always right, Sir. I have said on the floor of the House on more than one occasion that whether it be this party that gets into power, or that party over there, I would not want to be in any Government that gets 18 seats. It is regrettable if any Government in any part of the world gets 18 seats, for if this happens it is the electorate that suffers, not the Opposition, and I will never want to get a seat in any Government that gets 18 seats in this country because it is the country that is ignored, not the Members of the Opposition. The people in the country are those who are ignored, and here it is today - it is a disgrace that the Government can come down and ask for this money, and not having (a) a White Paper, or (b) not having any policy on the setting up of the Coast Guard Service. We do not have a clue of what is going on and I doubt whether the others on that side over there have any clue of what is going on either. We cannot agree to this when there are so many other things to do in this country. We cannot support this Resolution (a) in the absence of a White Paper and (b) since we cannot tell what this would cost in another nine months. In the light of what I have just said, we on this side will not support this Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remark just made by the last speaker, I can only draw certain conclusions from what he said. He said if his party won the Government and got 18 seats he would not want to be associated with that party, so I assume that when they ran 24 -

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to get into any combat today because I do not have

any friends in the Gallery. I am not like the other side. I am not afraid of anybody on this side or that side. What I did say was that when a Government gets 18 seats in its party, the interest of the people is ignored.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

When they ran at the last election I suppose they must have told the jokers that they were running, but they did not want to get in. Fancy, he is Deputy Leader of the Opposition and he would not like his own party to have 18 seats. This Government, since independence has.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member is not speaking on the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

A moment ago he questioned your ruling and refused to sit down. What I am saying is that Barbados is an Island surrounded by sea. I am not pretending.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order. What I would like to say is that the first statement the hon. Member has made for the year is just what he has just said.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is that all around us in Barbados is sea. There is nothing between Africa and Bathsheba, and this Government since independence has not gone in for any big shows; we do not have aeroplanes nor an army, and for the first time the Government realizing that with die increased number of yachts that come to Barbados, there is the possibility of their using the coast to bring, in things not permitted by law, the Government has now come to the decision that we must have protection for our coast, and therefore when the Government took the decision, which this House supported - if you check the record you will find that the House agreed on this, and the Opposition did not divide the House - so once they accepted die principle of providing four boats they have to accept the principle of buying them. 1.30 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we said that the House agreed in principle on the promise that there would have been a White Paper, but you have now come back for more money and there is no

White Paper so we cannot support it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, if he was honest with himself...

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I object to the Minister intimating that I am dishonest.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg your pardon, I said if he is honest with himself, I did not say he was dishonest.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, he has imputed dishonesty to me.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I will withdraw it, Sir. What I am saying is that the question of the White Paper on this Resolution is not relevant because the House has already voted the sum of \$650,000. This is just to pay for the operation of the same principle they voted for without the White Paper. When the Government comes to the House for money to run the Coast Guard Service, when the ships arrive in the Island, then the obligation to give the House a White Paper arises. The House voted \$650,000, the principle of having a Coast Guard Service was accepted, and when we were dealing with the Drugs Act, the Opposition agreed that the Coast needed policing, so all this Resolution is doing is to give effect to what was agreed on and it is supplementing a vote which the whole House agreed should be incurred from the Consolidated Fund.

This is not the end of the Coast Guard, we have to come to the House and tell you who the Officers are, we have got to come to the House from time to time for money to tell you how many Ratings there are, how many seamen first class, what is the composition of the Coast Guard Service, and in those circumstances, the Government is bound to honour its commitment to the Opposition by giving them a White Paper, and if this is not done then criticism would be legitimate. (Asides). The people gave us 18 seats, we did not grab them, we went to the elections in 1971 and Government has exercised its high regard for democracy because with the 18-6 majority we could have abolished you but we did not do it.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, do you see what is turning over in the mind of the hon. Member?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I think what is going to happen to the DLP is that the people might take away some of the seats because we have not exercised it as we ought to. I agreed that the Government is bound to give the House a White Paper when we depart from the principle on which the House agreed, and this Resolution is not telling you the salaries of the officers or how many Ratings, it is just to supplement a vote for which we are already committed, if when we come to the House setting up the service as such, when the boats arrive, we have to vote salaries for them, money for food and money for every aspect of the operation, and this is why I say that the question of the White Paper is not relevant at this stage, but when we are coming to the House to ask for a supplementary vote on an item agreed to you do not need a White Paper. Do you notice they have not told you at what point the Government promised a White Paper? We will give you a White Paper, all we are saying is - and this is Government's honest and sincere view - that since we are not departing from the principle which has been accepted, and since we are bound to pay for the boats we have ordered, at this point in time a White Paper is not obligatory. We promised the Opposition that when we get the boats and put them into service we will give them a White Paper. I could take this sheet of paper and write one for you now.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Sir, is it not that the hon. Member is trying to mfake a fool of the House? No matter he has been moved from being Attorney General to road building-Mr. CHAIRMAN No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If I were in the Opposition and I wanted to know the total cost of a Coast Guard Service, I would ask, but what can the Government tell the Opposition at this point in time other than that four boats have been ordered for \$X thousand?

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, is the Minister really saying that they have ordered four boats and do not know what the recurrent expenditure of a Coast Guard Service is?

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I think that if there was any need to reassure the Opposition that it was necessary to vote against this request for a Supplementary it is the speech made by the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, because the latter part of his speech was a complete disclosure of the ineptness of this Government in running the affairs of this country and having no proper plan to present to Parliament, and secondly, not taking Parliament into its confidence before setting out on a venture of this nature. I recall very vividly the time when the initial paper dealing with this Head of Expenditure was brought to this Chamber and indeed to this Committee. It was brought at a time after the main papers dealing with Capital Expenditure and Recurrent Expenditure had been circulated and the Hon. Prime Minister who is also Minister responsible for Defence and Security then set out in his introduction - and it is one of the few times that he gave much discourse to any of the Heads of Expenditure, either Capital or Recurrent - he set out very briefly some of the reasons why he thought it necessary to establish a Coast Guard Service. 1.40 p.m.

Very soon thereafter the Opposition asked the Minister to disclose as soon as possible in a White Paper the cost of the service: What would be its recurrent cost, and what would be its capital needs. This was done in March, 1973, and this is not the first time the Opposition has been calling on the Government to present to this House a White Paper setting out its policy in relation to the defence needs of Barbados.

Some time last year, when we were called upon to discuss the setting up of a Regiment, we were told rather casually that it was the intention of the Government to have a Defence Force. At that time the Opposition asked the Government for a White Paper setting out its proposals for a Defence Force. I am satisfied, after hearing the Minister of Health and Welfare and another Minister, that the Government has not exactly formulated in its mind up to this stage its plans, nor does it know the exact cost, or indeed even the approximate cost - recurrent or capital - of the Defence Force for this country. It seems that the plan of the Government is a haphazard one, and it has to make decisions on the spur of the moment. The Opposition is expected to vote with the Government in spite of this attitude. i

Mr. Chairman, it has always been a fundamental Parliamentary principle that when the Government gives an undertaking it should stick to it. The Opposition is asked to vote at the last moment on the presentation of Heads of Expenditure, but the Government is afraid to disclose certain things to the Opposition. The Government has already given an undertaking to the Opposition to present a White Paper, and the Government should not now go back on its word. This is not the time for hon. Members to come here and say that this is not the time for the presentation of a White Paper.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be taken as a frivolous matter. Tuesday after Tuesday this attitude is being manifested in here. I doubt whether there is any other country, where Parliamentary democracy is fundamental, that treats a House with the scant respect that this Government treats this House. No Member of the Government Party who is a backbencher in this House, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, or even the Chairman of Committees is in a position to know the full details about Capital Expenditure or Recurrent Expenditure. If the Members of the Government fell like abolishing the Opposition, then I am very sorry for them. There are many ways of treating the Opposition and some of your own Members are being irrelevant, and paying scant attention to them is one of those ways. For this reason only, I am going to vote against this Head of Expenditure.

Mr. Chairman, much time has passed since the Government has had the feeling of the House as a whole on the question of the establishment of a Defence Force. A lot has been said about defence and security in Barbados. If it is a question of urgency, then I think we ought to know what we have to defend, how we are going to defend it, and what is the best way to defend it, and so on. I am really thinking in terms of internal and external defence measures. I am also thinking about the dangers posed by external forces in the Caribbean and of our economic unity.

I believe, contrary to some of the views of Members on the other side, that the failure of the Caribbean countries to keep together politically has thrown a lot of problems on them. We should not now be dealing with an isolated item regarding the Coast Guard Service. We should be dealing with an overall plan, and, in conjunction with the other Commonwealth Caribbean territories, we should be thinking of the establishment of a common Defence Force which is able to move at a fast rate of speed from territory to territory without undue expenditure to the inhabitants of the Commonwealth Caribbean.

Contrary to what hon. Members on the other side may think, I believe that when we reversed the course of history in these territories by moving away from closer political union, we also reversed the rate of development in these areas. We should not turn lightly aside from that concept. I want to know what has taken place at the Heads of Governments Conference with regard to the internal and external defence of Barbados. I think the Government should make a full disclosure to the people of this country, if not to the people's representatives in this Parliament. It is not good enough for the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues to attend these Conferences from time to time without telling us of the decisions reached as a result of these discussions. In my view the Prime Minister is not doing the right thing if he does not make a full disclosure not only to the Cabinet, but to this House.

Mr. Chairman, on this occasion, I would have expected the Acting Prime Minister to have taken the House into his confidence, or to have informed us that a White Paper would be coming before this Honourable Chamber at a specified time. Mr. Chairman, a part of the external defence must be dealt

with in conjunction with the Treaty commitments of this country. We have a Treaty commitment with the United States and we have the presence of the United States base in this country. That Treaty is ripe for negotiation this year. In that Treaty there should be an arrangement whereby some form of technical assistance should be given by the United States for the training of people who will be working in the Coast Guard Service of this country.

I should like to know from the Government whether it intends to extend the life of this Treaty, and what are the external benefits. I should like to know from the Government whether it is its intention to share the defence of its territorial waters with the Coast Guard Services of Jamaica, Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago, bearing in mind what may be done for the defence of the Associated States. In the meantime, I realised that the United Kingdom Government is responsible for the defence of the Associated States, and we should like to know whether the Government has any technical arrangements with the United Kingdom Government in this respect. Mr. Chairman, these are weighty issues which should not be ignored in this House. It means that early next year the

Leader of the House should permit us to have a Special debates on this matter.

Finally, I should like to deal with the question of the escalating cost of things. We should have known when the original Estimates were presented, what the costings were. I am not going to blame civil servants for what has been done. It is possible that the costings were done years ago. Even if the figures were arrived at in March, then between March and November there should not have been such an enormous disparity between the figures. We would like to know more about this matter, because we are not in a position to speak as hon. Members who speak from the front bench of the Government side. 1.50 p.m.

It really is an enormous increase which is not properly explained; and simply to use, as we are using too often in this country, the excuse of the accelerating costs outside is not enough. It seems to me that there are many items of Government expenditure which are not properly costed, and so the true commitment is not known. It is unfair to the Government to say that the Opposition must be bound to a principle if you have done two things (1) brought in your vote all too suddenly and asking the House to deal with it right-a-way, and (2) you have brought in an estimate which has proved to be even worse than what you call a "guesstimate".

If the Government has to chop and chaise it should be more candid with us and these figures should be much more accurate. I believe that the circumstances outlined on this side justified the Opposition not voting for this Head regardless of whether CMC not the ultimate vote will be with the Government

using its numbers. There are few who have individual consciences to vote against the Party, and the best they can do is to vote willy nilly. We recognise that. We hope that in time it will be recognised that it was on these grounds that the Opposition could not vote for this Resolution.

Mr. WALCOrr:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Christ Church West spoke about voting willy nilly. It seems to me that those remarks apply to him because he voted willy nilly with his Party, and his Party after having heard the arguments of the Government voted with the Government in this matter for the sum of \$650,000.

This Sir, is only a bogus argument. How foolish can you be to vote \$650,000 for the Government to build boats and after building the boats come and say we will vote for additional money for it provided you can give us a White Paper. You have got to be more than a village idiot. You have given a promise to build the boats already. You have given the green light, and it is only now hindsight on their part. Why did they not say when they voted the \$650,000 that that was their proviso, that that proviso could have come in? Why did they not state that they were satisfied that this amount would build the boats and that they would not give one cent more? It was not a token vote in which they were voting for a principle. They were agreeing to build four boats, to put four boats in the sea. They agreed to build these boats and they agreed that the Government should spend \$650,000. If that has not proved enough to build the boats, how can they say now as a matter of principle that they would not vote for the remainder of the money needed, that they will keep the boats out in the sea? You could only be a class idiot.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that a Member of this House is a class idiot is unparliamentary, insulting and uncalled for.

Mr. WALCOTT:

That is a word in the dictionary.

Mr. FORDE:

There are many words which are dictionary words - like thief, robber, fool and coward which are yet unparliamentary. I respectfully suggest that to refer to a Member as a class idiot is unparliamentary language. If not, I can only assume that the hon. Member is also a class idiot.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the remarks if I was specifically saying that the Member for Christ Church West was a class idiot. I said that one could only be a class idiot. When we say that one could only be a class idiot you cannot ask that those words be withdrawn.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, if I may refer to May's Parliamentary Practice you will see that a Member may say something by innuendo which can apply only to X and if you read it in its context, it must be unparliamentary.

Mr. WALCOTT:

You cannot ask a Member to withdraw an unnuendo unless the innuendo is direct. If you say that one can only be a class idiot to say so and so there is no point of objection in that. If I can refer to the Member directly, a Member was suggesting that the Vote we are dealing with is a matter of principle which the Opposition cannot support. The Member said that party Members will vote willy nilly for their side.

If the Member feels that those words apply to him and are offensive, I can withdraw them and use other words. I can say that a man would be bereft of any parliamentary sense to suggest that there is any justification after that long speech for voting against the Resolution when the Opposition has already voted \$650,000 for this purpose.

Let us show how they would run the Government of this country if they were in power. They would agree that the Government can build four boats. Then they would leave the boats where they are and then say do not spend one cent more on them. That would lead to wastage of money. How can you run a Government that way? I would have to be an idiot to be a Member of a Party like that. I would have to be an idiot to allow them to do that. They say that they are going to vote against the Resolution. How could anyone after you have \$1/2 million expended on this project, and then ask for \$300,000 more to complete it say that you are not going to support it. 2,00 p.m.

I do not see how it is that the hon. Member can say that he will vote against this because he does not have a White Paper, because a White Paper in so far as the service is concerned is not relevant to completing the boats; so I am surprised that those hon. Members should be saying that they will not vote for it.

The hon. Member over there felt that he had to be in a chorus; he feels that he cannot go against that kind of chorus over there and that all of them had to be singing in the same key; he felt that all of them should not be singing in different keys. His intelligence would show him that he should not go around all the time with this kind of nonsense saying he is showing solidarity. Solidarity what? His solidarity is like an empty skillet. (ASIDE: And why did you march this morning?) I marched to let you see what Solidarity is. If I were not in here now the statements of those hon. Members over there would be different, because they might be asking the Government to pass a Resolution against the march, but we are here now so they have to face the music.

Those who said that they will not vote for this Resolution on a matter of principle will realize that there is no principle involved whatsoever because the Resolution is for a Supplementary Vote. The very Opposition Members voted for this when it came before the House in the first instance and it is crass madness for the Opposition to decide today that they are going to vote against it...

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since I have already made my speech, I would like to know what would be the final cost of this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

There is no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT:

So Mr. Chairman, I am saying that when the Members of the Opposition say that they are Voting against it on a matter of principle, this is entirely irrelevant. They are only singing a nonsensical chorus.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, when you listen to the debate here today you will think that Members of the Opposition are novices and have come in here for the first time, because this is something that has been approved of by all in this Chamber without any dissenting voice, I have already read all the figures; I have given the original cost and the new cost. This is a question today of each Member of the Opposition sounding a wrong note - one starting a wrong note and the others joining him and going wrong. It is a matter of being misled in the worst possible way. They are asking for a White Paper but what...

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What are we to understand? We have raised a question about the White Paper in relation to this question of the establishment of the Coast Guard Service. I do not see that there is anything wrong in that for him to say that we are misled.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I have given the capital cost already. The non-recurrent expenditure for the current financial year 1973-74 will be (1) 15% down payment on 1st April, 1973, \$270,684.72. (2) 2% financial charge on 1st April, 1973, \$36,091.30. (3) second 15% down payment on 1st December, 1973, \$270,684.72. (4) local cost of shore installation, \$433,720.98, (5) building provision, \$12,929.95, making a total of \$1,024,111.67. The capital expenditure approved on the 15th March, 1973, was \$650,928, and this was agreed on by everybody when the Prime Minister explained this matter. I am Aot going to explain everything in detail again. Tile Supplementary how requested is \$373,18767 so that makes a total of \$1,024,111.67.

Mr. CRAIG:

We would like to know what is the final cost, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Member who is Leader of the House is trying to explain to the Chamber the cost but he is reading 15% of so and so, date, so much; 15% of so and so, date, so much, but what we would like to know is 15% of how much.

Mr. CHAIRMAN :

There is no point of order. 2.10 p.m.

The question that the Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. P. G. SMITH, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GRfiAVES, Mr. J. B. SPRINGER, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN -11.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLOEN and Mr. H. deB. FORDE - 5.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. CHAIRMAN, reported progress and asked for hbve to sit again Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour, that is, until 3.15 p.m.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly. 2.15p.m. On resumption --

Mr. SPEAKER:

This Sitting is now resumed. When the Sitting was suspended, the House was in Committee of Supply dealing with a money Resolution, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair. The House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there was an undertaking that we would have dealt with Question Time at this stage.

Hon. F. G. SMTTH:

You cannot deal with questions when Mr. Chairman is in the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You should have dealt with the matter when Mr. Speaker was here.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1973-74 No. 28

The Resolution for the sum of \$677,586 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I give Members of the Opposition the assurance that, after we get through with the Resolutions, we will have Question Time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, that statement certainly is not in keeping with the cordial relationship which the Opposition hopes to have with this Government. After going through a long series of Standing Orders, the Opposition cannot now ask questions. There are questions which have been filed in here since Thursday last week, and I have been told that, because they have been held up some where, I will have to ask them later in the day. If the attitude is that the Government will do what it wants and then the Opposition will have an opportunity to ask questions, then it will mean that hon. Members on that side, who do not want to form a quorum, can prevent us from having our Private Members' Business done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

That matter should have been discussed when the Speaker was in the Chair, and it cannot be discussed now.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker said to wait, and then he walked away. The Leader of the House now says that, when he gets through with his business, he will start with ours.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I said that, as soon as we have dealt with the Resolutions, we will deal with the questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

The Leader of the House said that, and the hon. Member may proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, this is a straightforward Resolution. If hon. Members are so anxious to get their questions done, then they will not waste time on this matter. With regard to Item 16 - House Allowance, the Housing Allowance payable to the Director of Civil Aviation has been increased from \$900 to \$1,320 per annum by the Chief Establishment Officer, and a supplementary in the sum of \$420 is needed to meet the increase.

With regard to Item 24 - Maintenance of equipment - the sum of \$4,380 provided in the current year's Estimates has proved inadequate to meet the cost of repairs to the baggage conveyor system because of major breakdowns from time to time. Supplementary provision in the sum of \$4,000 is accordingly sought to meet additional expenses under this item.

With regard to Item 29 - Travelling -\$21,600. As a result of the awards of new contracts for the transportation of staff, which came into effect from the 1st August, 1973, the sum of \$21,600 provided under this Item in the Estimates has proved inadequate • An additional sum of \$2,000 a month will now be necessary. Meanwhile the revised rate, which will be an additional \$120 a week, has been agreed to as an interim measure for transporting staff between the expiry of the old contract and the signing of the new contract, which will be 13 weeks.

Now the sum required in respect of the revised rate for 13 weeks is \$1,560. The additional contract fee for 7 months is \$14,000, making a total requirement of \$15,560.

With regard to Item 32 - Cleaning -\$52,000 - this amount has proved inadequate as a result of new contract arrangements, which came into effect on the 1st July, 1973, for cleaning services. The new contract calls for \$7,130 per month as against \$4,250, which is an increase of \$2,880 per month, making a total requirement of \$25,920 to meet commitments under this Item to the end of the current financial year, March, 1974. These are the explanations, Sir.

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, the first thing I want to speak about under Head 20 is the maintenance of equipment. Once again I have to say that when one hears statements being made in this Chamber, one has to take them with a pinch of salt in order to get them to go down, but it will be better to ignore any statement in this Chamber. Now time and again Ministers of the Government have come to this House and told us about the extension of Seawell. The Minister of Tourism has told us about the large number of people who will be visiting this country and will be passing through our Airport. We have heard about the number of aircrafts and the new airlines that will be visiting Seawell Airport; yet you can find Seawell Airport looking dirty, and it is far behind international standards so far as international Airports are concerned.

Sir, I already have substantive questions drafted in relation to Seawell International Airport. For months I have been visiting Seawell International Airport. I have seen television sets installed up there, but I have never seen anything on them. I understand that the quality of the television is poor; what is printed is so fine that nobody can read it; and the sound is poor. I would really like to know who installed them. The Minister can save me the trouble of submitting my substantive questions by telling me who installed those television sets.

With regard to the baggage conveyor system, as the hon. Member for St. Michael West would say, only a first-class idiot would put down a baggage conveyor system with two sections thereby forcing passengers at Seawell to run from place to place in order to find their baggage.

Is that what the developers of Seawell International Airport had in mind? I was at Seawell Airport on Sunday night, and I saw passengers going on both sides of the baggage conveyor system in order to collect their baggage. 3.30 p.m.

How in the name of Christ can you tell me that you are going to develop an international airport and put in two minute systems when you say that you have plans to improve the airport so as to accommodate the Jumbo jets? All that they do is to spend money on contractors to do things piece by piece.

They have increased the housing allowance of the Director of Civil Aviation. I am not going to say whether it is right or wrong. I am not going to say whether it is enough or not enough, but one thing I would like the Government to tell me is why must policemen at Seawell have to move their beds at night if the rain begins to fall. They are housed in a building, which, I am informed, has been condemned for years now. Yet they have to use it, and the 28 policemen housed at Seawell are complaining that every time the rain falls they have to move around the furniture and beds to save the water from falling on them. That is something that should be explained; I would like to know what is going on.

To go a bit further, there is a situation at Seawell International Airport where particularly on Sunday evenings when you get two Trans Canada Airline flights coming in, you get two health officers and two policemen on duty. You pay the health officers but the policemen are not paid and cannot use the balance. It is causing discord between the policemen and the health officers. The policemen want to know why the health officers doing this same job are paid travelling allowance and the policemen doing the same job cannot get travelling allowance.

I now come to the question of cleaning. You only have to go into the Departure Lounge if you are going out and you will see how the cleaning looks. I do not know who the contractors are but I think that for the money they are getting, Seawell International Airport could look a bit tidier especially on Sundays.

We know that there are contracts awarded, and when the estimates came up for Seawell previously there was a figure put in for cleaning. This once again brings us to the point as to whether or not the Government enters into contracts with these various contractors who after being awarded a contract can do as they like. That is evident from the example of the Housing Authority. On the last occasion that we were debating these contracts I asked if they can charge at large and do what they feel like. That is strange because in another department it would not be done that way.

As far as I know, when you are tendering you have to submit to the proper authority what you are going to do the job for. It seems to me that every department has to come back asking for 50% or 80% over the sum originally awarded. This reflects completely bad planning by the Government or its officers. It can only reflect bad preparation of the Estimates by those who are in charge. When the Minister of Communications and Works can tell us that we have voted for one thing already and that therefore we should now vote for the increased estimates, it means either that the Government did not come down in the first instance and tell the people what it would cost or that it is bad planning by the Planning Committee as to what money they wanted. We in the Opposition are taking a very dim view of Government's performance in this respect.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with one criticism made by the last hon. Member. If he had read the Addendum he would see that the contract expired during the financial year. If a contract for travelling expires in August and the contract was for \$X and because of circumstances you have to come for a supplementary for \$Y which is more than \$X, it is not a question of the contract escalating but new circumstances,.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Hon. Minister has completely lost his senses. The Government, if it came down in March and had no idea that the cost would rise because of increases to be given to Civil Servants, I do not know what to say.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Here is a position where you agree to a contract being carried out for \$X. The contract expires during the financial year. How could the Government predict what the increased figure was going to be? And you hear this colossal nonsense. Would not the Government in these circumstances, have to come with a Supplementary Resolution?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Do not let the Hon. Minister mislead the House. Why talk about gasoline? They are using the energy crisis to save themselves.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Let us say that you have a contract to do something for \$X a month. The contract starts in April and it

expires at the end of July. Originally you had put in for \$X a month multiplied by the number of months. Suddenly you find - let me read the Addendum. (Asides.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am on my feet. I am drawing it to the attention of hon. Members for the last time that under Standing Order No. 33(6) Members must maintain silence except when called upon to speak by the Chair. I am asking both sides to maintain silence.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, all that I am saying is that if we have a contract with A to carry people to the airport and the contract expires during the financial year, can the Government predict what the new contract figure is going to be? If the contract price increases for whatever reason, would not the Government have to come with a Supplementary Estimate? What is all this talk about the Government not knowing what these figures are going to be? 3.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If we understand the Addendum, both services are done by contract; both of these contracts expired during the financial year, so how can the Government tell how much this will cost is what I would like to know.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Opposition Members like to get up and criticise the Government as if the Government walks about and gives away money. What I would say.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, is he replying to what I have said? Up to now he does not seem to understand what I said. I said.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Sit. I have already ruled that I must decide when any hon. Member gets up in this Chamber on a point of order; I must hear and determine what is a point of order. I have already asked for both sides to be silent when any hon. Member is on his feet. I am not going to accept this kind of behaviour from hon. Members. I will hear the point of order from the hon. Member.

Mr. BOLPEN:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the hon. Member to accuse me of raising any opposition about the travelling contract. On a point of elucidation. What I said is that the Government has not been taking into serious consideration its contracts because it looks like a contract can be made today and the people can come back again at some other time for more money; it seems to me that the people are not making right contracts.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, some hon. Members like to provoke fun. Some of them speak about a conveyor as if they are authorities on a conveyor belt, and as if it is something wrong to have a conveyor belt coming one way and not another. We have a conveyor belt at Seawall International Airport and some criticise the conveyor belt at Seawall International Airport as if it is different from those at other airports. They have conveyor systems all over the world and somehow people seem to have the idea that nothing goes wrong with a system in Barbados. There is no reason to criticise the conveyor system on the basis on which the hon. Member is criticising it, unless he is a one-sided man. In most cases at any airport, you have to go in one way and you pick up your baggage and you go the other side, but where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise. He does not know. You go to the airport and you may get your baggage on a conveyor belt No. 1 and you have to go to No. 2 to receive what you are to receive. If you go to Miami Airport you have to walk as far as from here to Kensington Oval before you get to the airport. In some cases you have to go ever so far before you get to the conveyor belt so I do not know if the hon. Member understands what he is talking about. He does not know himself what he is talking about.

The Minister pointed out that he could not know what the value of the contract was and that a negotiated price could not be put in, and the hon. Member continues to talk nonsense. What I would like to see about Seawall International Airport is that something is done to provide for the confusion you get at the Airport with crowds arriving almost daily and I would like to say that if the Government is making plans for improving the landing facilities at Seawall, adequate staff and personnel must be provided to cope with the number of people at the Airport. Since the fuel crisis there is a system of packing more people than usual into the planes and so you are getting more people at the airport than usual. 3.50 p.m.

I arrived at the airport and just could not get in; if it were raining people would have been outside getting wet, and I think the Government should look into this.

I do not know for what reason the policemen at Seawall are placed in this hut, because the hut appears to me not to be fit for policemen, and I would say that whatever airport development is considered this

should be a matter of priority. I would go further and say that steps should be taken to provide them with adequate accommodation as early as possible. They deserve it, and I am sure that everybody agrees that it is most unkind to expect the police to function under those adverse and what I regard as refugee conditions. They would be all right if there was a war going on here and you had to find somewhere to house refugees, but in Barbados the accommodation for the policemen at Seawell International Airport should be more up to date with all the facilities necessary at their disposal.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this Resolution. There is something which has been bothering me for a very long time, and I think I drew it to the attention of the House, but that is the actual behaviour of people at Seawell International Airport. There seems to be a degree of lawlessness which exists among the people employed in various areas, whether they be red caps, air traffic control officers, airline reservation clerks, cleaners or whoever it may be, and you can safely walk into the airport at any time and hear the transistors blaring and a lot of obscene language being spoken. I think that in this area, the police should have not only better quarters but their numbers should be strengthened. You will observe that the police at Seawell come into contact with the tourists and visitors before anyone else, and I would imagine that they should be hand-picked people who know their jobs and are in a position to give all the relevant information to people who are coming into the country and not to be out there in an area where they cannot really be seen.

Some of the police feel that they come to a dead end when they are sent to Seawell but I do not feel so, as I said before, they should be people hand-picked and in a position to do a good job. Some of them carry themselves very neatly attired and I think this augurs well for them. I like to see people being neat and tidy. I feel these are the type of people you need there, people who are interested in their jobs. I would even go further and say that they should be au fait with all aspects of Seawell International Airport. We may have some emergency at some time and they should be able to go upstairs and control air traffic, etc. I have already spoken in Parliament about the bad behaviour at Seawell, and I believe that if the numbers of the police are strengthened, they would be able to control this a little better, but it is not a good thing to hear that kind of obscene language which is being used up there.

As far as the VIP lounge is concerned, this is apparently a place for members of the Government Party and their friends. I wish to emphasise friends, because a lot of them use it as a short cut. I have seen friends of high ranking Members of the Government use it to go out to the aircraft wearing muddy shoes and you do not know if they are going to place a bomb or anything like that, but I feel that the VIP lounge should be closely guarded. People go there to discuss very important matters, and if it is open to the public at large something might happen. By accident I pushed the door at one time and I was surprised to find it open, but I am told that some of these people have keys. I do not feel that Government's money is to be spent in this manner, but you have a VIP lounge which should be given the necessary security it deserves.

I would not like to refer to the cleaning service at Seawell International Airport for personal reasons, since I am involved in a Travel Agency in Barbados, but I leave this for the Member for St. Michael West who criticised the airport during the last Estimates. I would think that the Government should pay some attention to the three areas which I mentioned: (a) the behaviour at the airport, (b) that the police should be hand-picked people, and (c) the security of the VIP lounge.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to speak at length on this Resolution, but the Member for St. James touched upon a point I have raised on many occasions in this Chamber, that is, the security at Seawell International Airport. I would like to see established a Special Port Department Police with the responsibility for the security of the Deep Water Harbour and the airport.. It is becoming increasingly necessary, and when last year I raised the question of the disappearance from Seawell Airport of certain mail it brought no response from the Minister concerned, but at some later stage, when one of his back benchers raised it, he said it was true.

The point raised about the people using the VIP lounge is something which a port department police could deal with if the Government establishes this branch of the Force. Some time ago we were told that the Government had appointed a consultant engineer and we were promised a statement - not a White Paper this time - at a stage when his work would have been completed. As far as I am aware, the report has been handed to the Government but as yet we have not had that full statement on the actual development of the airport. 4.00 p.m.

I do not mean piecemeal statements by any Minister going on television or something like that. I am referring to a full, frank, statement as to the overall development of Seawell Airport. I should like to know how many runways the Government proposes to build, how many terminal buildings will be erected, and what other developments the Government has in mind for Seawell International Airport. I look forward to the Hon. Minister telling us something about these matters when he replies. That is all I wish to say on this matter at this stage.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to speak on this item at all. I do not want to raise the point that, in our efforts to get the Airport completed, it had to be closed at night after eleven o'clock. If I do that it will only bring to light the fact that the Minister decided to keep the Airport open to allow Dr. Richie Haynes to land in Barbados. I believe that the Acting Minister of Finance should be called upon to pay the expenses involved in that decision out of his pocket. It was necessary to keep Policemen and other people up there working overtime. It must be remembered that Seawell Airport is not the private

property of the Minister to be used for the benefit of his friends. This is the sort of thing we want to see stamped out.

With regard to the maintenance of equipment at Seawell Airport, we must admit that it is costing us too much money. I would really like to know who are the contractors carrying out this maintenance work. It would be very enlightening if the Leader of the House who introduced this Resolution, would tell us who are the contractors carrying out the maintenance work at Seawell International Airport, because we are of the opinion that it is costing us too much money. We find that, in carrying out this maintenance work, the Government is called upon to meet certain expenditure that cannot be justified by anything that bears any relation to reason.

Sir, we are satisfied that there are enough contractors in the Island who can undertake the work, and that certain contractors are holding the Government to ransom in this respect. We have heard what it is costing us monthly, and we believe that it is too much. You install these baggage conveyor belts, and then you find that the maintenance cost for a year, or a part of a year, amounts to more than the cost of the equipment. We cannot continue spending the taxpayers' money in this manner because somebody submits a tender for a year, and then we are faced with the expense of flying a man down here to look after the maintenance of certain things. Let the Government tell us why we have to spend so much money on maintenance.

With regard to the question of cleaning, we appreciate that there is now a larger area to be cleaned than when former contractors were doing the job. When other people were doing the job the place used to be dirty. There were complaints time and time again, and we believe that there will be complaints as long as the Airport remains. We have been asked to provide \$52,000 in the first instance, and we are now asked to provide another \$25,920. I should like to hear what argument the Government is going to adduce in support of this. The Addendum states that the sum of \$52,000 has proved inadequate as a result of new contract arrangements.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to new contract arrangements, we know that you do not negotiate during the month of July, if your contract is coming to an end in July. You have to start negotiating much earlier, because if you find that there is no possibility of carrying on with the same contractors you will have to advertise for other people. In the circumstances, the Government must know well in advance what provision will have to be made for having the work done. Unfortunately, the Government has found itself saddled with people who will make a tender for a certain sum of money because they are friends of the Government, and in three or four months' time they will make further demands on the Government and we will be asked to vote an additional sum of money to enable them to get what they wanted in the first place. They always submit figures that will be accepted by the person dealing with the tenders, but we cannot go on like this.

Mr. Chairman, there are people in this country who are capable of telling you exactly what a job would cost annually. Of course, you will have to take into consideration the fact that labour costs may go up. In entering a contract for work at Seawell International Airport, you must have provision in a clause to take care of the rise in labour costs or in materials. A tender is submitted for a year hence; therefore, in your tender you must make provision for a year hence. We quite appreciate the fact that the Government will have to reconsider the terms of the contracts which it has entered into with particular individuals. We vote money too easily for certain people, and they are making a mockery of the Government and the taxpayers of this country through the system employed by the Government in which there will be found mishandling and mismanagement at Seawell International Airport.

Sir, one goes to Seawell International Airport and one can scarcely hear what is being said, when announcements are being made over the public address system. There are persons who use the system who, to my way of thinking, need some sort of speech training. I do not think the public address system is really bad, but I think that the people who are making the announcements are not speaking clearly. When announcements are made at the Airport, I doubt whether 1% of the people up there can tell you what is coming over. We feel that all of these things should be rectified in order for us to have a better Airport. 4.10 p.m.

The condition of the lavatories at Seawell International Airport leaves much to be desired. The atmosphere at the lavatory is totally forbidding. I invite the Government to look into these things.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, there are a few points on which I would like to reply. I will deal with the last one first. I think that the hon. Member for St. Peter would have been quite right in his remarks up to fairly recently, but it has been my experience that the situation with regard to the lavatories has considerably improved. I confess quite honestly that the Manager of Seawell and I have recently been in the ladies' lavatory and it is much improved.

I would heartily agree with the criticism as far as the public address system is concerned. I have complained about it, and I hope that between us we can get something done to get a proper public address system at Seawell.

There is one point made by the hon. Member for the City to which I would like to reply although he is

not in his seat. That is on the question of the long term development of Seawell International Airport. I have been looking for this final report, for these final plans because we have long wanted to make a model which would be something of the size of the Clerk's table by which people would be able to see what Seawell would look like when this long term project has been achieved.

I can tell the hon. Member for the City that these final plans have not yet been presented to the Government. They will be presented in 1974. The Canadian people are working on it and by early 1974 they will have the final plans presented to the Government. I think that it will be appreciated that when one speaks of final plans for a project that will extend over three years they have to be flexible because of improvements that may have to be made as different situations arise.

I hope that it will be possible to make public early in 1974 the plans for Seawell International Airport, It is not for me to say in what form the presentation to Parliament will be. That is for the Minister of Civil Aviation, but I hope to make it public, soon after the phasing of the development. I hope to have this information early in 1974.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, the new contract price from the 1st August, 1973 was \$3,875 a month, three and a half times what it was in 1970 which was \$1,275 a month. The contract provides for transporting the airport staff from Eagle Hall Corner, St. Michael, to St. Barnabas Church, to St. Philip and Seawell and return nine times per week day. That is a total of 18 trips per week day. On week ends the total number of trips..... (Asides) I am giving the other side full information. They either want it or they do not. I have not just now come in here. I am giving what explanation I have.

Under Item 4, the contract for cleaning, I will explain that the new contract price is \$85,560. The firm carrying out the cleaning service is Home and Of fide Cleaning Limited. The previous contract price agreed on in June, 1971, was \$46,210. As regards the other question which the hon. Member raised.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Would the Minister be so good as to give us the total cost of cleaning?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The new contract price is \$85,560.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

That cannot be correct unless you are coming with another Supplementary Resolution. It is \$52,000 that we have voted so far and now we are being asked for \$25,920.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I read from the original file. The position is that the new contract calls for \$7,130 a month.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I had asked if the Leader of the House had any information on Item 24, the maintenance of equipment contract.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

There is no information in the file. That can be the subject of a substantive question.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, under Item 24, the Minister says that he does not have the information in the file. I wonder if it is one of these Carlton Brathwaite jobs.

The question that Head 20, Civil Aviation, do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 4.20 p.m.

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, this honourable Chamber has approved the principle of providing a subsidized transportation service for the school children of this country and in the Current Estimates approval has been given to the sum of \$1,039,190 for this service under Item 45 of Head 36 - Pupil Transportation. A further provision of \$630,182 is now being requested as a settlement of this particular item in-as-much as the original provision has proved inadequate, and in keeping with the practice in this Chamber, we have come again to this Chamber for it to make the necessary provision.

As the note to the item says: "The undermentioned factors are mainly responsible for the present situation. (1) The under-estimation of the amount required to provide the service in the current financial year is due to the fact that subsequent to the standardization of the fare structure more pupils seem to be using the service; and (2) The increase in the number of pupils requiring more than one bus and consequently the increased use of the transfer tickets which are issued without charge to the pupils."

Mr. Chairman, I need hardly state that the educational services in a country are fundamental to the whole democratic process because it is through these services that the parents in this country can fashion their hopes and aspirations for their children, that the students in our system * can improve themselves, their economic, and social positions; so these services are vital to the whole democratic process here and if these services are so vital so too is the part that the transportation system plays in making these services available, because if we provide schools we have to provide the facilities whereby our children can get to school, and it is because of the fundamental part which education plays in the improvement of our people and with a view to ensuring that as few handicaps as possible are placed on our people in obtaining education, that in 1970 this Government decided to provide a pupil transportation service. I think hon. Members would recall that during the period between August 1970 and July 1972 the issue of tickets to children was based on the system of the purchase of tickets by the Government and the resale of these tickets at 10 cents a day for every journey or 50 cents a week, and this represented a subsidy of approximately 75% of the cost of the service. Transfer tickets were also issued free because it was felt that where someone lived should not be an undue handicap in making use of this service.

Mr. Chairman, in 1972 a decision was taken to subsidize bus fares at \$1.50 a week so that anyone travelling to school would not pay more than \$1.50 a week for the school bus ticket. Since the subsidization of bus fares there has been a considerable increase in the number of tickets issued and in the number of persons using the school transportation system, and particularly the number of children using transfer tickets. Let me give you some of the statistics on this.

During the period immediately before the subsidization - let us take the period April to July 1972 - during that period there were some 80,560 transfers issued while during the period September to December, 1972 some 121,679 transfers were issued (ASIDE: Repeat) I will repeat. In the period April to July 1972 - this is just prior to standardization of bus fares -there were 80,560 transfers issued and in the September to December term of the same year 121,679 transfers were issued. In the period September to December, 1973 the figure has climbed to 145,822 transfer tickets issued.

So, Mr. Chairman, the point I wish to make it that with the introduction of a subsidized bus fares

system there has been a substantial increase in the demand for transfer tickets and these tickets are issued free of cost. It has reached the stage where, because of the increasing cost of this service, the Government has had to take a very close look at this service and a Committee made up of representatives of my Ministry, the Ministry of Finance and Planning, and the Transport Board looked at the system to see how the cost could be contained and reduced, and that Committee having studied the matter indicated that the transfer system was being abused and misused and that a charge for transfer tickets should be introduced. 4.30 p.m.

The proposals therefore to control the system are as follows: The sale of transfer tickets for pupils attending schools within less than a mile of a bus terminus will be discontinued. We have had instances of children who use the bus services coming into, let us say, the Fairchild Street bus stand, they suffer from no physical handicap and they take a second bus to the schools within the Bridgetown area, and we are taking steps to stop this. The sale of transfer tickets at bus depots will also be discontinued and these transfer tickets will be available only at the schools. We are requesting the principals of our schools to provide the necessary certification that the students should be entitled to transfer tickets, because the schools would be in possession of the necessary information. When once the schools have certified that the persons are eligible for the issue of transfer tickets then these transfer tickets will be issued and these certificates will then be presented to the Ministry's staff which sells these tickets.

Because of increasing costs of this service, the Government has also found it necessary to increase the charge for the school bus tickets from 10 cents per day to 15 cents per day. That is the normal ticket, and this will mean that the subsidy provided for the pupil transportation system on the normal journeys, excluding the use of the transfer system, will be reduced therefore from 75% to 50%, so that the Government will be bearing approximately 50% of the cost of the school transportation system with the parents and guardians bearing the other 50%. In addition there will be a new charge of 5 cents imposed for the issue of a transfer ticket, and this will be 25 cents per week, so that those persons using transfer tickets will have to pay an additional 5 cents for each ticket. Again the Government will be subsidising this particular aspect of the pupil transportation service, but instead of 100% subsidy it will now be approximately 82% for this service.

Mr. Chairman, if these measures were not taken an even larger supplementary would be required, and we believe that in the question of pupil transport it is fair and reasonable that 50% of the cost to be borne by the Government and 50% by the parents and guardians, and a charge of 5 cents for a transfer ticket, appears to be reasonable in the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I would like also to take this opportunity to appeal to school children to use the buses that are provided specially for pupil transportation. There are many complaints from workers and others that they are deprived at peak hours of their opportunities of either getting to or from work by school

children who use the normal transport system. Some of this will be necessary, and I do not envisage that it will be practicable to state that school children should not travel on the normal buses, but I am appealing for some voluntary cooperation in this particular matter. There are instances in which children may stay at school for one purpose or another, whether to participate in extra curricular activities or to carry out some assignment imposed upon them, and it will be necessary to use the normal transportation service, but as far as possible we would think that the students should use the school buses which are provided by the concessionaires for this purpose.

I beg to move that Head 36(1), Item 45, in the sum of \$630,182 stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I think I am right in saying that, what the Hon. Minister has said, gives us enough to understand that Government finds itself so much in the red looking for money, unable further to bear the cost of pupil transportation, now finds that it must increase the cost of the tickets to the children by as much as 50%. They now pay 10 cents for a ticket and it will cost 15 cents in the future. I have never boasted to be good at mathematics, but it is an increase of 50% and one can only come to the conclusion that the Government has found itself having, to look every possible way, that it is now even looking into the pockets of the little children for money to help save itself out of this situation.

Mr. Chairman, all of us appreciate the fact that if you have schools you must provide ways and means for your children to get to school to benefit from the education which the schools offer, but all we have heard here today brings us into realising that the sooner the Minister of Education decides that this snob class system which obtains in our educational system is brought to an end the better. You will find that all of this, and the greater part of what we have been hearing from the Minister today comes from this. In the 11 plus examination, parents are asked to indicate in order first preference, second preference, and third preference of schools, but because of this snobbery that we have obtaining in our schools after this Government has been in power for 12 years now, we find that everybody wants his son to go to Harrison College, even if he lives the furthest part of the country, because of the class system. 4.40 p.m.

In other words, I have said in this Honourable House already that if you have two brothers living in the same house, one wearing a Harrison College blazer and the other one going to Coleridge and Parry, the one who goes to Harrison College feels most superior to his brother. We have to get rid of this class system. We must have parity of esteem in these schools. We should not have this first grade, second

grade, and so on in the schools. There should be some arrangement whereby teachers could be interchanged in these schools. Masters from Harrison College should be sent to teach at Coleridge and Parry and so on. I know that there are a number of masters at Harrison College who would not be seen going up the hill to Coleridge and Parry. (Asides.)

Sir, we are dealing with pupil transport. People should be made to Understand and appreciate that the same atmosphere, the same pride, the same prestige, and so on, can be found amongst the children who attend Coleridge and Parry as those who attend Harrison College. Look and see how many white boys you will find attending Coleridge and Parry or the Alleyne School! Most of the white boys can be found attending Harrison College and the Lodge School. What is wrong? Is it that the walls will crack if white boys attend Coleridge and Parry School? Let us change this system. If it is found that white boys will add prestige to a particular school, then send 12 white boys to Coleridge and Parry; send 12 more to the Alleyne School, and let all of the schools have the same sort of prestige. Let us stop this system whereby if a boy goes to Harrison College and he does not learn Anything, he can still get a job, and if another boy goes to another school and he is bright, he will find difficulty in getting a job.

You will find, Mr. Chairman, that a boy who lives next door to a school, because of this 11-plus examination, may find himself attending the Boys' Foundation School or the Alleyne School, and a boy who is living near to the Alleyne School may find himself attending the Boys' Foundation School. Boys have to leave St. Lucy, pass the Coleridge and Parry School, and go to the Boys' Foundation School, Harrison College and so on. It is known that children have to take a bus from Bridgetown and travel to Coleridge and Parry School as well as the Alleyne School.

Mr. Chairman, it was wickedness when the former Minister of Education in 1962 introduced this vicious system of taking children from St. Lucy and sending them to school in St. Philip and so on. If people were made to understand that they could get the same type of education almost in their own districts, then we would not have been faced with this bill. We are not opposed to voting for this Resolution, but we have to ask the Government to find ways and means of cutting down on this vote.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Education knows that some of these children have to wake up early on mornings in order to get something to eat and catch the buses. The Minister tells us that there are 71,121 transfers, and that appears to be a dangerous thing. We ought not to have all of these transfer tickets. No boy in a little place like Barbados has any right catching two buses in order to get to school. The teachers will tell you that some of these children have to drive so far in order to get to school, they spend more time keeping them quiet than they spend in teaching those who want to learn. They become sleepy and restless, and they find it difficult to concentrate. We are really destroying our whole system of education by continuing in this manner. It is an indictment on somebody's part when children are called upon to make all of transfers.

Mr. Chairman, if the children have to travel so far in order to go to school, then let us see whether it is not possible to have children from certain districts accommodated in one bus. Let us reduce the number of these transfer tickets. Too big a burden is being placed on these children. If the Minister of Education will adhere to my suggestion, he will make people understand that what is being taught at Harrison College at Fifth Form level can be taught elsewhere. Why must all of these white girls find themselves at Queen's College? I want to see some of these white girls attending the Alexandra School. What is wrong with St. Michael's Girls' School? The white girls will get the same education at the Alexandra School as they are getting at Queen's College at Fifth Form level.

We cannot support any move by this Government to maintain the present system. You have all of these boys going to Lodge School, and the Government is even subsidising some of these schools. The trouble is that the people do not believe anything said to them by the Government on the radio or on television.

Mr. Chairman, we will have to adjust our sites and see what can be done to place these children at strategic points to be transported to the various schools in order to cut out a considerable amount of this travelling, and I believe that we will get better results from the children. I am sure the Minister of Education cannot and will not stand before this Honourable House and say that he is satisfied 100% with what is produced in our schools, bearing in mind the amount of money we are spending on education.

Mr. Chairman, we are urging the Minister of Education not to spend money for the sake of spending it on education. He should spend the money in such a manner that the children will be in a position to benefit from the tuition they are receiving and the whole system will be beneficial to all concerned.

4.50p.m.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have suggested long ago that if a child is attending these schools he should never have to leave his school and go into the bus stand to buy a ticket. We have suggested that every school should have a sales booth for tickets. Their only contact with the bus stand should be to get into the bus and go home. You have some conductors and drivers who, by their friendly approach, engage these school girls into conversations that they would not need to be engaged in. You should not be able to keep a school if you cannot agree to let the children from your school get tickets at the school, and prevent children from going into the bus stand and being exposed to what we know is taking place.

I would like to see children who live within a mile of their school do some more "tar slapping". You have some lazy people who stand at the corner of Eagle Hall and who want to get to town and they ask you for a lift. Thank Senator Taitt for that; but not everyone can ask me for a lift. I know whom to give a lift to.

No child who lives within a hundred yards of the school should need a bus ticket, but there may be occasions like in the case of rain or some such situation where I would like to see a ticket available to assist children. I am not saying that they should walk to school in all circumstances. Even if he has to pay his fare in coins, he should be able to do it and get to school, or you will find that there will be a lot of dropping out and a lot of absenteeism. He will say that he was at home watching the cloud and he could not get to school, that he does not want to get wet because he would catch a cold. I realise that with such a system, there may be many 10 cents or 15 cents going into the hands of many people, but that could be overcome if the conductors and inspectors are more vigilant than they usually are.

We are asking the Government to consider these matters. We are not at all opposing this Resolution. We have got to support it. We will do so, but we are asking the Government to take everything into consideration because we want to see the system functioning for the good of the country as a whole.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, if I may just reply briefly, I am very grateful to the hon. Member for St. Peter for speaking on this Resolution and giving his support and that of the Opposition, to this particular measure. He has spoken with such force and vehemence that I wonder if he was not voting for it how he would have spoken.

The main question that this raises is the burden placed on the transportation service and the present common entrance examination system. One advantage of the present system is that it provides at least that parents and guardians are provided with the opportunity to have a say as to which school their child or ward gets into. If someone has a preference for the Boys* Foundation School or Coleridge and Parry or Harrison College or St. Michael's, the parent can indicate that preference, and if the child gets a mark which would gain him or her admission to a school of the parent's choice, then the aspiration of the parent is satisfied.

That, Sir, is certainly one value of the present system. It maintains the choice of parents of the school to which the child should go, and this, regardless of the colour of the child. However, there are certain drawbacks in the system in that the aspirations of parents and children may not always coincide, and by their merit as determined by the particular examination some children have to move from one spot to

another. I think that that is one of the drawbacks in the present system; but it is precisely because we realise that there are difficulties in the system, and precisely because we will not allow or give the exposition or any others in this country any opportunity to state that we are acting in a high-handed manner, and without consultation, that we have set up a Common Entrance Examination Review Committee to study the whole operation and the effects of the Common Entrance Examination.

That Committee - and I am certain that the hon. Member who reads every word on this subject and who is a lengthy spokesman on this particular subject- is aware that the Committee is sitting under the Chairmanship of Dr. Leonard Shbrey and studying the full effects of the Common Entrance system. I cannot anticipate what recommendations they will come up with. What I do know is that I am anxiously awaiting their recommendations.

I think, Sir, that they are giving a very deep and thorough study to the whole matter and are inviting the views and opinions from a cross section of persons in the country and then using their experience and their knowledge of the system and the conditions operative here in order to come up with the best recommendations.

I can assure the hon. Member that when the recommendations come up we will give them very careful scrutiny and take decisions based on these recommendations. If it is the burden of the contribution of the hon. Member for St. Peter that parents should not have a choice of the school to which at secondary level their children could go.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not want it to go on record that I said that parents should not have their choice. If you are Minister of Education, you and the Government should know what is best for the country. If the Government finds that it is best for the country, the Government will find a means of putting it over to the people and let them know; but there should be no high-handed approach.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I thank the Member for his point of elucidation, but it remains the same thing. If someone who lives near the Boys' Foundation School has to go to the Boys' Foundation School and not to Harrison College, it means that we will have to tell the people who live within a certain radius of a particular school that they can only go to this particular school.

I hope that if this is one of the recommendations of the Committee, and it is found acceptable to the Government, and we bring down the proposal; to this Honourable Chamber that I will find the hon. Member as vociferous.....

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of elucidation. It is not a question of the recommendation being found acceptable to the Government only but to the Government and the people because the Government must first understand what is best for the people. It must be found acceptable to the people before it is put into operation. 5.00 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Thank you for your elucidation, but I was relying on the hon. Member, I will be relying on the hon. Member to help us to get this across so I am looking for his support to get it across.

On the other matter which he raised, that of the Government or whoever is in charge of the administration of the secondary schools -particularly the older secondary schools - having to help with the teacher who has to be moved from this school and sent to the other school because the school does not have a mathematician. I would like to state that we believe that it is in the interest of equalizing opportunities to have the possibility of transfers although we do not believe that this should be used heavy-handedly, but again this possibility has been included in the draft Education Bill.....

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Since 1962 I have been hearing about this draft Education Bill. The Minister should not worry to mention that now. We have been hearing about it too long ago and nothing has been done. Don't mention that now.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I am afraid I will have to, because the Bill is now with the Teachers' Unions in this country; the revised draft is now with the Teachers' Unions and we are awaiting their comments by the 7th January, 1974. Soon thereafter, I expect that the Bill will be introduced in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I think that I have answered most of the points. In fact there were only two main points made, and I am grateful for the contribution made by the hon. Member for St. Peter.

The Question that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) General Administration Item 45 -Pupil Transportation - for the sum of \$630,182 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) Industrials Schools - was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple request here. As the note to the Item 27 states "The sum of \$1,504 is required to meet the increased cost of fees to Instructors in the Vocational Training Programme at the Government Industrial Schools. The old rate of \$8.00 per period has been increased so \$11,00 per period with effect from 1st April, 1973."

It is therefore necessary to supplement the \$5,659 which has already been provided by this Honourable Chamber in order to meet the increased payments to the Instructors in Vocational subjects at the Government Industrial Schools.

I beg to move that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) Industrial Schools, Item 27 -Vocational Training, stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that at long last the Government has seen fit to give these instructors what is necessary for them. One thing I would like to see put in operation, that is, that the instructors are paid promptly. They have not been receiving their payments promptly during the past and this is a small matter - a small administrative matter - however if somebody would speak to the Headmaster or the proper authority I feel that something better could be done.

I believe that the Government would realize the necessity to increase the number of visits, or lessons,

that these Instructors give to these pupils. We quite appreciate the fact that you cannot do everything at one time but we know there are children benefiting from these instructions and the more often they get lessons, the better it will be for them.

The minds of some of them are so bent that you have got to try and knock it in reverse gear and it may be for the better, and if the Government would revise this programme - we realise this would mean an increased cost for the scheme but it would be good if the Government looks into this suggestion. I believe that they can certainly look into this matter, if the Ministry of Education were to put up a scheme for increased visits at this institution, I believe it would be worthwhile in the long run.

The Question that Head 36 - Ministry of Education (1) Industrial Schools, Item 27 -Vocational Training - for the sum of \$1,504 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$677,586 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that. 5.10 p.m. SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1973-74 No. 29

The Resolution for the sum of \$1,800 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 18 - Training Division - there are two Items, Item 16 and Item 17, Under Item 16 - Office Expenses - the sum of \$7,000 was provided, but at the 31st October with five months still to go to the end of the financial year, the uncommitted balance was \$933,15. This has been caused mainly through the rapid depletion due to the increase in the price of typing paper and the increased costs of servicing and repairing office machines. It is estimated that the sum of \$1,500 would be adequate for the remainder of the financial year. On the last occasion only the sum of \$1.81 lapsed under this Item.

In so far as Item 17 is concerned, the provision under this Item was \$500 and the balance at 31st October was \$80.73. This amount cannot suffice until the end of the financial year, but the depletion was

due to the fact that many offers of training abroad are received at very short notice from international organisations, and as a result our replies accepting places are frequently sent by telegram or telephone. In addition the unsettled conditions at Mona, Jamaica during the year led to an unusual amount of correspondence by telephone when normally this would have been done by mail. It is estimated that \$300 would suffice till the end of the financial year.

I beg' to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, just one point I would like to bring to the attention of the Government oil the question of training. I understand that from certain recommendations made it has become difficult recently for members of the Barbados Police Force to get study leave to study overseas or even here at Cave Hill, and I would like the Government to investigate this matter.

I know that representation has been made with respect to one gentleman who is studying law overseas because the recommendation was that the police have no need for further study, especially in law, because there are enough lawyers in Barbados, and I think it is an extremely short-sighted view on the part of the Training Division to say that you do not want members of the Police Force with any more training. One notices that in the Trinidad Police Force there were about three or four lawyers and some have certificates in economics. I think that every police officer should be given permission to go on study leave overseas. I know of many cases locally where police officers have applied to gain admission to Cave Hill to study law and have not been granted the necessary study leave. I think this is of particular interest in the case of the Police Force, because I think we are considering ourselves a most sophisticated country and that we look forward to see that our police officers are properly trained, especially with the various duties they have to perform whether immigration, crime, secret service work, they must have some sort of special training, ajid certainly the training in law and economics will assist not only the particular individual but the Police Force as a whole.

I would like to ask the Minister to look into this question of allowing the police where they qualify to have the necessary leave to study/They should; be given every encouragement to get training where they show a tendency to do so.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one brief point on the same note the hon. Member for Bridgetown was speaking. In the Police Force at the present moment, you will find that it is being found convenient to take an officer who is already qualified as an attorney-at-law and send him to the University of the West Indies in Jamaica to study, and if the people charged with the administration of the Training Division were to examine it, I am sure no person would say that having qualified as an attorney-at-law the particular officer could benefit in any respect if he is going to remain and serve the Royal Barbados Police Force from the further training he is now receiving abroad. You will find that there are going to be some retirements from the Force in another few weekes or months and the like, and people who have an interest in the Force and in the upgrading of the ability of the Force to do its work in a community such as ours today must come to the conclusion that it is a classic way of getting rid of people who would be on the spot to vie for promotion. Nobody could say that the type of course which Inspector Durant - if you want me to call names - is doing in Jamaica would benefit the Police Force in the next forty years, he is being trained in what he already knows, and we are to ask that they must have their priorities set in order, they must make some better decisions and if policemen are to be trained they ought to be trained in the type of work they are going to perform in the Service for the benefit and service of the community in the long run but not just hide people away for the sake of accommodating someone else.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of three Money Resolutions in Committee of .Supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 5.20 p.m.

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Money Resolutions were read a first, and second time, and agreed to.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, We will now revert to Question Time.

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

QUESTION TIME

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 130 standing in the name of the hon. Member for the City of Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister is not in his place.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 139 standing in the name of the same hon. Member.

REQUEST FOR A PAVILION AND CULTURAL

CENTRE FOR NEW ORLEANS Mr. MOTTLEY:

.Mr. Speaker To enquire of the appropriate Minister 1. Is it the intention of Government to provide a Pavilion and Cultural Centre for the residents of New Orleans? 2. If the answer to No. 1 above is in the affirmative, will the Minister state when?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 139 is as follows

Competing demands upon the resources of the Government have so far prevented the erection of a Community Centre and Pavilion to serve the recreational needs of the residents of New Orleans. However, subject to the availability of funds, every effort will be made to carry out the project during the next four-year Development Plan period.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state from when this four-year Development Plan period will start?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the period 1974-78.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether any work of a technical nature has been done in relation to the type of centre which will be provided, and whether there are any proposals as to the cost of this centre?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Are you referring to New Orleans or some other place? Mr. Speaker, the reply to the supplementary question is that work of a technical nature has not yet been started.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state whether a site has yet been found by the Government to provide this Cultural Centre and Pavilion?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a site has not yet been located, but some preliminary visits have been made to an area adjacent to the Westbury Junior School. The search for a suitable site is still continuing.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister give an undertaking that he will invite the Parliamentary representative of the City of Bridgetown to accompany him on any such visit?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, any information supplied of possible sites by the hon. Member for the City will be evaluated, and any assistance which he can render will be appreciated.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to render assistance, if the Minister will invite me

to accompany him when he is visiting any site, in the same way as he invites other Members of his own party.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly invite the hon. Member to accompany me when a visit to a site is being proposed.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, can the Minister state.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have had your quota of three supplementaries. Question No. 130 standing in the name of the hon. Member for Bridgetown.

QUESTION RE THE PUBLIC BATH AND

LATRINE IN PONSIDE AND "THE

CONCRETE" IN KING WILLIAM

STREET, BRIDGETOWN

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister 1. Is the Minister aware that the Public Bath and Latrine in the Ponside and "The Concrete" in King William Street are in a state of disrepair? 2. Will the Minister take immediately steps to have this situation remedied?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows

1. Yes, Sir.

2. The Minister will take appropriate steps to have this situation remedied.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Have any steps yet been taken?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Yes. The Minister has already asked the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to look into the matter and make a report.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 138 standing in the name of the hon. Member.

QUESTION RE THE NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister 1. How many National Development Scholarships have been awarded by the Government? 2. Will the Minister state (a) the subjects for which scholarships have been awarded (b) the number of persons who were awarded scholarships in each subject? 3. Will the Minister state whether any survey has been carried out to see the needs in respect of each subject? 4. If the answer to No. 3 is in the affirmative, will the Minister cause a copy of the report to be laid in the House?

Hon. L. E. SANETT FQRD:

Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 138 asked by the hon. Member for the City of Bridgetown is as follows

Since the inception of the National Development Scholarships programme in November, 1970, 28 National Development Scholarships have been awarded. The allocation is as follows:-

Subject Area	No. of Awards
--------------	---------------

Architecture	2
--------------	---

Drama (teaching of)	1
---------------------	---

Land Surveying	2
----------------	---

Quantity Surveying	2
--------------------	---

Journalism	1
------------	---

Veterinary Science 4

Medicine 2

Accountancy 1

Hotel Management 2

Aircraft Engineering 1

Dietetics 2

Dentistry 3

Sanitary Engineering 1

Tourism Studies 1

Pharmacy 1

Teaching and Secretarial Science 1

Electronics 1

28

The subject areas for the awards were determined through an examination of information submitted (on request) by Government Ministries, including the Ministry responsible for the issue of work permits. This process did not involve the preparation of a report. 5.30 p.m.

QUESTION RE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT THE VARIOUS SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question No. 144 standing in the name of the hon. Member for Bridgetown.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows- To enquire of the appropriate Minister 1. (a) How many children attend Grammar Schools? (b) Would the Minister state the number at each school? 2. (a) How many children attend Comprehensive schools? (b) Would the Minister state the number at each school? 3. (a) How many children attend Private Secondary Schools? (b) Would the Minister state the number at each school?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows-

At November 23, 1973, there were 5,435 students enrolled in the ten Government Secondary Schools (Grammar) and 12041 students enrolled in the nine Government Secondary Schools (Comprehensive) distributed as follows: -

Government Secondary Schools (Grammar)

Boys' Foundation School 460

Girls' Foundation School 564

Queen's College 499

St. Michael's Girls' 606

Alleyne School 435

Coleridge & Parry 456

Alexandra 408

Lodge 562

Harrison College 655

Combermere 790

Government Secondary Schools f(Comprehensive)

Boys Girls Total

Ellerslie 743 791 1,534

Parkinson Memorial 1,046 366 1,412

Princess Margaret 692 704 1,396

St. Leonard's Boys' 1,660 1,660

St. Leonard's Girls' 1,486 1,486

St. George Secondary 612 583 1,195

St. Lucy Secondary 473 508 981

Springer Memorial 1,472 1,472

West St. Joseph 466 454 900

2. At the same date, there were 6,985 students enrolled in the nineteen approved independent schools, distributed as follows:-

Approved Independent Schools

Christ Church High 550

Codrington High 158

Community High 539

Co-operative High 332

Federal High 619

Industry High 318

Lynch's Secondary 447

Mapp's College 111

Metropolitan High 330

Modern High 759

Presentation College 203

St. Anthony's 350

St. Gabriel's 254

St. Winifred's 231

Seventh Day Adventist 450

Approved Independent Schools (Cont'd)

Unique High 317

Ursuline Convent 293

Wakefield High 216

Washington High 467

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister stated the figures for the 19 approved schools. Has he the figures for the schools other than those approved by Government, and if so does he have those figures with him?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member .knows that I am not required by law to maintain a register

of private students. My official responsibility is in respect of Government Schools as well as those schools which receive a Government grant. I do not have that particular information, but I can advise the Member that he may seek such information from those schools which he has in mind.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This is a supplementary. The Minister has given the figure of 19 approved schools. I wonder if the Minister could say how many other schools applied for approval and did not get that approval.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That sounds to me like a substantive question.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I accept your ruling, Sir.

Mr. HINDS:

Can the Minister tell us after approval has been given to a school, how often is the school revisited by the School Inspectors or any member of the Ministry's staff, and for what purpose?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. Member for St. Peter how often a school is visited. There is an officer whose responsibility includes the approved schools and visits to approved schools, and this officer is in contact with those schools from time to time; but I cannot say how often visits to these schools are made. 5.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Government gives a subsidy to these independent schools - the nineteen of them - does the Government take into consideration the ages of members of staff, particularly on the basis of those whom the Government pays?

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is an agreed basis on which the Government makes grants to these schools. I am not certain whether the hon. Member is asking if we enquire of the ages of the persons who are placed

on the sheets for payment by Government at the level agreed, as to whether these people are below the age of 60 or what.

Mr. HINDS:

Over the age of 60.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think I will need some notice of that Question, Sir.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question Time is now ended. This will be the appropriate time for the hon. Member for St. Joseph to give notice of his questions. The hon. Member may do so now. Before that, however, the hon. Member for St. Peter may give notice of his question.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister Is the Minister aware that the several householders of French Village in the Parish of St. Peter have taken every lawful step that could be expected of them and are still denied the installation of electrical service to their respective homes?

2. Will Government take steps to ascertain the cause of the denial of this service for years to this district?

3. Will Government urge upon Barbados Light and Power Company Limited, the necessity to give as urgent a consideration as is possible to the needs of the householders of this district for a supply of electricity?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Questions which stand in the name of the hon. Member for St. Joseph re The List of 300 names appearing on a list prepared at the Ministry of Communications and Works.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister Is the Minister aware that a list has been prepared at the Ministry of Communications and Works containing some 300 names who are to be involved in a redundancy, or laying off programme?

If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state;

(a) the reason for such action;

(b) how long will the situation last;

(c) what financial arrangements are being made to compensate these persons?

If the answer is in the negative, would the Minister investigate why a selective list of names has been prepared of certain persons employed with the Ministry of Communications and Works?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question by the same hon. Member re the number of tractors owned by the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

Will the Minister state:

(a) the number of motor tractors with necessary equipment owned by the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology, which are available for land cultivation of plots owned by small farmers;

(b) how many tractors are allocated to each Agricultural District Station;

(c) does the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology still maintain a list of applicants for work to be done by these tractors;

(d) how many applications were received by the Ministry between the period June 1972 - October 1973 inclusive;

(e,) how many acres were involved in the applications;

(f). how many applicants have been serviced; (g) how many applicants have not been serviced and why?

Will the Minister forthwith increase the number of tractors with equipment available under this scheme?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question by the said hon. Member re the new cemetery, at Wairreiris, St. Michael.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister.

Would the Minister state:

(a) the persons and/or institutions who created the plans, drawings and specifications for the new cemetery at Warrens in the parish of Saint Michael;

(b) who are the contractors and/or the institution carrying out the construction of the building and related services at the said site;

(c) whether any estimates in respect of the cost of construction was prepared on the project? If the answer is in the affirmative, who prepared the said estimate and what was the estimated cost;

(d) whether any foundation tests were carried out before construction began? If the answer is in the affirmative - what were the results of these tests? If the answer is in the negative - why were no tests carried out?

(e) whether a work progress schedule was prepared in relation to time and the sum to be expended in relation to the percentage of work carried out? If the answer is in the affirmative - what is the difference between the percentage work done and the sum expended to date? If the answer is in the negative - why was no such schedule prepared?

(f) what percentage of the work has been done to date;

(g) when was work last carried out on the site and what was the work done;

(h) what sum has been spent to date on the project;

(i) what is the original scheduled date for completion;

(j) will the scheduled date be kept?

Will the Minister forthwith lay the plans, specification and surveys in connection with this project on the Table of the Hon. the House of Assembly?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question by the same hon. Member re the Primary School Teachers.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire trf the appropriate Minister

Will the Minister state:

1. How many teachers are employed by the Government in die Primary Schools of this Island;
2. How many of these teachers are in the une'stablished category;
3. How many teachers in the unestablished category have received training at Erdiston Teachers' Training College to date;
4. What is the cost of training a teacher at this institution;
5. Will the Minister state whether or not there are any plans made by the Government for the retrenchment, or laying off of any of these unestablished trained teachers?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question by the same hon. Member re the paid up capital to the Central Bank of Barbados.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister

(a) Would the Minister state how much capital Has the Government of Barbados paid up to date to the Central Bank of Barbados?

(b) How much did they originally undertake to pay into the said bank?

If there is a difference between the amount paid up and that originally pledge, will the Minister state when the Government intends to pay the remainder.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question by the said hon. Member re the Central Livestock Station.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, To enquire of the appropriate Minister

Would the Minister state:

(a) the number and total poundage of animals received from the Central Livestock Station at the Barbados Marketing Corporation's Abbatoir for sale to the said Barbados Marketing Corporation during the years 1970, 1971, 1972 and 1973;

(b) the value of die said animals so received at the Barbados Marketing Corporation;

(c) has. the Barbados Marketing Corporation ever paid the Central Livestock Station for the animals so received?

(d) if the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state the dates and amounts and to whom the said amounts have been paid?

If the answer is in the negative would the Minister state why no payment has been made in respect of these animals?

Would the Minister state whether or not the animals and the value are accounted for both at the Central Livestock Station and the Barbados Marketing Corporation? 5.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Question in the name of the same hon. Member re the Canadian Dairy Development Scheme.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister-

Will the Minister state:

1. The number of dairy cows acquired by the Agricultural Development Corporation from funds provided under the Canadian Dairy Development Scheme from the inception of the scheme to date;

2. What is the total cost of these cows;

3. What are the terms of repayment between the Government and the Agricultural Development

Corporation;

4. How much of the cost of these cows has been repaid to date;

5. How many cows are still in the possession of the Agricultural Development Corporation; if the present number differs from the original amount acquired would the Minister state what has become of the missing cows; whether or not any cows have been sold and the price at which they were sold;

6. How much milk has been produced by these cows and sold by the Agricultural Development Corporation;

7. What is the value of the sale of cows, calves and milk from the said cows;

8. Is the Minister aware that all other dairy farmers involved in the scheme have had to make annual repayments under the said scheme?

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FOR TUESDAY 4TH DECEMBER, 1973

Mr. SPEAKER:

I would like to take this opportunity to have a set of Minutes confirmed. It was my omission, but at the beginning of this Sitting this should have been done. The Minutes for Tuesday, 4th December, 1973 are before you now for confirmation.

There being no dissenting voices, these Minutes are hereby duly confirmed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed. move that Government Business be nor resumed.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

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 Item No. 2 which stands in my name be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that,

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

THE STATUTORY BOARDS (MISCEL-LANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT, 1973

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend certain enactments relating to Statutory Boards to delete any reference to a specific sum-in respect of a post for which the Minister's prior approval is required for assignment of salary or appointment to that post.

The position is that there are some 12 Statutory Boards which employ staff and which are required to seek ministerial approval for the creation of posts and the appointment of staff at certain salary levels. I

refer to the Natural Gas Corporation, the Public Utilities Board the Barbados Transport Board, the Barbados Board of Tourism, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, the Barbados Development Bank, the Agricultural Development Corporation, the Industrial Development Corporation, the Barbados National Stadium Corporation, the Parks and Beaches Commission and the National Housing Corporation.

Apart from the specific matter of salaries, an examination was made into this entire matter and it was felt that the amendment should come in this form in order to facilitate matters. Another reason is that the salaries of the civil servants are now subject to annual increases and most of the Statutory Boards have in recent agreements with the Union adopted the same principle of inflationary increments. The Establishments Division considered that it would be far too cumbersome to specify a sum above which ministerial approval would be necessary a practice which in most cases would require annual amendments to legislation. It is felt that all the relevant Acts be amended to delete reference to any specific sum and substitute therefor the words "such amount as the Minister may from time to time determine." All that would then be necessary is the Minister's approval of the appropriate change.

Those are some of the reasons which prompted the Government to bring this amendment down, and 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. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill, the Objects and Reasons of which are essentially twofold, that is, to give the Minister the final say in the appointment of persons to statutory corporations at salaries greater than 7,200 per annum, raises the whole question of the relationship between the Statutory Boards and the Government Ministers. 6.00 p.m.

I would never support the principle whereby a man receiving a certain salary cannot be appointed or fired until the Minister has had a say in the matter, I think that this sort of relationship will lead to what someone so aptly described as a very good "pimp relationship". We have to look at the relationship between the Government Statutory Boards and the Ministers.

As I understand it, these Statutory Boards are called upon to carry out the policy of the Government,

and the Minister has the exclusive right to tell the Boards what must be done. While it is possible that: in the past these Boards were strong, we now find that the Boards are now becoming weak because of the type of persons appointed to them. You will find that persons, who have no contribution to make in a particular field, are appointed to work on these Boards, and their only qualification is that they happen to be a member of the Democratic Labour Party. Throughout the years, this attitude of appointing persons to Boards, who are aptly described as "yard fowls", has been responsible for the Boards becoming weak and not being in a position to make any positive contribution to the economic and social development of this country. We find that the Boards have lost their objectivity because they are afraid to do certain things and they have to comply with the day to day wishes of the Minister. That does not encourage good relationship.

Sir, we find that a Board such as the Old Housing Authority Board was unable to deal with certain problems. When the Auditor General pointed out certain discrepancies in the accounts, the Board was unable to deal with the employees who were involved in the mismanagement; it proved ineffective in dealing with the Minister, and it allowed the Minister to push it around. People talk about the "Watergate Scandal" in the U.S.A., but we have to look at what is taking place in Barbados. It is difficult to get to the bottom of these things because the people who work on these Boards have a party allegiance with the Democratic Labour Party. It is possible for several of these Boards to do things objectively, but they allow the Minister to push them around and that will always result in bad relationship.

Sir, some of the members of these Boards are afraid to stand up to the Ministers and speak out against their wrong doings. If this political party, or another political party, continues with this practice of packing Statutory Boards with purely Government party members, then this country will surely suffer in the long run. In this country, some people have developed a fear of their own shadows and they are afraid to speak out, with the exception of one individual whose name I will not call at the moment.

Sir, some persons enrich themselves on the Boards at the expense of the taxpayers. The Government is aware of this, and yet the Government has done nothing about the matter. I think that the time has come when the Government should review the relationship between itself and the Statutory Boards. We find that with the abolition of the Local Government system, the Statutory Boards have been used in place of persons who were previously elected under the Local Government system. I am saying that the attitude of the members of these Boards leaves Much to be desired. We find that these Statutory Boards are not serving the people as well as the Local Government system used to, because they do not now have to face the electorate. In most of these Statutory Boards you will find that no elected member of Parliament sits on them, and there is no accountability on the part of the members of these Statutory Boards.

Of course, the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is not a Statutory Board, but certainly no one can say

that this Board is dealing with matters in the same way as the Local Government Board, so far as leaving garbage on the street is concerned, if this was a Board where the Members had to account to the electorate, the attitude which now prevails would never have prevailed. I should like the Government to reconsider its relationships with the Statutory Boards.

It has been said that the Minister must have the right to appoint persons at a salary in excess of \$7,200. I know that I will be told that this was first introduced by the Barbados Labour Party, but I do not agree with it. It may have had its use at that time, but the attitude of people today has changed completely. Today some people believe that they must tell the Government what it wants to hear and not what it should be told. In the circumstances, Government, as well as the country are suffering from this sort of thing. Some people are not prepared to tell the Government the truth and what is in the interest of the country because they want to maintain a certain social status. 6.10p.m.

I believe that it was the Member for St. Michael West who some time ago shared the views I am now expressing and the biggest mistake any Government could make was to pack Statutory Boards with members of the same political party.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I cannot remember ever saying that. (Mr. MOTTLEY In Nelson Street one Sunday evening.) I cannot remember ever making a statement like that in Nelson Street, Baxter's Road or anywhere else, that there is anything wrong with Government putting members of its own party on Boards. What I remember saying was that when you put people on Boards, you should put people who have the ability. That should be the qualification for sitting on a Board. I speak for myself. I would not want a Member of my Party solely because he is a member to sit on any Board with me. I must find the best person available.

I have no quarrel with putting people on Boards, who are members of political parties. I think the hon. Member for the City will understand that if you have a Statutory Board you would have to be a "political clown" to put on it your political opponents. We have some clowns in here, who sometimes try to stretch their necks out and put people on Boards who should not be on Boards at all and they suffer by it. I do not have to mention names. It speaks for itself.

When the hon. Member speaks about fairness to the minority, I say that a man must have intelligence and integrity, and if you have those two, that surpasses everything else. My allegiance to my Party has to be bound up with integrity. I would not join with my party in anything that would make me lose my integrity.

There has been comment about power being put in the hands of Ministers. I think that what is important is whether the Minister who has this power is going to behave like a manager, instead of a Minister. Some Ministers like to behave like managers, and go into the workshop, and interfere with people, who are working, and say that he is a Minister. If Ministers have sufficient work to do at ministerial level, they will not get into the workshop affairs.

The hon. Member talked about inflationary increments. There can be nothing like inflationary increments. The Government has a salaries plan that you should work for \$X until you reach a certain point in years. That cannot be inflationary. That is the basis on which the officer is going to reach his new Jerusalem. There is something in the minds of some members of Government that you can have duplicity, that you can have one person working in the Civil Service under one system and those on the Statutory Boards working under another system. This will never work. The workers are organised. They are going to act in their interest when the time comes. You can put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Whether you are an economist or anything else, you cannot expect people to be eternally satisfied with \$50 a week. You can preach and you can talk about productivity, but you will get unrest. If your mind is not made up for that, give your heart to God, and your soul to someone else.

When I was not here, I heard that jibes were being made at the Union from the other side. We saw some lessons today and you will see more lessons. The day of organisation has come. I will not side with a Minister of any Government, even with the Prime Minister -when the Prime Minister has to send someone to negotiate with the B.W.U., you will see that there is a tendency to defend the Government. It has happened this year that we have had negotiations for workers at the Ministry of Communications and Works. Do you think that the Minister can come and say how many bus conductors are to be employed? The Minister is the Minister of Government which is going to be responsible for providing funds, and by all means, he should have some say, but he is not a negotiator. His say is a say in policy, and people will say whether his policy is acceptable or not.

You are bound to have occasions where the workers are not going to agree with the Government's policy. We had an example with the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. The Minister cannot tell us that there is going to be a 40 hour or 44 hour week. That has to be by agreement. You can lay down whatever law you like. When Moses came down from the mountain, did he bring down these laws with him?

These are matters of collective agreement and must be submitted to the process of collective

agreement. We have had to discuss that on many occasions in this House. There are some people who, because someone else is a servant of the House, believe that they can spit in their faces. They are represented by the Barbados Workers' Union. 6.20 p.m.

I think that it must be borne in mind when we have people working, that there must be fundamental respect for them. What I have discovered in my own way, dealing with staff matters in the course of negotiating is the relationship between representatives of Government and the negotiating bodies. You get this see-sawing between the Ministers - in cases where Ministers represent the Government - and negotiating bodies; you get an agreement oft-times and you find that the agreement is not really an agreement, because it has not been agreed to. We will never stand for this nonsense. If we get an agreement that agreement should be final. Too often we find that the stage is reached where the whole matter that has been under negotiations has to be gone into again. We are not going to stand for that nonsense. I am saying that this will not work.

If the Prime Minister sends a man down to the Union to make an agreement, whatever is agreed to, stands; and that should be the policy when it comes to negotiations in all cases, if I sit around a table and I say, after the discussions, that this is what we are agreeing to, then that is what we are accepting for the Union, and that is the agreement; therefore this must stand. Negotiators must know how to act. The only body of people who can accept this kind of thing is Parliament. The only reason that you have Ministerial Government is - if a Minister knows what he is doing and understands what he is doing, he acts on behalf of his colleagues and therefore the Parliamentary process would be carried out because if he agrees, the bringing of the matter to Parliament is only a matter of course - if you have an agreement on any matter and the Minister agrees that it is reasonable, the others have to accept that it is reasonable. It will go down as reasonable.

Now you hear people talking about abandonment. The electorate abandoned people in one way or another, so if.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What does this, that you are saying, have to do with this Bill?

Mr. WALCOTT:

This is a political Bill* In order to have an election - we are talking about Parliament having power to deal with Statutory matters'. Wherever a Minister exists, it is a political matter, and the power that a Minister is getting here in this Bill, I am not opposed to. In exercising power, the Ministers have to be knowledgeable; they must know where policy resides and where administration begins.

I do not subscribe to the view that it is a Minister's job to be interfering with the administration of a Board that is set up. If you set up a Board to do something on your behalf they - the Board - are entitled to make their own decisions. If you do not like the policy of a Minister, you should not accept it. If you do not agree with a Minister's policy, say so. If I do not agree with a Minister's policy I will say so and I will always make my position quite clear.

I was not here but I heard about what Boards can do - I do not know if this is an attempt to let Ministers come in and do what the Board should do; but all I say is that you never know how lucky you are until you reach a stage where industrial unrest takes place and this will take place however you try. Look at what is happening in the Caribbean now; see what is happening in Jamaica, Trinidad and Grenada. What is happening in Dominica and the rest of these places, is happening because Ministers should know something about respecting basic human rights. There is a lack of respect for basic human rights in many of these countries.

I said twenty five years ago that the public servants must not be at the whims and fancies of any of us as politicians. I say that public servants should not be dismissed at the whims and fancies of people like us. The public servant must be sure that he can work until the end of his days. The basic rights of these people must be respected. If you give a man the right that he cannot be dismissed, unless he has a fair trial by all sides, he should not be dismissed. There should be no difference between the public servant and the sweeper. There are some Permanent Secretaries who want to have the power to be able to knock off a man, but I would want to know what are the processes you have to go through before you knock him off. Some people believe that you have big rights and little rights but I do not believe in big and little rights.

Human Rights Day will soon be here, so let some of us remember human rights. Sometimes we forget that we are human beings. 6.30 p.m

I listen to people, a man may be a little wayward, but I do not defend a man who is lazy and does not do his work. I have been working for more than forty years and nobody can say that I am a lazy man, I have never drawn sick pay and I am lucky, but I am against anybody who wants to pick on people/Some people want to look on all the small people to pick on, all the defenceless people, and therefore they are the ones who want to jump on their backs. We have lazy people in the Church, lazy people in politics, and you may have lazy Ministers too. There are Ministers and Ministers, and there are politicians and politicians. You cannot dismiss a politician by saying that he is lazy, you have to wait on the electorate, but do not tell me that you are going to dismiss a man because you do not like him.

I have never asked the Minister to put me on any Board or to put any member of my family or a friend on a Board. I have no objection to the Minister having the reserved power, because there are some people who would dismiss people from a Board. I was a member of a Board and my name was being bandied about for some years because I did not agree that a certain lady should have been a headmistress because I did not think that she had the experience, and I heard a lot of reasons for this. First it was because the woman was black and I voted for a white woman. When it suits people to think they can scandalise you, they do it. One of the people has gone to the "Great Beyond" and it is not necessary to talk about it, but the woman made an excellent contribution to education in this country, and in my view, she would have done a lot for the school.

I had another experience. A man was not suitable to be a headmaster, but there was a certain magic attached to being a Barbados Scholar. Because he was a Barbados Scholar, ipso facto he must be a headmaster, and in my view, he was the worst headmaster you ever had in this country. The hon. Member does not have to worry, this has nothing to do with the Democratic Labour Party, this is something which goes on in all parties. This is something that is symptomatic in our society. Unfortunately we are a small society and everybody knows everybody else. Sometimes a Minister is going to find himself under more political pressure than members on a Board. He is the first person you want to condemn, you want to pin his back to the wall, and these are some of the issues which are going to arise. These are the human factors and the inter-plays which come into it. People get into trouble and they come crying to you, but I want the Minister to be clear in his mind. We are at a stage of our history and they should know what is going on around them, we have reached a stage in the world, not only in Barbados, where people are not going to be satisfied to be pushed around by anybody. Nobody in the world today accepts being pushed around. Names do not mean anything to people any more whether it is in Australia, England or Timbuctu; everything is being swept aside and means absolutely nothing to people any more. At one time you had to get a collar and tie to get anywhere, but those things have gone now.

These are problems we have to face, and we have to deal with them as problems to be solved, but we cannot deal with them by sweeping them under the carpet. It is going to push the thing from one area to the other but it cannot change the basic thing which is there. Those who do not like it, will have to get out of politics.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, there are three aspects of this Bill that I would like to comment on. However, I would like to comment on a statement which was made by the Hon. Leader of the House when he was introducing this amendment to the various Statutory Boards as are contained in this Bill before this Honourable Chamber. He stated that one of the main reasons why this limitation was being removed

was as a result of the inflationary increases which the Boards had been negotiating with the Union.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, I hate to interrupt the hon. Member, but I am being misquoted for the second time. I said that because salaries in the Civil Service are now subject to annual increases and most of the Statutory Boards have in recent agreements with the Union adopted the same principle of inflationary increments, the Establishments Division considers that it would be far too cumbersome to specify a sum above which Ministerial approval would be necessary, a practice which in most cases would require annual amendment to legislation. It is accordingly recommended that all the relevant Acts be amended, to delete reference to any specific sum and substitute therefor the words "such amount as the Minister may from time to time determine."

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that reference has been made to inflationary increments, and an increment is as far as I am concerned, an increase. 6.40 p.m.

If one were to examine the Bill and its statutory powers, if one knew what the situation was, one would see that there are only two Boards with which the Barbados Workers' Union is involved in negotiating for increases above \$600 a month. There are a number of Boards where the limit is less than this. We know that in future certain people employed by Statutory Boards will be subject to discipline by the Minister. I referred to this matter earlier this year when an amendment was brought to the Transport Board Act to reduce the amount of money on which Ministerial approval had to be sought. At the time, I felt that it was a situation which could have serious repercussions in the whole process of negotiations.

Sir, it is within the experience of the Barbados Workers' Union that we have negotiated contracts with a Board, and when the Board made its presentation to the Minister, he either did not approve, or was hard to give his approval, to the conditions of employment and the wages which we had agreed on. I refer to the fact that we had negotiated an agreement with the Transport Board for the provision of a pension scheme for the workers who were covered by an agreement between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board. The Minister came to this House and introduced an Act which made it possible for him to grant pensions where he wanted to without any regard to what had taken place between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board. It is important when we make an agreement with a Board that the agreement is adhered to and implemented.

I will refer to the Industrial Development Corporation. This Corporation should be able to play an

extremely vital role in the economic and social life of this country. Naturally, if it plays an important role in the economic life of this country, it will also play an important role in the social life of the workers in this country. This relates to the policy and the relationship which exist between the Ministers and the members of the Boards. We have a situation where investors are invited by employees of the Board to come to this country to invest money. Of course, the employees of the Board must make the initial contact. When the investors come here and find that the climate in Barbados is good for them to set up industries, and the workers attempt to carry out one of their constitutional and divine rights to organise themselves, we find that efforts are being made to frustrate them. We have a situation where every kind of act bordering on a criminal act is employed by some of these investors to pay the workers as little as possible, and sometimes they leave the workers in some doubt as to whether they are protected by the laws of Barbados.

Sir, we had a situation quite recently where some employers were in the habit of terminating the employment of their workers at the end of each year and re-employing them at the beginning of the next year. It is only after the workers were organised that they realised the advantage which was taken of them before. As a matter of fact, we think that industrial peace will be of benefit to the entire country, but industrial peace cannot be maintained if we are going to have that type of employer or investor coming to this country and pursuing policies which are harmful to the workers of this country.

Sir, we would like to see a situation where the investors are told in no uncertain terms about the situation which exists in Barbados. They should be told of the rights of the workers, and the way in which investors are expected to behave so far as their relations with the workers are concerned. This will be of tremendous benefit to the country in the long run.

When we are talking about the Statutory Boards, it must be remembered that it is an important function of the people who have to look after the administration of their affairs to do things in a proper manner. This can only be done if people clearly understand the role that they have to play, and are prepared to function in a proper manner.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long. What the hon. Member for St. Lucy has said about the question of the Minister and pensions for workers at the Transport Board is not correct. As far as I know, no pension scheme has ever been negotiated between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board. There was discussion on the matter, and I must say that the Union showed a certain amount of responsibility at the time. Now, the relevant section of the Transport Board Act, 1973 (1973-27) Section 3(14)(3) reads as follows:

"No pension, gratuity or other benefit may be granted to an officer or servant or to any other person by reference to his service, or to dependants or estates of such persons except in accordance with such conditions as the Board, with the approval of the Minister, determines."

In the circumstances, where does the Minister come into this question of nullifying agreements reached with any union? I just want to put the record straight, I think the Union knows that at the present moment there is no agreement for a pension scheme between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board.

Mr. WALCOTT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Transport Board refused to...

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order. The hon. Member must take his seat. There must be no infringement of the Standing Orders of this House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for St. Michael West has already said that the Union negotiates with the Board and no Minister can tell the Board what to do. I do not think it is fair for either the Member for St. Lucy or the Member for St. Michael West to say that I ignored any pension scheme agreed to between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Transport Board. Do not give the people the impression that I sat at the Pine and jeopardised the future of the workers when their days at the Transport Board are over. I think the Union will agree that they are now discussing some aspect of the quantum to be given by the National Insurance Board. 6.50 p.m.

I want to get that straight. Impressions are being given that I interfered. That is not true. You either have ministerial status or you do not. I do not believe -whether the Democratic Labour Party is in power or not - in putting square pegs into round holes. That can do neither the party nor the country any good. You get people who are obviously square pegs. You get people whose shape has not been completely assessed and therefore you have to give them an opportunity to see that they do shape up so that they will be a round peg in a round hole and not a square peg in a round hole. You cannot condemn a man whose ability to make a contribution has not been tried.

I have said so already, and this is party politics. The Opposition has said that if they ever got the Government they would not fire all the members of the Democratic Labour Party and put in their own people. Let us be practical. If you have people in all walks of life who represent the 43% of the electorate, in that 43% there must be people of ability who supported them. When their time comes, will they say that they have this essential ability and will still keep members of the D.L.P. appointed?

In America when Mr. Nixon gets into power, he kicks out the Democrats and puts in the Republicans. In England Mr. Heath puts party members in key positions. In Trinidad, in Jamaica, in Africa, they either select people from the same tribe - in the case of Africa - or whatever party is in power. Do not come playing high and mighty and saying that if you got into power you will look into the whole population and pick out people from among those who supported the D.L.P. There are not many of us who have supported the party from 1955. You must support people who supported you. Their support made you get into power and when you get into power will you say that you will not bring in Barbados Labour Party supporters?

I want to reiterate that square pegs should not be put into round holes but must be fitted into the position which they can hold. There has been talk about Ministers having a say in various things. Are you to tell me that a director of a firm will not have a say in who should be the manager of the store? I am Minister in charge of natural gas. Must I have no say in the appointment of a person who should be manager of that body or of the Transport Board?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, the Hon. Minister need not try to fight the issue.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The Minister has got accountability for what happens in the Transport Board. When schedules are missed, questions come to the Minister where policy is concerned. Can it seriously be argued that I should allow a manager to be appointed to the Board without my having a say?

I agree with the hon. Member for St. Michael West that Ministers must not play managers, must not be interested in the day to day running of the Boards. You do not keep a dog and bark too, but you as

Minister have an overall responsibility to see that the job is being done. I do not deal with personnel, but I am prepared to investigate when cases of injustice are drawn to my attention; but I am not going to tell you who is working at St. George and who has got laid off. I do not want to see anyone laid off, but I do not want to do day to day work. As long as Ministers realise that they are the policy makers, it must be realised that they have overall responsibility. If the Transport Board breaks down completely it is obviously the Minister who they will criticise at election time.

I want to know that the man who is appointed manager has the requisite qualifications. I want to know that nepotism will not come into play. It is always the Minister who will do this. Prejudices very often operate on Boards to the detriment of the employees. If the Minister does not have a say, the Board itself can victimise employees. The Minister, if he is to see that justice is dispensed to all the workers, must have an overall say and see that the Board is carrying out its duties, since in the last resort the political responsibility is with the Minister.

Sir, it is not a question of power, but the political responsibility where it lies, and you have to decide at what level you should give the Minister the right to have a say and to see that the policy of the Government is carried out. Secondly, if the manager of a Statutory Board is charged with feaseance or non-feaseance, can the Minister responsible for the Board come to this House and say as a responsible person that that manager was appointed without his knowledge and therefore he is asking for an excuse?

If you are running a country with a Constitutional Government and Independence, I can think of no other way than that the Minister himself must have the right, not to appoint or dismiss, but the power to approve appointments, in the top echelons of the Boards. That is in accordance with the best parliamentary traditions all over the world. Look at the U.S.A. One morning Nixon got a rush of blood and three men were fired. 7.00 p.m.

What I am saying is that once you are in a position of political responsibility, you have got to give to the Minister the fact that he cannot remove himself from that responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong in the Bill. I agree with the hon. Member for St. Lucy that the words "inflationary increments" were probably not the correct words to be used but I am sure that the hon. Member who used them did not mean to imply them in the sense in which they are taken. Mr. Speaker, I would state that this Bill is intended to help people who have given their service. We have to make provision for people who work for us so that when the time comes that they cannot, because of age or some infirmity perform that duty which they have been performing, they will still have something on which to fall back. They should still be able to live in such a manner that all those years of toil and

sacrifice would have been suitably rewarded so that they can live for the rest of their days in peace and know where their bread is coming from.

There is nothing wrong with the Act. It is in accordance with Ministerial status, and not to do this would be making a mockery of the Ministerial set up. Reference has been made to square pegs in round holes. In many cases you cannot tell at an early stage whether you have square pegs in round holes; gradually you have to look at the way and the manner in which a person performs before you can assess the ability of the persbri to do the particular job. That is all I have to may Mr. Speaker.

Mr.CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Communications and Works probabty took a lot of steam out of his address by paying too much attention to the speech made by the hon. Member for St. Lucy. From what the hon. Member for St. Lucy has said as regardsi his supporting the Clause, I do not think the Minister should pay much attention to what the hon. Member for St. Lucy said. I must say that the hon. Member for St. Michael West opened his innings too early. He should have come in to bat after the Minister of Communications and Works.

Mich has been said about square pegs in round holes and so on. What I have observed of one of the Statutory Boards is - as a former member of one of the Statutory Boards - that there is a lot of responsibility put on people who have no knowledge; absolutely no knowledge of what their duties are and because of that they tie themselves up and are at the whims and fancies of the Minister. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot give a man responsibility and do not give him authority. All of these Statutory Boards, they are just mouth pieces of the Ministers - they are just the Ministers' spare tyres. You will notice that nearly all of the members of the Boards are J.P's and party ticket-holders and therefore they do the country no good, and the Government must be blamed for this attitude. That is why last Tuesday so much praise was showered on the Parks and Beaches Commission, because they are all knowledgeable people, except the Chairman and he has been rewarded financially because he served the Government party in the last election. I could sky a lot more but I will Hot do so now. But apart from him, you have a number of knowledgeable people on that Board. On almost all the other Boards you have a lot of helpless people. Not one of them can come out with an idea that can help the Minister. Not one of them. They go to work and at a quarter past four they are ready to go and at the end of the month they send down for the vouchers. But the fact is, you will have these people on these Boards because you have to give assistance to those who served during the battle of election. It is true to say that you cannot put square pegs in round holes. You should not, but that is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this. If there was ever one thing wrong that the Government has done in this country - one of the biggest mistakes they ever made was to abolish Local Government. By abolishing Local Government, they have thrown a lot of responsibility on the Statutory Boards, and particularly the

Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. As regards the Transport Board, the Transport Board came out of silly spite and the country suffers as a result of this; If you are saying that the Minister has power and final decision rests in his hands for any person earning \$600 and up, I do not agree with this because you are giving the Board responsibility to carry out the policy of the Government. In the meantime there is a top post, let us say. The Minister may feel like putting a square peg in a round hole and the Board is saddled with this square peg in a round hole, and the structure of the Board suffers. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot put him in a job simply because he served you well. 7.10 p.m.

I make the plea to the Government that if there is one thing they could do for this country is to bring back Local Government but watch carefully the qualification bar. That is what was responsible for the failure of Local Government in this country.

There is another point I wish to make. Democracy must prevail, and if you are over the age of 21, you have the right to pay your \$240 and contest an election, but it is regrettable that the Trade Union must find seats in Parliament as part and parcel of Government, because at some future date you must have a head-on collision and no person is going to suffer but the workers. They could be in here as Independents to represent the interests of the Trade Union because they are more knowledgeable in industrial relations than any one in here, except perhaps the Minister of Communications and Works.

I would also like to draw to the Government's attention that when you find a Board not only weak because of their being square pegs in round holes but also because of interference by Ministers, that is another problem which weakens the hand of the Board. Nothing could be more weakening than a directive sent to CBC by the Minister of Information: that before anything can come out, the Minister has to vet it. It is ridiculous; how can you give the Board responsibility to do something and yet they do not have the right to appoint whom they think can do the work the best? We have made criticisms repeatedly in here about the BMC, CBG and the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board and they fell on deaf ears because most of the members are friends of the Government. Do not say for one single moment that if we won power I would be one of the people who would support putting my supporters on Boards, but I would also say this, that I would never support putting a man on a Board just because he has done something useful during the campaign unless I see what contribution he can make on the Board. The Government and the taxpayers suffer if this person cannot produce.

With regard to this reserved power in the hands of the Minister, I am a little doubtful about it, that you can appoint a man at \$200 or \$300 a month but the Minister can bring anybody at all, as long as he is receiving \$600 or over, so if the Minister is satisfied that the man is right though he is wrong, he may have done something embarrassing to all the Board members and the Government, but he is the Minister's friend and therefore the Minister cannot discipline the person. The Board cannot function properly, because the man will still be there and the whole structure of the Board will fall down. This is

what I have always repeated, that if there is one thing I would like to see my Party and the Government putting our heads together and working out is a framework for Local Government, I feel it would do the country some good. There are times when we see our priorities and ideologies different from the Government, therefore we are true socialists, because in the Minutes of the House for 1937 - the Leader of the House took the Minutes and he can recall that the Barbados Labour Party proposed and worked hard to see a strong merchant union going - but it is all recorded, and now the hon. Member for St. Michael West says that we are making gibes at the Union. It is no wonder the Minister of Communications and Works feels that the Labour College should be named die Sir Grantley Adams College, and I believe the Leader of the House feels this way too, because he knows of the nights he had to light a kerosene lamp for the late Sir Grantley to see to get up the stairs, to help the masses of this country.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, are you suggesting that the only thing I can do, is to hold a lamp? I organised the Progressive League, I did not only hold a lamp.

Mr. CRAIG:

I must apologise to the Leader of the House because he has taken what I said out of context. Sir Grantley Adams held the light for others to follow, I do not mean that all you could do was to hold a lamp, I mean that you have made a contribution in the dark days, so there is no need for me to say anything disparaging about you. I must apologise to the Leader of the House, and I do not think I can do any more but apologise.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that Government should look into the appointments to these Statutory Boards and the Ministers must not interfere at any time with the working of the Boards. Minutes are kept by the Boards, they are submitted to the Ministeris, the Ministers must look at them and if they are not satisfied with what is going on at the Boards then it is their duty to revoke any decision made by the Boards, but for them to interfere with the working of the Boards, I believe will weaken the hands of the Statutory Boards.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, if I genuinely thought that this amendment would eradicate the \$20 million or more which has been lost by Statutory Boards since the operation of Statutory Boards in this country, if I genuinely thought that this amendment would improve the efficiency and cut out the bad administration of Statutory Boards, if I genuinely thought that after this House has voted for the Bill, we would see a greater accountability to Parliament, then I would support this Bill. 7.20 p.m

Not only do I doubt that this will be achieved, but I am certain that the effect of this amendment will worsen what is a very bleak position for the operation of Statutory Boards in this country. What bothers me about Parliamentarians is that sometimes we seem not to look at the progress which has taken place in thinking, particularly in relation to the operation of Statutory Boards and the role which they have had to play as instruments of Government.

Sir, very soon after the Second World War and the introduction in Britain of a socialist Government under Prime Minister Attlee, the Labour Government, not going in for full socialism used the Statutory Board as an instrument to effect certain socialistic changes. These Statutory Boards were given various kinds of specific powers. The trouble about our situation in Barbados is that we have adopted the Statutory Boards and used the precedents in England without recognising the weaknesses which occurred in them immediately after 1945, and successive Governments continued to burden the country with these Boards that are not performing adequately.

I would have thought that, instead of the Government coming here with piecemeal amendments to Statutory Boards, its first duty as a responsible Government would have been to take stock some 23 years after the first Statutory Board was established in Barbados, and to see what could be done to improve things. Instead of the Government going into the matter and introducing comprehensive changes in new legislation, it is persisting with piecemeal legislation some of which worsens an already bad situation.

Now, I want to make a very important point. Most members have spoken as if the amendment dealt with the method of appointing members to Statutory Boards, but it does not. I believe this is a separate issue. It is an issue in which; unfortunately, political parties are still wedded to the idea that they must compensate their political supporters by putting them on Boards, regardless of whether they are capable of performing their duties efficiently. On the Boards today one of two things will happen. You will either become a member of the party, or lose your own independence and follow the party line.

Sir, I know that on the existing Boards can be found some very good men. Some people try to adopt a neutralistic attitude, but if there is a change of Government tomorrow the incoming Government, on political grounds, might feel it incumbent to remove those people. Of course, this happened when the Government was changed in 1961 and it has continued. As we get further from 1961 some people do not pay any regard as to whether the people who were serving on Boards are worthwhile or not.

With regard to this question of appointment and dismissal, I do not concede that the Minister needs to

have this power. As a compromise we could say that certain matters should be referred to the Cabinet. I believe that, in new Independent territories like ours, we suffer from the idea that we must have a say in everything that happens. I can say that on most Statutory Boards there is a fear that members may do something to displease a Minister, and some people try to avoid doing that.

Contrary to what the hon. Member for St. Michael West has said, the Minister already has the power to lay down the policy that any Board must follow. It is a fallacious argument to say that a Minister will feel that he is not accountable to this Parliament, if he does not have this power. In the case of the civil service, or the public sendee, from die Chief Justice down, the Minister does not have the power at the moment, but he is still responsible, because of the concept of Ministerial responsibility, to this House for the day to day administration of his Ministry. He cannot hide behind the civil servant when his day to day act of administration goes wrong. He takes the limelight of the civil servant when his Ministry performs well, and he must also take the limelight when things are not going well.

I urge upon the Government not to be afflicted by this argument, because it is die sort of argument which provides, in my humble submission, a political charter for political patronage. Part of the trouble in these Statutory Boards is the question of political patronage. In the Barbados Labour Party in the 1950s the Housing Authority suffered from that ailment; this Government suffered from the same ailment, and most of the Statutory Boards are now suffering from political patronage.

Sir, I am not saying that some of the men on these Boards are not men of integrity, but I am sure that we have not been properly served by these Boards for many reasons. I would hate tdo think that we are iiow going to leave most of the Boards bereft almost of their vitality by undermining die confidence which they have in their officers. 7.30 p.m.

The hon. Member for St. James says that he has grave doubts about it. I believe that those doubts are shared by all of us on this side of the House. I believe that we will have to vote for the amendment which has been brought to this House, but I wonder if the Government wants to press ahead with an amendment of this nature which cannot meet the existing situation,

I would like to talk about the distinction between policy and administration. It seems to me that there is some confused thinking in the Government as to where policy begins and where it ends and where administration begins and ends because surely the appointment and dismissal 6f an officer can never be a question of policy as such in the properly understood sense of that term.

Sir, it is a matter of day to day administration, and there is where it should reside, and nowhere else. All the Ministers want to do is to send down in writing the broad policy which the Board must follow, leaving it to the Board to implement that policy. Their duty is to see that these officers execute the policy which the Ministers have referred to them or the policy which they are carrying out within the full compass of the Act.

The Minister is now telling me that he must get from the realm of policy and get into the day to day administration. Surely his duty is to dismiss the Board if it is defying him, or alternatively, to call on the Board to dismiss its servants. Unfortunately, many of these servants have no security of tenure.

I have heard the hon. Member for St. Michael West say that this is the time of organisation and nobody can be pushed around; but there are occasions when people working for these; Boards can be pushed around because of the Minister having the opportunity to appoint the person he likes in a particular position.

It is unfortunate that this is occurring because I believe that we should be at the stage of political maturity that matters like these should be "de-politicalised", if I may coin a word, and we can get proper government without having to descend to these little matters.

Speaking for myself, if I were a Minister, one of the things that I would not want to do is to be hampered by my supporters. One of the dangers of the amendment is that it opens the Minister to this type of pressure so that he may be forced to make decisions not in the best interest of the nation as a whole. I do not know if the Government has seen the full implications of this.

I have not been satisfied with the performance of one or two of the Boards. I believe that questions will be raised on these issues. I do not want to deal with the Boards in particular except for two Boards. I am concerned, for instance, that this power should now reside in the hands of the Minister of Information, having regard to the experience of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and the edict coming to members of the staff that they should only report the positive side of the news.

Sir, any Minister who is going to ask a Board, looking at a professional Journalist and treating him this way, even if he earns \$70.00 a week, he should not be appointed to a particular position. I am equally concerned about this power residing in the Minister of Trade as well. I am not satisfied that he is as

objective as he should be. I am prepared as a matter of parliamentary practice to speak to the Minister myself on one or two matters or to the Leader of the House, and then if I am not satisfied, I will come back to the House and speak on these issues. It seems to me that instead of offloading these little duties, they are taking on more and more power. I am sure that they do not understand the real purpose of the Act.

Let me make a few points clear. If the Boards are going to behave in the way that the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board is behaving, as I understand it, I think that the Minister has the right not to take their decisions. I cannot for a moment agree with the hon. Member for St. Michael West that an officer of a Board goes into negotiations and there is a ceiling on the percentage of increase that you should allow him to go beyond that because it can have serious repercussions on the economy, and the officer who disobeys the instructions leaves the Minister in an embarrassing position. This is a wrong concept. I do not agree with it even if it comes from the Union Leader. It is basically wrong. The Minister of Health should have known and should have been able to consult with the Minister of Finance so that negotiations would not exceed the national ceiling of \$X. Certainly the Minister must have the right to lay down a national guideline for wage negotiations and to ensure that the negotiations are within these guidelines unless he is persuaded, because of special circumstances, to go outside of the guidelines.

I will say, Sir, that it is not every collective agreement that is negotiated that is in the national interest, and that is why I think that the Government should act with speed in bringing in a minimum wage legislation to take a lot out of what is happening both in relation to negotiations with Statutory Boards and otherwise, because if you have relationship with a Trade Union, as the Labour Party itself had in its formative years, there will be natural hesitancy to take up anything which will be against the Union because it may not be politically expedient. It should not be a question of political expediency, but a question of good statesmanship.

I am afraid that this amendment is another sign of badly thought out policy and lack of statesmanship. It is a retrograde step and I believe that any analysis of the position will show that it is. I think that it is time that we get away from people who just pay lip service and I will warn the other side that supporters who pay lip service, are always the first to leave the ship. I believe that many who did not support us, if we had won, would have done the same thing. Many of them have no convictions. 7.40 p.m.

My judgement of people does not always rest on their political affiliations. It rests on whether they can perform and perform well and I hope my party would be magnanimous enough to set up some guidelines which would be followed and which would enable people, with convictions, to move forward.

History has a habit of repeating itself. None of us know who would be here in ten years time but everyone of us know that we all cannot be here forever, and so I end with this. I believe that the Government must take a comprehensive look at the Legislation which is brought into Parliament. Look at other legislation in other countries that use these Boards. To have this model form which we are adopting all the time is in my view a mistake and it is not necessary to extend the Minister's power more in this respect. I will be voting against the amendment on those grounds.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, there have been so many irrelevancies that.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Leader of the House replying?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am replying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Is the Hon. Leader of the House prepared to give way?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am not giving way. I have very little to say. This is the Second Reading of a Bill which is before us. What this Bill seeks to do, as the Objects and Reasons state, is to amend certain enactments relating to Statutory Boards to delete any reference to a specific sum in respect of a post for which the Minister's prior approval is required for assignment of salary or appointment to, that post. The Minister already has power.

I hear some hon. Members speaking about dismissal and things of that sort. The question of dismissal does not arise at all. Now there are some twelve Statutory Boards which employ staff, which seek Ministerial approval for the creation of posts and appointment of staff at a certain salary level.....

Mr. FORDE:

If the hon. Member would give way, Mr. Speaker, may I draw the hon. Leader's attention to the

amendment which says that no person may be dismissed from any post to which the subsection refers, without the prior approval of the Minister. Well, with respect, I would suggest that the question of dismissal does arise, not only appointment but dismissal also.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will come to that. The Minister at present has power. You will see that in one case an amendment provides for deleting the words "\$7,200 per annum" and substituting therefor the words "such sum as the Minister may determine and notify in writing to the Board." In another case it provides for deleting "in excess of \$6,000 per annum" and substituting therefore the words "is assigned by the Minister," and so on. So the purpose of the amendments to this Bill is to have it regularized at a certain salary level, but, the power is not exercised by the Minister himself. The matter is brought to the Cabinet for the approval of the Cabinet, so this talk about the Minister having all this power is all irrelevant nonsense. If anyone over there on the side of the Opposition wants to give a lecture, he can, but do not come in here and waste the taxpayers' time. We are here to regularize this; salaries are being increased every year. Right now the Union is seeking to get \$25 per week more for a certain category of workers, and the staff - the people employed by the Boards that we are concerned with. So this is a waste of valuable time, talking about a retrograde step and all that. Whatever amount it is to be will be decided by the Cabinet, not by any particular Minister, and no Minister can appoint anybody without the consent of the Cabinet, and as far as dismissal is concerned, no Minister has any power to dismiss anybody. So just get that clear out of your mind; get rid of the views that you have been holding in mind with regard to dismissal by the Minister and things of that sort.

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

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. W. R. LOWE, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN and Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND - 10.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN and Mr. H. deB. FORDE -4.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this may be a convenient time to suspend the Sitting. I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for three quarters of an hour.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 7.50 p.m.

On resumption:-

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Sitting is now resumed.

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

Clause 1 was called and passed, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES and Hon. F. G. SMITH - 8.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN and Mr. H. deB. FORDE-4.

Clause 2 was called and passed, the House dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES and Hon. F. G. SMITH - 9.

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN and Mr. H. deB. FORDE - 4.

The Schedule to the Bill was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill,

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, in the Schedule every Statutory Board stands to fall under the influence of the several Ministers responsible for them. We have seen public conflict, or letters written in public which show the conflict which now exists between the Boards and the Ministers. We have heard in this Chamber that one hon. Member said that the Boards and the Union have got the Government hamstrung. Mr. Chairman, you very well remember, when the debate came up last time dealing with one of the Statutory Boards, the statement which was made on this particular point. What worries me is that if the Minister is saying that they must have control over certain members of the staff of the Board, as has been said by the Minister of Communications and Works, when he said he must have the right to determine who must be employed, and as the Bill says in the several sections, "no appointment whether temporary or permanent may be made to any post to which a salary is assigned by the Minister under paragraph (a); and (c) no person may be dismissed from any post to which this subsection refers, without the prior approval of the Minister", one has only got to reflect on statements made in this Chamber.

The hon. Member for St. Andrew once stood on the floor of this Chamber and said that if he had two people applying for a job the one with the party ticket would get the job, as opposed to the one without the party ticket, despite the fact that the one without the party ticket is more qualified. As the hon. Member for St. Michael West said, the Boards will now be shivering under the thought of what the Minister will do. He has already laid down his threats and his warnings, and I ask will the Ministers now ask for the same powers in relation to their Permanent Secretaries? I hear a lot of talk about Ministerial Government, but you will remember the Right Hon. Prime Minister said that he has never read a book which says that a Minister must be responsible for what the Permanent Secretary does and he is not taking any blame for anybody. I have heard every Minister on the front bench say the same thing.

Let us look at the Ministry of Tourism and refer to the statement made in this Chamber by the Minister about what he wants CBC to do. As of tonight I say that every employee of every Statutory Board in this country will now become the lackey of the Minister, otherwise he has no job, and if you want the job, you will have to sweep the Minister's yard. Do not think that this is not true, because you have seen the writing on the wall when it comes to the Minister of Information, He says what he wants done and now to put this Board in that Minister's hand, woe unto my brothers and sisters, and I will stand by and see what the Union will do. I know you do not need any help because you will grab him by the 31st of this month. I am begging God not to let violence take place because I cannot run out of Barbados, I have no second passport for any place, I did not come in like Robinson Crusoe and I have not got a Man Friday,

You have heard the issues involving a certain gentleman, of complaints about the Price Control Board and the Minister. You have seen the conflict between the provision merchants on one side, the Board of the BMC and the Minister. This is not going to create better relations in this country, it means something like an incident which took place recently. A certain officer on a particular Board - I will not call the Board because you would identify the officer and I know now that the man would not have a job although we know him to be a good yardfowl of the Democratic Labour Party - but he was assaulted by an employee of the Board and he reported it to the Board but the man who assaulted him was a good friend of the Minister, and instead of justice being done the man who was assaulted had to write an apology to the Board and to the man who assaulted him, otherwise he would not have a job today. This is what we are going to find as a result of these amendments. This is what the Ministers are asking for, the lever to control everybody on a Statutory Board, but when it comes to Parliament and you begin to ask questions about what is happening with the Board you hear that they have no control, it is a separate Board.

We must vote against this. If you are saying that you are creating Boards to run things in this country, the first thing you must bear in mind is that if you have placed your party hats on them and are ashamed to get rid of them, that is your problem. You must not now sit down in your ivory tower and dictate to a Board - who must or must not be employed, who must or must not be fired. If tonight the Board of the B.M.C. - because this is the Board in the news today - finds that one of its employees is contravening

one of its rules and it is a serious contravention of the rules, by this amendment although the Board is convinced that this man must be dismissed forthwith for the good of the institution, he cannot dismiss him forthwith because if the Minister controls the salary the Board has to sit down and write a report to the Minister and the Minister will come in here and say that it has not got to him yet, it must be with the Permanent Secretary. All this time that employee is doing what he wants to do because he might be the good friend of the Minister. 8.45 p.m.

Let us say that a Minister approved the appointment of an officer. The Chairman of the Board may not know of the relationship existing between the employee and the Minister. The employee can act as he likes and the Board cannot send him home because the Minister has appointed him. If the Minister has* gone on a short tour to Jamaica, Canada or Geneva, then the Acting Minister may decide to allow a certain matter to await the return of the Minister, and the Board will have to remain in chains. There are some people employed at the Ministry of Communications and Works and it is useless complaining about them, because your complaints cannot get past certain officers.

Mr. Chairman, this is the position in which these amendments will be putting certain Government employees. You and I know that Barbadians like to watch each other. If Tom Brown can do what he feels like, then another Barbadian will expect to do as he feels like, too. It seems to me that laziness is the object of most people. Even in politics you have lazy people, and in the Government you have lazy people. In the Statutory Boards you will find a lot of lazy people.

Mr. Chairman, when I complained about the B.M.C. not taking mangoes, I was told that the Manager said: "Do not take any more mangoes in here because the people will eat all." Why is the Minister claiming this particular power? Is he afraid of the Board? If the Board does not carry out the Minister's policy, then he can call on the members of the Board to resign. The Minister said that you do not put square pegs in round holes, and you have to give a man a chance to prove what he can do.

Now, in the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board some people will sit down and sign cheques when they feel like. Some people are afraid to say: "Brother, you helped me in the election, and I have tried to help you. You are not doing your job properly, and I will have to revoke your appointment." When speaking about the Transport Board, the Minister of Communications and Works said "Do you mean to say that I am going to appoint a Manager, and I must not be able to have a say as to his ability?" Sir, this is multiplying the burdens of the people involved in the appointment of officers. Let us say that the Board had vetoed a man's qualifications, and had discussed with the technical people certain things to ensure that he was capable of doing the job, but because of some family feud the Minister decided against the appointment of this man. Despite the fact that the man may be qualified to fill the job, the Board will not be able to employ him. This is the type of amendment the Government has introduced, and it will certainly cause trouble at these Statutory Boards. At the moment the Statutory Boards are not

functioning properly, and this sort of thing will run this country into industrial disputes.

Sir, the hon. Member for St. Lucy has already made an allegation against the Minister of Communications and Works, and he has said it is not true. There must be some truth hanging between the corridors of these two big rooms. I do not think the hon. Member for St. Lucy would come here and tell this Parliament an untruth, and I do not think that the Minister of Communications and Works would come here and mislead this Honourable Chamber. I do not want to see any more marches. We are going to vote against these amendments, because we are of the opinion that you will be making a Statutory Board a tool of the Minister.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw your attention to Standing Order 30(6).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I have already realised that the hon. Member is adhering to Standing Order 30.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, on a debate on a Government Order, a Member may speak for 30 minutes, except on third reading of a bill. We have not yet reached the Third Reading stage.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Read Standing Order 30(6), and you will see that you have exceeded your time.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, who is keeping the time in here? Mr. Chairman has not yet told me that I have exceeded the time limit. If the Minister of Health wants me to talk about the Trade Union having them hamstrung, I will do so. If the Minister of Health is worried, then I will.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am not worried,

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, they are afraid of the Trade Union and the Union has them hamstrung. It is a fight between the Ministry of Health and the Barbados Workers' Union. I am not on the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board; I did not make any agreement, so what are you afraid of? 8,55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that the four or five Members in the House who belong to the Opposition have to be confused and waste time as their only means of dealing with a serious matter. We are dealing with Clause 2. The hon. Member went all over the Bill. I do not want any less or any more latitude than the hon. Member. He covered every sort of subject. There is no point talking about the Trade Union. I do not want any help from any Member over there. They never ran a Trade Union in their lives. The one they started, failed. That is the one that you should name after Sir Grantley Adams, or go up Roebuck Street to that "razzy" building you meet in and call it by the name of Sir Grantley Adams.

The Labour Party was in power and they had a lot of dunderheads on the Boards. Now they can come here and talk about Boards. I will not call names because I want to be fair. I said that I agreed with this power which the Minister possesses, but I know that if the Minister of Communications thinks he can appoint a conductor, he will be an idiot, and if the Minister believes he can appoint a gravedigger let him go and appoint "Commander". There are certain areas which you cannot deal with. I do not think that the Minister should get involved in this. A Minister in Barbados cannot be any less than a Minister in England. The Acts in England give a Minister these same sorts of powers or authority; but you must also look at the 1964 Trade Union Act.

I cannot agree with the hon. Member and say that the Minister can chase away people unless the people are idiots. There is the Local Government Act of 1954. Section 50(1) of that Act says:-

"Every council shall, with the consent of the Governor, appoint fit persons to be respectively Clerk of the Council and Treasurer, and may pay to such officers such remuneration as, with the like consent, they may determine, and no officer appointed under this section shall be dismissed except by the Council with the consent of the Governor or by the Governor."

The Minister would only be an idiot to believe that under this Act, you can dismiss someone or dismiss all the people from the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. We will walk and tell him to go and bury the dead. The question of dismissal is not in dispute, but there are some people who want to change this Act. We have a Trade Union Act which says that a trade dispute means any dispute between

workers and employers on the terms and conditions of employment. The Member for Christ Church West knows what I mean, but there are some sandside lawyers who tell the Government what to do.

I do not even need a lawyer now. I have to tell the lawyers that this is what you have to deal with, if you want to deal with a particular case. The problem arises not so far as the Union and the Minister are concerned, but where the country and the Minister are concerned because if you get into a conflict with the Union as an organisation it is a conflict with the people, and therefore you will get a dislocation which could be avoided.

This is an Act of Parliament which was passed by this same Party in 1954. It is the same Party which gave civil servants the right to become members of the Trade Union. There is no point doing that and then coming and saying that we should amend the Act in so far as staff of the Boards is concerned. The Member for Christ Church West said that he knows that a collective agreement is no different from an agreement that you make in other circumstances. All that happens with a collective agreement is that the courts do not have any jurisdiction over it. You do not go to Court with a collective agreement.

It is all right for the member to talk about what is good for the country. Ex hypothesi, the person who is negotiating for the Minister must be sensible and must be in duty bound to carry out the instructions given to him. Those instructions must be specific. You cannot just say "you know what to do". What does that mean? The instructions must be specific.

If the Minister of Finance asks the Chief Establishments Officer to go and negotiate with the Union on the basis of a 15% or 20% increase and the officer reaches an agreement with the Union within those limits, must the Minister tell him, "you should have waited until next week?" The whole machinery would break down, How can I negotiate, how can I meet a Government representative and negotiate on behalf of the thousands of workers that the Government is employing if I am not sure that the agreement we have reached is in good faith? The Government has adopted that method. I never met the Prime Minister. We met the Chief Establishments Officer. 9.05 p.m.

It is for the Chief Establishments Officer to go back and tell the Prime Minister that he cannot get past the Union at this point, and if he says he cannot get any further, then you reach a breakdown; but, you reach an agreement with the accredited officer of the Government. The Minister only has the right to approve. Now in selecting a person for appointment you tell that person "your appointment is subject to the approval of the Minister", but often we cannot reach an agreement subject to the approval of the Minister because if you must reach it subject to the approval of the Minister you will never reach an agreement. So you cannot tell a worker to wait until the Minister approves, Again, the person

representing the Minister often does not know what the Minister has in mind. It is obvious that he should have certain guidelines for them to work on, but it is a waste of time when you send people in to represent you and they do not even know what is in your mind. So if people go in without any knowledge of what you require and they reach an agreement in good faith, you have to accept that. The only way you do not reach an agreement is where somebody is ready to put a gun at your head or where it is in duress that "if you do not reach an agreement I will kill you in the morning, or I will lock you up."

The hon. Member for Christ Church West used to be Counsel for the Barbados Workers' Union years ago. I would not have bought that building in Roebuck Street.....

Mr. FORDE:

I saved the hon. Member from being locked up on so many occasions. (Humour).....

Mr. SPEAKER:

What is the hon. Member speaking on?

Mr. FORDE:

Just a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I don't mind what the hon. Member has said. The hon. Member gave me the right advice on certain occasions. I am only saying that the relationship between us was a close one, so, the hon. Member must know the attitude to the question of industrial matters. But in so far as this amendment is concerned, there is nothing in this amendment for anyone to be worried about. I would say this, that I do not have any control over the Ministries. I do not know who will be the next Minister of Labour but we in the Barbados Workers' Union always have to be working along with the Minister of Labour in getting matters straightened up. I know this, that there are a lot of civil servants with whom you have to deal, who are just jokers when it comes to certain matters. They give bad advice and prepare bad papers and they give wrong information, and along with that, they are biased, and all those things. I have to live through these things but because I feel that I know how to manage these things, I take it with a shrug of the shoulders. So the Union is not afraid of getting the Ministers or their representatives to deal with matters in which the Union is involved, but there are numerous workers who every now and again want you to represent them. There are ever so many bus drivers and conductors who every now and again are seeking for something more and seeking for you to do something for them. They come from all parts of the island, some of them, particularly those from Britton's Hill, they will not only want more money as

bus drivers and conductors but they want more money because they are your constituents.

So going back to the point. Do not let us get confused with these amendments, thinking that the Government is doing something now for anybody to be afraid of. I want to make sure that they do what is right, and I am satisfied that this is nothing to be worried about. The Government passed the Trade Union Act in 1964 giving the people the right to be recognised. The right to be recognised is something for which you have to walk about the streets and show your might, in order to get it - in order to get the right to be recognised. Some Ministers are afraid of the power of the people but, the power of the people will be exemplified whether you like it or not. I can go and call the hon. Member for Christ Church West tomorrow, and carry him to court to represent me, and he is recognised. I can go and get certain other lawyers to go to court and I will get them to go simply because they are recognised. So the right to be recognised is something of importance.

The fact of the matter is, we have too many problems in Barbados in regard to Unionism. 9.15 p.m.

How is it that you can pass an Act like this for the Government of Barbados, all the Civil Servants and the Government employees, and you do not have one on the Statute Book dealing with those coming from the southern States of the United States? They will pass the law when somebody chops off a hand or a foot. Did you hear what happened in one of the places at the harbour this week? They stormed a place down there, but one of these days passions will rise higher and some blood-thirsty person will go in there and do something drastic and then they will pass the law to deal with this. I do not want to say anything more on this, but this is going to arise in this country because there is no point in Ministers getting on like children in this matter.

There was a time when the powers that be felt that the Ministers who were Ministers could not run this country, you had to be recognised, and I do not understand how there is a Government like the one we have in power which takes so long to get on the Statute Book the kind of laws which should have been on the Statute Book a long time ago. This is no special Act for me, there is no Frank Walcott (Amendment) Act, my pension is prepared already for me by the Union, I am not going to be begging the Government or anybody for a pension, you will not see me down Broad Street begging for a pension, I was never in the Government Service begging for anything. I am not one of those people who want to become a Minister for half an hour and then come back and draw \$50,000, I do not know what money is, I was born poor, so money does not worry me. As long as I get food to eat and I can go to the sea on mornings I feel happy, but I feel what is good for people is good for them and when you talk about these kinds of Acts I would like to see when on the Statute Book. Unfortunately the Minister of Labour is not here, but I would like to see the Government as speedily as they can, bring down the law to give the Ministers this power to tell the people here they must recognise the Union. What is wrong with that? Do you think they are recognising me? They are recognising the workers who work for them.

Our labour is cheap if you use the word in its ordinary sense. There is cheap labour in Singapore, and I have been invited to visit that country some time soon. I do not run about places for the sake of running about places, I was invited to a lot of these places, and I am going to Singapore in February because I was invited by the Trade Union. The Prime Ministers' Conference was held in the Trade Union building, and that is where I am going. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned this is nothing personal, but when it comes to the idea of something that the Government is passing and they are saying there is something wrong with it, there is nothing wrong in it. The hon. Member for Christ Church West knows that in England, the Ministers had these powers, The lawyers who studied constitutional law would know that the Government of Barbados was a virtual dictator in a democracy before we had ministerial status. A gentleman by the name of Mr. Whyatt said to me that when he advised the Governor he had to take his advice or go to the Colonial Office.

I do not see anything wrong with this, when the Governor-in-Executive Committee had this power in the past - it is true it was a colonial system - but I do not see anything wrong in giving the power to the Ministers, what I do not like Members saying is that you will give it to the Ministers' friends.

The question that this be the Schedule to the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

AYES:

Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES-9,

NOES:

Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. C. L. BOLDEN and Mr. H. de.B. FORDE-4,

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr.

CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 9.25 p.m.

Hon. C E. TALMA:

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

Hon. A.-MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows: -

AYES:

Mr. W. R. LOWE; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT; His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, and Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES - 10,

NOES:

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. H. deB. FORDE -4.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

**THE RACING SERVICE BUSINESS (REGISTRATION OF PREMISES) (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1973**

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, you have already given me permission to deal with a Bill to amend the Racing Service Business (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964, and I will now proceed with it. As the Objects and Reasons state, this Bill would amend the Racing Service Business (Registration of Premises) Act, 1964 (Act 1964-34) to increase the fee payable for a certificate of registration in respect of a racing service business and provide for the making of a deposit of securities with the Accountant General in respect of such business.

Mr. Speaker, this is to implement certain budgetary proposals. Hon. Members will recall that the Minister of Finance and Planning in his budgetary proposals on the 31st May 1973 said inter alia:

"I proposed that the Racing Service registration fee should be \$25,000 instead of \$20,000 as at present and that they should hold a minimum of \$25,000 in government bonds or securities."

Now, an applicant for the grant or renewal of a certificate of registration can make a deposit, with the Accountant General, of securities to the value of not less than \$25,000. Where an applicant finds it impracticable to obtain the securities necessary to make the deposit under subsection (1), the deposit may be either in the form of cash or partly in cash and partly in securities.

As I have said, this Bill is merely to implement certain budgetary proposals. There are at present three racing services operating in this country, and the yield from the proposed increase will be \$90,000. The Attorney General was given instructions to prepare this legislation, and he has done so. It will become effective as from the 21st December, 1973. This is necessary since Section 4 (3) of the 1964 (24) Act provides that racing service operations certificates be renewed during the month of December*. The licence is valid for one calendar year, that is, from January to December, and for this reason I am asking for permission to deal with this Bill in all of its stages today*

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, when I received this Bill the first thing that struck me forcibly was that it was of such great public interest that we should deal with it in all of its stages today. I observe, Mr. Speaker, that the fee for the registration of a racing service business was originally \$20,000 and it will now be increased to \$25,000. I have spoken to a couple of persons who seem to be very interested in this type of exercise, and I have been told that the racing sendee business is finding it very difficult to exist. This does not sound right to me, because it has been said that the bookie is never out of pocket. I was looking forward to an increase even greater than \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, I think that Guyana has raised the racing fee, and I am wondering whether the Government has given this matter enough thought to increase it to \$25,000. The Leader of the House has said that there are three racing service operations in Barbados, and that this increase is expected to yield \$90,000. In my opinion it will only yield \$75,000. If there are three racing service operations and you have increased the fee to \$25,000, then you should only get \$75,000.

On the other hand, racing is fun for some people. They invest their money with great expectations, but it also has a degree of lawlessness. You can see a lot of young boys loitering around these places with no desire to work. A few of them have said that they do not have to work when they can pick up \$20 a day either from making a 50 cents bet, or from begging people who have won money. 9.35p.m.

I am one of the people not particularly interested in off track betting, and therefore I may be a bit dumb where this is concerned. I think that the Government should get revenue and I will support them in getting revenue from any source, but I believe that there are other areas which the Government might have overlooked in getting revenue.

I feel that the Airport tax for passengers leaving Barbados should be raised. I am dealing with the raising of revenue, and I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should look into areas where they could raise a bit more tax, and one of the areas is increasing the tax on people leaving the Island. I firmly believe that if you can afford a holiday abroad, there is nothing wrong with paying an additional tax. Then, you have thousands of people who pass through Barbados and there is nothing wrong with increasing taxes in that area to bring in additional revenue,

As far as the Barbados Turf Club is concerned, I am told that they hardly make any contribution to the

Treasury of Barbados as far as racing is concerned. Furthermore, the sanitary facilities at the racetrack at the Garrison are deplorable. There are just a few toilets along the road and thousands of people are on the race track with no facilities. It is not a good sight to see young ladies exposing themselves because they have nowhere to go to relieve themselves. I know you will say that the Turf Club is not responsible for the Garrison after a race meeting, but the Government gives them some subvention and they could provide better facilities at the Garrison.

I cannot see why this Bill is of such paramount importance that it should be dealt with in all its stages today. I would be glad to know why.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have reservations about certain gambling matters. I can say that one of these racing services is a neighbour of my office and there is sometimes quite a lot of noise. As the hon. Deputy Leader has said, we have to face certain facts of life. Whether you like it or not, it seems to me that it is something that is there to stay. As I have said, we have one of these services next door to our building, and it can be a nuisance to us and at one stage I wondered what we could do.

I see that the Government in this Bill has imposed \$5,000 more, and I will not bring an injunction against them but let them survive and help us against some of the noise in the building. This type of service provides people who want to bet on horses with facilities to do so. The last hon. Member seems to have been fighting against it.

Mr. CRAIG:

On a point of order, I am not fighting against it. I said that I did not hear the Minister explain it well enough and I would like to hear more about it. I would like to know if it is high enough or too low.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have been hoping for a long time that the Government, instead of putting this money into the general fund, could not utilise it for some specific purpose or in certain areas. They could take some of this money and use it, say, to improve the stadium or something like that.

However, Sir, I would like to see more revenue obtained from gambling. I throw out the suggestion to the Acting Minister of Finance that if people like to spend money this way, if the community likes to invest in this sort of thing, I do not see anything wrong in extracting some of it for the benefit of the

community as a whole, We have hospital services and social services, and I am not against taxing whether it is bingo or the racing service, I am satisfied that if people are going to do these things we should get more money out of it,

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to quarrel with the increase in the registration fee, but I would like to comment upon the second portion of the Bill which introduces a deposit on security which previously did not come into the Act,

I am wondering whether or not the Government has looked carefully at this amendment because the amendment now requires the racing service to provide a security of not less than \$25,000, but it does not go any further than that, Under the Insurance Act you have to provide insurance before you can go into business, and, Mr. Speaker, you very well know that gambling has a particular position in law. It means now that a person can sue a person in the racing service in court. I would have thought that you would amend the Act to make it possible for a person who places his money with one of these racing services and was not paid could get judgement or have recourse to the money put up with the Accountant General. Otherwise it still leaves me wondering what are the securities there for. If you are going to amend the Act, I would have thought that that is what you are amending the Act to do. This leaves me at a loss as to what the Government is trying to arrive at. If you are going to charge a licence fee and ask betting shops to put up a security, at least you should protect the people who go into the betting shops.

You have to agree that a man who wants to gamble can do so under the provisions set out in the Act. Let us take it a bit further. If you raise the conditions to \$50,000 any judgment or any fines obtained will be paid out of this sum which is under the control of the Comptroller. 9.45 p.m.

Now in Trinidad, Mr. Speaker, you have had instances where betting shops have been set up and instances in this country also where betting shops have been set up, and where large bets have been involved, and after certain circumstances arose, the proprietors of the betting shops have run out of the country. This is a loop hole that the Government should have seen. You should put some provision so that only a genuine betting shop operator would come in and set up a betting shop, or so that only a national is registered as a betting shop operator, so that when he runs out you can have redress against him. I think that the Act has been carelessly drawn because it deals with the question of recovering \$25,000 if land tax or certain debts due to the Crown are not paid, but if a betting shop operator rents a building from John at Nelson Street and pays his licence, and then he deposits his \$25,000 into the Treasury and loses on a \$30,000 bet and runs out of the country, he does not owe any land tax to the Crown. When circumstances like these occur, how are you going to seize the \$25,000? These are things you should have looked at. This piece meal amendment makes it difficult also for the civil servants. I would like the Minister to explain how this is going to benefit anybody, including the Crown, because

out of the three betting shops in this country I would bet that only one is owned by the proprietor of the betting shop, and if one of the proprietors comes in for a handsome sum and decides to abscond, how is the Crown going to benefit? As far as I know the betting shops are not owned by nationals.

I was not actually listening when the Leader of the House introduced the Bill but as far as I can see, the amendment really and truly does not mean anything as far as Government administration is concerned and it does not reflect any positive thinking, and I would like the Leader of the House to look at it; do not have it passed as it is. It does not help anybody at all. The amendment which is brought down certainly does not help anybody, not even the Crown to any extent

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I really regret that the Leader of the House had adopted the procedure which he has adopted with regard to this Bill. Since the Budget speech was outlined in June, it seems to me that Bills of this nature should be brought in very soon after the Budget speech, particularly having regard to the fact that after the three years limit the Budget proposal no longer has the recourse of law, and obviously it becomes necessary to have everything in order since Section 4 seeks to have the Bill come into force by the 1st December, 1973. The Minister should adopt better procedure with the legislation which becomes necessary or arises out of the Budgetary proposals and this should be given very high priority in legislation and this House should devote its attention promptly to such legislation, but it is not good enough to come to this House and rush this as the Government is doing now. To rush this when the Government knew since June that this was legislation which it wanted to have passed, seems to me to indicate that there was some neglect somewhere along the line and I hope that after the next Budget speech we will not be treated to this procedure by rushing this kind of legislation although the Government knew it was intended to bring it before now.

The hon. Member for St. Joseph developed a point with which I agree, and I would say further that if under this legislation persons are going to make deposits into the Treasury to comply with the legislation, then this security should remain available not only to pay any arrears of taxes due to the Crown but also for the benefit of the people they employ. I am very concerned about some businesses folding up and the proprietors leaving the country without anything that can be held on to, and leaving workers who cannot even get severance pay because of their insolvent position, and cannot even get holidays with pay. I regret that the Government did not provide legislation and allow such securities to be held also to satisfy at least the severance payment liability and holidays with pay for the simple reason that the persons concerned, if the employer leaves the island and does not pay, still has the right of redress as against the severance fund. Also to be borne in mind is the attitude of some employers who have a real estate company owned under a separate company and operating under a different company for certain purposes. These are things which the Government should bear in mind.

I am one of those who do not subscribe to the view of the Methodist people with regard to national lottery. I hope that the Government would see to it that it gets a greater slice out of the betting. The Government should look at the idea of taking some of the stakeholder's fund of luck which comes to him, because this is the only way we will get quick development - by making all people to contribute to some extent. 9.55 p.m.

Those are the only points I want to make on this. Of course the Opposition is not going to vote against the principle of this Bill, we have accepted the budgetary proposal on it and I believe that we have this agreement with some of the sections of the Bill and I feel that section 3 in particular does not go far enough in this respect. I believe the Acting Leader of the Opposition has spoken on other issues which I would not comment on here, but I do not know if the Leader of the House feels that time permits him to appeal it so that he will come with a further amendment or will accept the amendment to the amending section 3 so far as the new section 4(b) is being brought before the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before you put the question, Sir, my impression is that very few hon. Members seem to listen when anything is introduced. This is implementing a budgetary proposal, not mine, and he fixed the figure at \$25,000 instead of \$20,000 so it is not anything I can change as such..

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, if the hon. Member would hear what we have said. We are not objecting to the \$25,000, we are saying that the securities do not state what it is there for, and in respect of section 4(b) it does not give the right of recourse to anybody.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The hon. Member is the mouth-piece for all the Members of the Opposition. The hon. Member for St. James wanted to know why we did not make it \$75,000.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I said that the Minister said it would be raised to \$90,000 but in the meantime he said there were three betting shops and I said that they could put it at \$75,000 which means that each shop would pay \$25,000, and I wanted to know how he reached \$90,000.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is a budgetary proposal which I cannot amend and I am just implementing it. The Racing Service Registration fee should be \$25,000 instead of \$20,000 as at present and that they should hold a minimum of \$25,000 in Government Bonds or securities. The object of this Bill is merely to implement that. So far as clause 3 of the Bill is concerned, it sets out its purpose very clearly, to deposit the sum of \$25,000 and no certificate of registration shall be granted under section 4 unless the applicant satisfies the Comptroller that the deposit has been made as required by this section.

The hon. Member for St. Joseph referred to a section which he did not read. Section 4(b) says where a certificate of registration is cancelled or refused by the Comptroller under section 4, or (b) a racing service business ceases to exist the securities or cash deposit with the Accountant General shall be retained until the taxes are paid, land tax, income tax or any other dues due to the Crown.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of elucidation. Mr. SPEAKER You are quite out of order.

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

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the Bill was read a third time, and passed. Its title was agreed to. 10.05 p.m,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next item under Government Business is Item No. 3 which stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and it is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Waterworks Act, 1895.

THE WATERWORKS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1973

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, the principle of this Bill is clearly set out. This is an amendment to the Waterworks Act, 1895. I think it will be accepted by all Members of this House that, apart from the rise in the consumption of water, this Bill was not designed to meet certain changes and developmental problems in a modern society. In this Bill there is nothing about the laying of water mains or the development of land which is becoming a big problem in Barbados. We have to supply water for private land development projects, and there must be an agreement concluded between the Government and the owners of the land. These agreements provide that the Government would lay the necessary water mains, hydrants, and so on, on the land and the owner will pay to the Department a percentage of the estimated cost as the Minister may determine. The Minister of Communications and Works has the right to say what percentage of the sum which is estimated, should be paid to the Department before any of the work begins.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is accepted on all sides that the cost of pipes has increased; the cost of labour has increased, and the cost of installations has increased. We have, therefore, included a figure equivalent to 10 per centum of the actual cost of the installation. In this Bill it is proposed that the Minister can lay down the percentage which must be paid by the developer which, I think, at the moment stands at 75%. I find that a lot of people were getting these water mains installed and they now owe the Government a lot of money. I have raised it from about 25% to 75%, and I am watching the collections. If the collections get worse, then I will have to compel the developers to pay down 75%. I think 75% is a reasonable amount.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter so far as the Waterworks Department is concerned, because it keeps people employed. The hon. Member for St. Joseph has drawn my attention to certain aspects of this particular type of development. I have brought the matter to this House, and I am taking steps to see that it does not turn out to be what he thinks it is. I am taking steps to correct everything that is going wrong. There will also be a 20% surcharge on the actual cost of the work. We found that 10% was extremely cheap, and it is now proposed to increase the amount to 20%.

In the case of transactions already concluded there will be a 10% surcharge. As I have said, the Act made no provision for this, because it was never conceived in 1895. This Act is to validate the provision to give effect to this 75%. We have already had a challenge by a developer asking whether the original 10% is lawfully imposed or not, even although there is an original agreement. In case there is any doubt, this Act seeks to rectify that position.

In Barbados, as I have said before, we take water for granted, and the pattern of consumption is, undoubtedly, too high. We are using 23 million gallons of water a day with a population of 240,000 to 250,000, and that is high by any standard in any country. Barbados is one of the few countries in the world in which water is not metered. We have an archaic, outmoded system where you do not put a meter on the domestic supply. Some people, therefore, attach a hose to their domestic supply, by-pass the meter in the garden, and water the garden year in and year out. We put a meter on a pipe on land, but we do not attach a meter to a domestic supply! If you look at the collections at the Waterworks Department, you will find that a large number of householders usually attach a hose to the domestic supply and water their gardens. I see the hon. Member for St. Peter looking at me, but I know he will not do that sort of thing. I know that he will use his domestic supply for domestic purposes. Anyway, I think the public is only now realising the seriousness of the position.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this Bill imposes any hardship on any person. It is merely meant to make the developers contribute something reasonable. We are asking them to pay 20% of the present cost of pipes and other materials, and 20% in this context is certainly not too much. Now 20% for other installations is, again, not too much. I think that the validating Clause is the only one which may cause some controversy. I know that the hon. member for Christ Church West will realise that *ex abundanti cautela* or out of an abundance of caution, this Clause has been put in to make the agreements legal, in the same way as it was done in the Road Traffic Act, 1937, in order to meet the needs of modern traffic. Similarly, the Waterworks Act which was passed in 1895 is not geared to take care of the land development and housing schemes which now obtain in 1973.

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the Hon. Minister that this is a straightforward Bill. Anybody who wants to do business with the Waterworks Department will now have to pay more. With regard to what

the Hon. Minister has said on Section 37, I am not saying that the land developers should not contribute to the cost of installing water. Either the civil servants are not doing their jobs correctly, or they are ignorant of the work they have to do. They should be able to estimate the cost of work properly, because the Minister will determine how much money a man will have to pay in keeping with the estimation. If he tells you to pay down 60% or 70% of the actual cost of the work, at the end of the job you may have to pay 25% plus another 20% surcharge. 10.15 p.m.

This is not a licence to protect people. This is a penalty. If the Bill had said that if the amount is not paid within a certain time then you should pay so much and so much, I would agree, because the Waterworks Department, like any other business cannot carry outstanding debts for an indefinite period. Part of the contract is that you pay this amount within a certain time. If you pay outside of the stated time, there is a penalty.

There is a very important point that they have left out of the Bill. John Thomas has a piece of land, which he wants to develop and he has received approval from the Town and Country Planning Department to develop it. Peter Jones who is next to him has a piece to develop and has also received permission to develop it. So he sits back and waits until the other man brings in the water. He then pays the cost of bringing water from the nearest point because the Waterworks Department retains the right to tap that water for everyone else. The man waits until the other man pays, then comes in, and says, I want water too.

If you are talking about equity and justice, these are the things, which you should take into account, when you are amending this Bill, Do not let us follow like copycats the legislation passed somewhere else. Let it be based on the circumstances existing in our country, if you want to talk about an equitable society. This would be an admirable opportunity for the Minister to instruct the Legal Draftsmen to give the Waterworks Department power to charge a reasonable amount where someone else has paid to bring in water, because they have the right to tap with a six inch or an eight inch main, it means that someone is getting the benefit out of what the man down the road has paid for, and the latter has no redress.

This is a problem with the Barbados Light and Power Company. If you live at a certain spot, you must put up twelve poles at \$100 each to get your lights; but according to the agreement, you have no right against anyone tapping into the line. The Minister of Home Affairs talked about banjo string lines running up little cart roads in the country. A man will say "I am not going to put in a two-inch main to bring water to my home and then Peter Jones can tap into it and I cannot get anything for what I have spent. This Bill should contain a Clause where the Chief Engineer or the Minister can determine what charges could be refunded to the person who put the main line down. That would be spreading the burden evenly among the persons for whom the work is done.

The question of retroactive legislation comes up again, and it will cause us a little trouble. I have heard the Government say that we do not know what it will cost you to do so and so and that is the reason why the Government will always put in this. Businessmen have to plan and know what is going to happen. If you say that water is going to cost you \$X a foot, let him know. The Minister is well aware that before you can get approval to put in water, his own Department has to draw up plans and tell you what the cost will be and you have to pay a portion of the money before the work is started. So, therefore, all of this is controlled by the Waterworks Department. Even the Department's mains have to be approved by the Town and Country Planning Department before they can start to work. They have to give you a rough estimate as to how much it would cost to put in your water. There are people for whom the agreement date goes back to last year and now they will find under this new Clause, that they are faced with an expense that they did not expect.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation. We have been drawing up agreements under which we imposed the 10% increase and people have been paying it. They are not caught by this 10%.

Mr. BOLDEN:

The Minister is not listening to what I am saying. What I am saying is that you are imposing retroactive legislation. If it is in the agreement and you have signed the agreement, it has to be approved by the Crown Solicitor. We do not mind paying a surcharge on something if it is not paid within a specific date, but not where the Waterworks Department holds the key to life and death and then tells me you can hold it back and tell me on another date that you have to pay so much.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, in supporting this Bill I would like to make two points. The first is about the developer who deals with development in a particular district. It is known that there are certain poor people in several districts who would not have been able to have water services in their homes, but since these developments have come about these people are in a position to have these services. This is what I have seen throughout the Island.

Therefore, Sir, when the hon. Member for St. Joseph says that certain people pay for these mains and then others are allowed to have the service, I do not think that he has taken into consideration the number of poor people who derive a benefit from these people who are in a better position financially to develop the area. 10.25 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. I would not like the hon. Member to lose the gist of what I have been saying or to misinterpret what I am saying, with regard to the type of development which is related to this Bill. I am not trying to prevent the poor man from benefiting from the provisions made under this legislation.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I am only replying to what, as far as I could understand.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

You are making a speech. You are not replying.

Mr. WEEKES:

I said I am replying to the hon. Member's criticism. He said that people are allowed to have their service without having to pay to get the service to their homes. The position is this. I tried to clear the air by stating that the distance from the Highway in some cases may be approximately 400 or 500 yards and there may be tenants in that area who are peasants. On account of the development, those people are given the opportunity to have the water service at their homes. Secondly as regards the increased amounts which the Minister has stated in the Bill in many cases, the hon. Member knows that you may get a shipment with pipes this month at a particular price and the following month, another shipment comes at a higher price and therefore when the department deals with the estimate for a particular job, the Government would have to revise that estimate to suit the increased cost which they would have to pay for the materials. In addition to that, you may get increased wages for workers. All of those points have got to be taken into consideration; and when the points that I have made are taken into consideration, we must come to the conclusion that the Government must do something so that these developments would not be a liability to the Government and that the Government should clear all the expenses for such developments. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this bit of legislation would give the Government the opportunity to give the developer an accurate estimate for his development.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Speaker, I have two points of view on this matter. I would like to say to the Minister that I would like to see the Government develop areas where they have to pipe water in for the people on a basis that they can get it easier than the way which the hon. member for St. Philip South spoke about. I told the Minister already that if he comes into my constituency, he would see pieces of pipe running across Yearwood's Land, and it is a disgrace that you have train lines taking the place of pipe tracks and the Government has not developed this area.

There is something that missed the hon. Member for St. Joseph. My Organization is not a developer; we are not developers in that we are not going in for a commercial development. Under the present system of calculating in this monetary situation, you have to look for an extra \$24,000 and you are asked to provide this before a single bit of work is done. Some of the Government calculators are lazy. They are lazy calculators in that they are calculating on a 75% basis that with 25% amount of work or zero amount of work, you pay 75% down payment, and it does not make any commercial sense. This is a service that you are paying for, and I cannot understand the mathematics of this system in which work requires 75% of costs and therefore.....

10.35 p.m

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, I would like the hon. member to know that in many cases, when people are allowed to pay 25% they owe the Government so much money and we do not get the money after. Secondly, you have to increase the percentage so that you are sure of the money.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I understand that, but this is a commercial business. We must pay you \$180,000 for doing zero work. Let me make it clear, this is a high financial risk you are taking, all you are doing is increasing the cost to the person because you have to put up \$180,000 and you do not do any work, therefore you have to borrow and nobody walks about with \$180,000 in his pocket. Do you know how much \$180,000 at 12 1/2% per month means? All that this is going to do, is to increase inflation. When I hear people talk about inflation and any inflationary trend along any line, all it means is to make the cost of the land more expensive. It means in the end development of the land per square foot or per acre will cost more as a result, and if I have to look out for \$180,000 at the beginning of December to pay you for work which will start in March, then it means that at the end of the job it is going to cost me that amount of money more.

I looked at this Bill when it came to me and this is what they said the Waterworks want; they want 75%. It is just like a contractor telling me that he wants me to pay him all the money for the building before he starts because he is not sure that when he has finished the building I will pay him. It is a very peculiar way and only the Government can do it, making a charge for a service that you are going to use, because it bears no relationship.

The other thing I would like to say is that with all these charges the Minister has put in, we have come across a situation, Mr. Speaker, which would affect my colleague. For example, we find people living on an area of land where there is no means of any recovery of rents or anything, but we have to pay this kind of price to put water in - which we would not deny the people - but the Government has to understand what is going to happen to lands where you put these charges. A man came to us for \$3.88 and he is living on lands of a plantation, so Government is charging us on this land 1% of the total value, and the taxes the Government charged for the land are more than what the man is paying in rent, so you have this very peculiar situation. We are in it now as a temporary measure, and when the hon. Member mentioned the Town and Country planners, these are the biggest jokes in Barbados. I would really like to know what you must do. I heard a joke today, that someone went into the Town and Country Planning office in a very razzzy way, and wanted to know, who was the man you had to give the money to, when you wanted something done.

I do not know if it is our organisation, but you will find organisations like ours cannot renovate their own premises because you have to build a garage, but next door to us you will find things going on. Right here on Broad Street, Manning, Wilkinson and Challenor has extensions done, so I would say to the Minister that I am not protesting against the question of arriving at this amount to a developer but everybody is not a developer on a commercial basis, and therefore when you are a non-commercial person, you should be dealt with differently. You get this straight line thing coming from the Waterworks, just 75% which is unrelated to what you are doing. They would not say that the Barbados Workers' Union is not a developer, they want the same thing from everybody and I feel I should mention this sort of thing because I do not know if the Minister is aware of this. It seems to me that by this method development in housing in this country is going to be a memory, if it is going to be at these costs, because only the multinational companies who are not coming here to develop housing would ever put any money at this kind of investment rate. Nobody other than Government would ever touch housing for the people, and you will find that nobody is going to touch a house for anybody in Barbados under \$30,000 or \$40,000 because it would not pay to build a house for any man at this kind of cost. You will find that a lot of dilapidated ramshackled houses will remain on the spots because nobody is going to touch them. Nobody can build a house today for \$15,000, I understand the Government has built some for \$10,000 and if they put in the development costs which they are charging other people, they could not sell them for \$10,000.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long, I just want to reply briefly to the hon. Member for St. Michael West. As the Bill is, I have the right to say what percentage should be laid down, and I laid down this 75% for developers who do not pay when they are developing and then we cannot go and dig up the pipes. The Government is losing a vast amount of revenue, and I think hon. Members know that the accounts of the Waterworks Department have been in confusion for years. The Minister has the power to lay down the percentage, and if the Union comes, I can say, that they should pay down 10%, and therefore I am surprised to hear that the honourable Member for St. Michael West did not come to the Minister about this. 10.45 p.m

I am hearing that for the first time. The people at the Waterworks will tell you what is the general principle, but exceptions can be made depending on the type of organisation involved. I am sure that the matter could be corrected, but the Government is attempting to collect this money when it is due. I want to read from a statement prepared by Mr. Churchill in February, 1973. It states:

"An examination into the present practice of paying 10% of the cost of the work on an application for new development has revealed that the percentage is inadequate to offset the actual cost to the Government and, therefore, developers are being partially subsidised when a new water service is being installed." He recommended 20%, which is reasonable in the circumstances.

Now, the hon. Member for St. Joseph spoke about an owner of land who has challenged this 10%. An Attorney-at-law of his Party has challenged it, and, in order to avoid going to court, the Clause says that all agreements which have been charged with the 10% surcharge will be deemed to be legal. This Clause is saying that in order to avoid any legal confusion, since they have signed an agreement, we should make it law. You will find in the Act that you will get an estimated cost, and then the actual cost in terms of labour, materials and so on. You will pay down 75%, and when we work out the actual cost, it may be more or less, and you will then

add 10% to offset the cost of installation.

We are now putting in natural gas at Clapham and.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order. I am lost in the information given by the Hon. Minister. Is he talking about the actual cost of laying down pipes, making connections, and so on. Why is he adding an additional 20% on top of that?

Mr. SPEAKER:

That intervention can be ignored.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, hon. Members on the other side have been extremely co-operative. It has been decided to make the surcharge, and the amount is not unreasonable.

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. A. MORRISON:

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 took the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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

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

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

On the separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH, seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time and passed. Its title was agreed to.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's Sitting.

In moving the adjournment, I should like to extend the compliments of the Season, as is customary, to yourself, Mr. Speaker, your family, and my colleagues on both sides of the House. I wish everyone a happy Christmas and prosperity in the New Year.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 15th January, 1974, at twelve noon.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion for the adjournment, I would also like to extend to you Mr. Speaker, the staff of Parliament, and Members on the other side the season's greetings, which I know my colleagues share with me, for a happy Christmas, and we look forward to a prosperous New Year.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I reciprocate to all hon. Members, their families, and the staff of Parliament the very good wishes for a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year

ADJOURNMENT

The question that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 15th January, 1974, at twelve noon was put, and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 10.55 p.m.

