

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, 3rd December, 1974

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12. 05 p. m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL. B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C. B. E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister without Portfolio); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); 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; Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B. A., M. A. (Econ.), (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community

Development and Sport.

Prayers were read.

Mr. W. C B. Hinds and Mr. C L. Bolden entered the Chamber and took their seats.

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I am commanded to lay the Customs Duties (Armstrong Manufacturing Company Limited) Order 1974.

Also, on behalf of myself, I am commanded to lay the Report on Vital Statistics and Registrations for the year 1972.

Also on behalf of the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, I am commanded to lay the Report on the Severance Payments Scheme for the year 1973.

NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$1, 247, 998, out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75 No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of \$2, 910, 000, out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75 Part I -Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974-75, No. 15, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

BILLS

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Health and Welfare I beg to give notice of a Bill to repeal the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947.

Also a Bill to amend the Health Services Act, 1969.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to -move that the Bill to repeal the Barbados General Hospital Act, 1947 be now read a first time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

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

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Health Services Act, 1969, be now read a first time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

ORAL REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 268 asked by the hon. member for St. George North, is now ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 243, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is now ready.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be now suspended for the remainder of today's Sitting.

Sir, you are fully aware of the fact that the reply to the Honourable Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning's supplementary budgetary proposals may be continued at a later stage. Bearing all that in mind I am asking for leave to suspend the Standing Orders.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The question is that I do now leave the Chair. Before I put the motion, what is the subject being dealt with?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before making that motion, Sir, I am asking for leave at this stage to deal with two money Resolutions of which I gave notice earlier, standing in the name of the Minister of Finance and Planning, one is for \$1, 247, 998 and the other \$2, 910, 000. I think one has been circulated. I am referring to the one dealing with the Christmas bonus. I think it has just been circulated and I am asking for leave to deal

with this Resolution in all its stages at a later stage of this sitting; I would suggest, Sir, at the end of the Sitting, so that hon. members would have an opportunity of discussing it among themselves. I refer particularly to the members of the Opposition. It is part of the budgetary proposals and it should meet with very little opposition as such.

I am asking for leave to deal with it right at the end of this sitting in order to facilitate the payment of these bonuses and to ensure that all workers and employees in the public service and in Government offices who are in receipt of salaries of \$700 and under - whether salaries or wages - will receive the benefits to which the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance referred in his supplementary budgetary proposals.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I thought you said there were two.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The one I am dealing with is that one, Sir, which deals with the Prime Minister's undertaking to pay workers getting \$700 and under, this bonus for Christmas. That is the one I am dealing with, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER:

So there is only one then.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Sir, to be very candid, as I have just got this one, I was doubtful - I thought that the amount might be more than \$2, 910, 000 and not having a copy of the other one yet, although I have not had a chance to go through it properly yet, I just out of an abundance of caution asked for leave to deal with both.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that you would never become a party to this Honourable House undertaking the type of exercise which the Hon. Leader of the House is trying to put before us, because, here the case arises where he is bold enough to tell us that he has not seen one of these Resolutions himself; he is not familiar with it and he knows nothing about it; he knows absolutely nothing about it.

12. 15 p. m.

He knows absolutely nothing about it.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the Resolution has just come in and I can give full details if the hon. member wants, but the one which has been duly circulated is the appropriate one. The one which has not been circulated is not. It is not that I do not know; it is all here, but I have not had the opportunity of looking at it carefully, and because I speak forthrightly and honestly, the hon. member says I know nothing about it.

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is no point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Since hearing the Leader of the House I am to wonder if it is really one Resolution, but that he now has to have something substituted for the original, and in truth and in fact there are not two Resolutions that he is asking leave to deal with later today. I am sure we are entitled to an explanation on this particular point.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would give way, the first one is for the sum of \$1, 247, 998 which is an omnibus Resolution which has no relationship whatever with the matter I have in mind. The other is for the sum of \$2, 910, 000 in connection with the bonus for the workers involved. I am only asking for leave to deal with the latter.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection to leave being granted to this Resolution for \$2,910,000 being dealt with at a latter stage in today's sitting, leave will be granted. I understand that copies will be circulated to hon. members.

There being no objection, leave is hereby granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75 No. 13

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum sets out, the workload of the Director and Natural Gas who is a temporary officer, has increased considerably because of the intensification of the exploration for oil and gas. As a result the salary of the post is being ungraded from \$4, 740 per annum to \$7, 200 per annum with effect from 1st September, 1974. That is why supplementary provision of \$1, 435 is needed.

The position is that owing to the energy crisis and owing to the fact that exploration of crude oil has expanded over the last year or so, we are now at a stage where Mobil has brought in about seven wells at Woodbourne between Christ Church and St. Philip, and therefore the services of this petroleum expert are more in demand, he has to work much harder and we even foresee the day when probably in another few years we may be producing enough crude oil locally to assist us in our demands. We may not be able to supply our demands entirely, but at least we would reduce considerably the importation of crude oil. For that reason these services are strictly necessary and the day may not be far distant when the appointment of a full time expert in this particular field may be necessary, and instead of coming for \$7, 200, the difference in this case of \$1, 435, we will have to come for very much more in order to expand that department of Government to deal with the expansion and exploration for oil.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Addendum as it reads shows us that the Government had any confidence in the oil exploration that is being conducted in this Island and maybe off-shore from time to time because if that were so, it would give us to feel that oil exploration is becoming a permanent feature in our operations here and we could well be looking forward at some future date to its contribution to the country's revenue. If the Government itself has confidence in the undertaking, why have we got to come here to vote money to retain the services or acquire the services of a temporary officer such as a Director of Operations to deal with a permanent feature of our life and revenue earning capacity. I believe that whilst this measure will pass, the sooner that Government can get down to bringing us all into realising whether there is some dependence on oil to help us out of our economic chaos and whether we have got to build our hopes and bind ourselves down into accepting what is going to come out of this whole undertaking the better.

You will understand, Mr. Chairman, that if the country can be assured of Government's confidence, that in itself will bring a measure of relief that will permeate the whole society and start to relieve us even mentally of some of the present stress and strain. One of the features that could be employed at a time such as this would be for us to see that, if he is worth his salt to the organisation or this Director is not keen on being appointed permanently, some other person should be appointed so that we can feel there is some sort of dependence on this oil drilling and exploration that we have been dreaming and hearing about for so long.

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. G. G. FERGUSSON, Mr.

CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one

Resolution in Committee of Supply, and Mr.

SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly. 12. 25. p. m.

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

SUGAR WORKERS (PROVIDENT FUND) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 be the next order of the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, this item deals with an amendment to the Sugar Workers' (Provident Fund) Act of 1968. This Act, as the hon. member will recall, came into operation on the 3rd November, 1969, providing benefits for persons who had retired since 1966 from work in the Sugar Industry.

I think that I should go through very briefly the history of this Fund because at the time the Act was passed and came into operation it was stated then by those who were supposed to carry' out investigations that 1, 500 persons would have retired between 1956 and 1966 from the Sugar Industry and those persons would be entitled to Provident Fund benefits. From our own experience we have

discovered that over 4, 000 persons applied for benefits under the Act between that period. In other words two-thirds more applied than it had been estimated were eligible.

It is estimated that the amount of money required to provide the necessary pensions as well as to pay funeral grants and also to administer the scheme will be \$1. 2 million, and this will be financed from the various sources as set out in the Act. This Act says, "All monies received by the Accountant General by virtue of the Provident Fund Act of 1964 and such sums from time to time paid to the account of the Sugar Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund and the Labour Welfare Fund". This is the Act as originally passed. Since then we have amended it to include the Finance Labour Fund or such sums as may from time to time be paid to this account out of money voted by Parliament for that purpose, and such other monies as may be received by the Board for payment into the Fund.

In other words, what we have done is to widen those sources out of which the Fund is to be financed. During the last Financial Year we passed a supplementary provision to provide money out of votes by Parliament for this purpose in order to supplement the Fund; and in this Financial Year we have included a half million dollars to help finance the scheme. These were all accumulative in the sense that money was provided out of the traditional sources - the Price Stabilisation Reserve Fund, and the Labour Welfare Fund as well as money provided by Parliament.

Now, these monies have been financing the scheme for the whole of this Financial Year. We are now in December the very last month of the calendar year, and I want to state here and now that it is completely untrue that during this Financial Year or even this Calendar year there were any difficulties in receiving pensions under the Fund. All those persons who were eligible to receive their pensions under this Fund were receiving their pensions and on time.

There were one or two problems last year, and that is why we introduced a Supplementary Resolution in order to pay those persons who qualified. That was last year, and because the funds out of the traditional sources were not sufficient at the time, we put through as I said earlier - it looks as if I have to repeat it, judging from some reactions that I have been seeing - we passed a supplementary Resolution during the last Financial Year so that money could be paid out to people who qualified under the Fund. No parson during this Financial Year, I repeat, has been in arrears of his pension or payments due under this Fund.

Now, the Cabinet has taken a decision a couple of months ago to pay to these pensioners a sum of \$5 a week instead of \$3. 60 a week as previously. This Fund will be financed as usual from the sources as suggested and from the levies passed during the last meeting of Parliament. It is clear that we will have a

sufficient amount of money to meet this increase.

This amending Act is doing one more thing. Previously, and up to now persons who qualified for - pensions under this Act are also eligible for National Insurance pensions. We are doing two things here. We are raising the amount of pension payable to persons under the National Insurance Fund to \$5 a week. Even to this day there are some persons who receive even less than \$5 a week under the National Insurance payments.

Sir, we are going to change the Regulations under that Act so as to pay to these persons the sum of \$15 a week as from the 1st January, 1975; and then it is also proposed to pay persons who qualify under the Sugar Workers Provident Fund this \$5 a week; but they will no longer be eligible for both pensions. As a matter of fact there are few persons who will now be eligible for both pensions. We feel that neither Fund would be able to take an increase if pensioners would be able to qualify for both National Insurance pension and benefits under the Provident Fund. One would have to give. We feel that justice would be served if in fact we were to increase them both especially at this time so that pensioners would have increased benefits on which to subsist.

That is what this Bill is about, Mr. Speaker, and I beg to move that it be read a second time.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, while I take great pleasure in commending the Government for introducing this Bill, I consider it my duty as a member of this House who represents workers in the agricultural sector of this country to let the Minister know that this Act which was passed in the House during 1968 has some weak links; and as I go on to make my speech I will explain them to him hoping that he will do something to alleviate the hardships which people suffer.

Now, Sir, when a Bill which benefits agricultural labours comes before this Honourable House, I consider it my duty as a representative of a constituency which is in the rural area to speak from authority and to represent those workers who have always been the backbone of the economy of this country. 12. 35 p. m.

I also speak, Sir, for you who by virtue of your office cannot make any contribution to any debate in this House but you too, Sir, represent workers in the rural areas. I have no doubt, Sir, that you too are aware of the problems which these workers must overcome before they receive pensions from Government funds.

It is my opinion that the Act should be amended to suit the many changes and rapid ones which have taken place since this Act was passed in the House of Assembly in the year 1968. You and I, Sir, represent the largest parish in this Island; and in the past, on these plantations in St. Philip the biggest number of agricultural labourers were employed in the Island. Consequently we are obligated to look after the interest of these people now that they are reaching old age, and in some cases may retire in the very near future. Some of us in this House, Sir, are aware of the conditions under which these labourers worked in the past, and especially the women who carried manure in big baskets on their heads and also had to load the canes to the trucks.

Sir, the children were sent in those days to work in the fields at the age of 10 and 12 and some were not even given the opportunity to go to school. Those who were given the opportunity to go to school were in most cases obligated to leave the schools in first and second standard and to go and work in a gang which in those days was called the third gang. During the time that these children were employed, if they stopped for five minutes to relax, the women who were drivers would punish them by giving them lashes with what was called in those days a 'cow-skin'. This was a whip which could even cut the backs, feet and hands of these young children.

Mr. Speaker, some of us would also remember the men digging cane holes at eight and nine cents per hundred, digging long drains for paltry sums when the week ends, and cutting the canes in those days at twelve cents per one hundred holes, and, males and females would work as machinery at factories. They had to keep the mills going by running with bundles of canes on their heads and shoulders. This can only be considered as slave work.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people that we are considering here today. These are the people who have contributed to the economy of the country. These are the people who have caused men like you and me to be in this House of Assembly and therefore it is our duty to do all we possibly can for them. If you travel around in the rural areas you will find out that some of them still live under very deplorable conditions. Some live in a one-room home without kitchen, without toilet, and, those are the people who have worked in the past to contribute to the economy of this country.

On the other hand, Sir, the employers have purchased plantations. Some of them had big investments and in the evening of their days they can live in happiness, peace and tranquility.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Minister what I call the weak links in the Act. There are people who have worked in plantations from their early childhood until they attained the age of 60, or may go as far as 64. They have given over 40 or 50 years service as semi slaves in plantations. Now imagine that those people who find it possible to drop out, say, at the age of 60 or even 64 are not entitled to one cent unless they produce a doctor's certificate proving that they are unfit to work. 12. 45 p. m.

Imagine these people who find it possible to drop out at the age of 60 or even 64 years not being entitled to one cent unless they produce a doctor's certificate showing that they are unfit to work. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me why it is necessary in this age that a person who has given forty or fifty years' service should be called upon to produce a certificate to get the paltry sum of \$5. 00 per week? I am saying that the Act must be amended. On the other hand, you get a person who was never a labourer who decides at the age of 54 years to go and work at a plantation, and because he has worked for ten consecutive years he is eligible for a pension from the Fund, and the person who has worked for 40 or 50 years is not entitled to one cent because he has not produced a certificate proving that he is unfit to work.

In Government you have people who can retire at 55 or 60 years. How are you going to encourage people to cultivate the land if when they reach the age of 64 and a doctor does not think they are medically unfit they cannot drop out. It is time that we look into the matter.

There is another problem which we have to face with this Fund, and it is this. Some people have worked at plantations from their early childhood until they reach the age of 65 years. The position is that these people cannot get the former owners of the plantations to approve the forms so that they can get benefits. In some cases, in a matter of ten or fifteen years, four different persons had purchased the same plantations. Now these people are running here, there and everywhere trying to get the paltry sum of five dollars per week after working all the days of their lives on the plantation. There is something wrong with this Provident Fund and it needs looking after. The Act must be amended to suit present day conditions. I have spoken to various officers about it at the Labour Department, but they say it is the Act and ask what can they do about it. The Minister is here and I am drawing it to his attention. I know that he does not represent a constituency which is in the rural areas, but I am aware that he has a special interest in the community, and I am sure that he will listen attentively to all that is being said here today and will do his utmost to alleviate the hardship which these workers suffer.

Mr. Speaker, do you not think that after a person has worked from the age of twelve until he reaches sixty and wants to drop out from being an agricultural worker on a plantation that he should be able to leave and go straight and claim his pension, and not have to go beseeching an employer or begging a doctor to give him a certificate to get \$5. 00 a week after rendering forty-eight years' service? I think the time has come when we have got to think along the right lines; we have got to realise that these people have done all they possibly could; they have made their contribution in this world, and anything we can do to help them we should do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that when this amount of \$15 is given to certain people that it will not be less than what certain other people at present are receiving from the Provident Fund and the National Insurance as labourers, because I know of some labourers who are getting \$8. 00 and \$9. 00 per week, and therefore I am supporting this Resolution, and in doing so I am appealing to the Minister to go into the matter fully and see what can be done to help people who have reached a certain age but have not been given doctors' certificates to qualify them under the Act as it stands at present. I know the Minister will do his utmost for the people and therefore I am appealing to him to have a good look, call in his experts and go into all aspects of the matter so that in the long run the people will benefit. This does not really call for experts; it calls for a few people like myself getting down to business and telling the Minister what are the facts. We do not have to bring in persons who have not got any experience, do not mix with the people and do not know their problems. Day by day these people come to me, and I am sure they come to you too, Mr. Speaker, and we as their representatives have to do the utmost for them. It can be very disappointing and frustrating to us when we see that there is no solution to their problems, and I know that they have worked hard on the plantations. I ask the Minister for his wholehearted support, and I do hope that he will deal with this matter as early as possible.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed glad to see this sudden turn about in the hon. member who has just spoken in telling us that the Act has him mixed up because most of us on this side of the House have been saying this from 1970 when the payments began. We have complained about persons who have been receiving money and those who have not been, and the Hon. Minister sought to say that it is not true that persons who should have received money this year have not received it. I am going to repeat it because up to yesterday morning at 6. 30 I had a call from a woman whose father is now in hospital, and whose documents have been sent to the Labour Department for the last nine months, there is nothing else left in order for them to deal with it, and up to now he has not got a cent; so who is right and who is wrong? 12. 55p. m.

Who is right and who is wrong? I have said before in this House, and the hon. member who has just sat down literally abused me when I told him, dealing with this same Provident Fund, that he must not let Civil Servants write answers and put into his hand and come in here and read a lot of documents like

the one he has just read. I hope that he will release the written document that he has just read before this House for a Press Release and let everybody outside see what goes on in Parliament. Whoever gave him the document or whether he wrote it himself he should make it a public release to the Press.

But, Sir, the hon. member should have looked at the present Bill because I think that the Bill which the Government is now seeking to introduce has got more than weak links. The links have dropped out completely. In the first place the Government is satisfied to raise the Old Age pension by \$2 a week; but when it comes to the sugar Workers they raise it by \$140. The subtle principle is this: for those who toiled in the land we give them the least return in order to maintain and upkeep the city dwellers.

That is what it is, Sir. You hear the Leader of the House and the Minister of Housing and everybody saying that the Prime Minister has been able to take sugar and work this wonderful financial magic with it to pay off our debts and run the country; but those who worked in the land to produce the sugar will get less out of it.

Look at the Bill as it is now written. The poor sugar worker has got to make a choice. Is the Minister telling us that the primary object of this Bill is to completely eradicate the Sugar Workers Provident Fund and leave those who have qualified to the mere pittance of \$5 a week while you are prepared to increase other pensions to those workers who are primarily city dwellers while the sugar worker gets poorer and poorer?

The sugar worker gets no bonus in December. The old age pensioners draw a little "land lup" as they call it. The Minister says that you cannot qualify for both. I know what I would be telling my people now because the Act does not tell you whether you make a choice or not. It does not tell you when and how you have to make your option. It is like a court of law now. You are either standing on a no case submission or you are calling the defence.

The Act does not tell you what to do and I will tell the people that from the 1st January all of those who are entitled to Provident Fund benefits should write a disclaimer to the Board saying that they no longer want benefits under the Provident Fund, that they want old age pension.

But, Sir, they may be caught again because the Minister has not yet said what you will qualify for, how many stamps you must have on your National Insurance Card to qualify for the \$15 a week. These are things that the Minister must tell the House and the public. There are people now to whom the National Insurance Board returned money telling them that they paid money which they had no right to pay. So, there are a lot of things in this Act that have to be clarified. It is not simple to my mind and to

the mind of those whom I represent because they are all country people. At least 60 per cent of them are sugar workers; but I will know how to advise them.

What will happen now? The National Insurance Office will have to set up an information center because we will be asking a lot of questions before we fill out any forms to ask for Provident Fund benefits. I am glad that the hon. member for St. Philip South raised the question of those persons who have left or resigned or have had their employment terminated before they reach the age of 65. I have come here and spoken about the case of a woman in St. Joseph who had two operations on her eyes by a visiting specialist at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. She applied for Provident Fund benefits and they told her that she had to bring a medical report. The Hospital authorities said that they could not issue a medical report because the visiting specialist was no longer in Barbados. I have tried every method available and she cannot get any money.

The member for St. Philip South raised some very valuable points. There are people who have worked in sugar from the time they were eight years old. Their health has failed them, but they still cannot qualify because they have not reached the age as set out in the Act.

I have called for several amendments to the Act long ago. There are instances of people who have worked on plantations. The managerial staff of these plantations has changed several times, and the present people who are now in possession or the present managers are saying "we cannot vouch for your having worked in agriculture all this time. "

Up to last week I raised the question of getting your counterpart to sign a document so that you can get money. Barbadians "shy off" when you ask them to sign a document that is beneficial; but I bet you if you ask them to tell the Police what they know about you they will be only too glad to make a statement whether it is true or not; but when it comes to those who have toiled beside them in the field and who are now entitled to benefits, these are the people who will get less in this whole exercise.

The Minister will find that this amendment to the Act is going to create numerous problems. Let me ask a simple question. Why should you raise the Provident Fund payment from \$3. 60 to \$5. 00 while the same Government has the authority to vote money into the Provident Fund.....

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Are we talking about a providence fund or a Provident Fund?

Mr. SPEAKER:

Carry on.

Mr. BOLDEN:

I am minded to say something, but it would be unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It was quite an unnecessary interruption.

Mr. BOLDEN:

You can only speak when Frank Walcott is in here.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is no such person as Frank Walcott in here.

Mr. BOLDEN:

That is why I am not (referring to anybody in here.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will have to ask you to withdraw that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Withdraw what?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The words "you can only speak when Frank Walcott is in here. "

Mr. BOLDEN:

I humbly withdraw that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

For the last time, the hon. member must stop interrupting,

Mr. BOLDEN:

If you do not watch yourself, Sir, the two of them will try.....

Mr. SPEAKER:

That is beside the point. I do not need to be told what to do. Carry on.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister will find that in connection with the Provident Fund and the Old Age Pensions there is going to be a conflict because, as I see it, people will be faced with making a choice. Another point is the question of funeral grants. 1. 05 p. m.

Another question is too, the question of funeral benefits. I would have thought they would have taken the opportunity to increase the funeral benefits under this particular Act because of the paltry sum which was given. Again, Mr. Speaker, what provisions have been made for those persons who qualify, who have made all applications to have money from the fund and then die before it is given to them. These are things we have constantly raised about the fund.

Let us assume that when the Act was brought in in 1968 we did not know the problems which would have arisen under the Act, but this is 1974 now. When you are going to amend the Act I would have felt that these problems which have been raised in here from time to time would have been taken into consideration and the Act would have been amended in such a way as to relieve the burden of those people who have been walking from the country districts - don't let us talk about the Belle plantation and that area, but of those who have to come from St. Joseph, St. John, St. Philip and even St. Lucy, to Bridgetown, to go down there to ask "What is happening, when can I get my money; when am I going to get my money?"

The Minister says that people are being paid, but I phoned the Board up to last week and somebody at the Board said to me that the Board will not be meeting until January because they had no money in the fund. (ASIDE) The Minister says 'this is rubbish; ' but who is talking rubbish? Is the clerk who deals with the fund talking rubbish? As far as I understand, the Board meets every two months; so what is the position? As I said, the Minister has his own views; the people down at Herbert House have got their own views as to how the fund must operate; but all I say, Mr. Speaker, is that we will end up with a lot of problems, and, I want the Minister to explain how many stamps will qualify you for this \$15 a week minimum, and when I know that, I will know how to advise my people.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the remarks by the hon. member for St. Philip South on this Bill. The history of agriculture in this country is painful to read and much more, perhaps so, to listen to. However, our chief concern is that the Minister has given us to understand that the Cabinet has taken a decision to increase the Provident Fund weekly benefit from \$3. 60 to \$5, 00.

I believe the Minister would tell us upon what that is based. Why from \$3. 60 to \$5. 00 and not to something more in keeping with present day standards and bearing in mind our present sugar prices and what is likely to accrue to the strengthening of the Provident Fund. One might even look at it in this light, that the Government is trying to jump the gun, so to speak. That is, you know that these people are hungry and you give them something; or rather you give them nothing knowing that they would take it to be something, but at the same time we very well know that there is a likelihood that for a period of three, or maybe four years, the contributions to the Fund should be healthier than they have been perhaps any time during the past ten, and if the Government were to decide on paying this \$5. 00 now, we wonder if they would be good enough to consider that they are paying this \$5.00 on account. You increase it to \$5. 00 but pay it on account, because, we believe that the Government itself must be satisfied that these poor people are worth something much more than \$5. 00 at this particular time, and when we take into consideration the fact that \$5. 00 can purchase absolutely nothing to their comfort at this particular time. We wonder if the Government would look into these matters.

On the other hand, we have heard of the number who have not been brought into the paling of grace from the coming into operation of the Act, and we know for ourselves, being active politicians among these people, of the extent of their suffering. We know of the efforts that they have had to make in finding who were their employers at particular times. I myself have had cause to send them to look for the old driver, or the old watchman on the estate to make affidavits to bear out that they were really employed, because the person who was the manager or the bookkeeper at the time had gone to New Zealand or somewhere and cannot be traced or be found.

To be honest, the exertion to which these people are put to be able to get the pittances from the Provident Fund is not pleasant to have to relate. We must admit? that there must be some criteria; that we just cannot have everybody walk up and say 'I served twenty years at this place or thirty years, ' and just receive it. No, Sir. We do not agree with that: but we are satisfied that there are large numbers of these workers who have given of their entire working life if we were to put it that way - who have given their entire working life to the sugar industry of this country, and? with the coming into being of the Act, there have been little loop holes here and there that have thrown them off balance, that they were not able to benefit from the Fund.

Now we believe, Sir, that since we know of the possibilities of the growing strength of the Fund, the fact that Parliament can vote from the Consolidated Fund to help strengthen the Fund, we are to wonder if all of those persons who served these estates cannot be helped. Let us say, if we were to take into consideration a person who can satisfy that he has given, say, thirty years at any one of the plantations, that we should consider that if he does not qualify for a pension, that he should be given some ex gratia payment. Let us see how many people would then qualify; let us see what it would cost and let us see if we as members of parliament could be humane enough to take into consideration the contribution that these people have made to this country's economy over the years; that a person who can satisfy us that they have put in 30 years in the industry, should be given some ex gratia payment 1. 15 p. m.

I believe that something can be done so that a measure of relief can be given. We feel half way comfortable in our minds that the fund has been launched and somebody has been getting some benefit from it over the period. It has still helped to tide them over some of their problems, but we still know of large numbers who have been looking, hoping and praying, well knowing that they have really made their contribution in terms of their labour, and we would be happy if some consideration could be given to this aspect of the matter. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that you know as well as I do that some of these people who after they have served the industry are still homeless and living in sub-human conditions, and some are left to beg their bread, and that is not good enough if we realise what sugar has meant and will continue to mean to us perhaps in the future. I would like to be assured by the Minister that the point made by some other members, that people who now get the old age pension and national insurance or provident fund pension, when this \$15 is brought into effect from the 1st of next year will not receive less than at present. We would like an assurance that there are not going to be any contrivances to reduce people to this or to say that a person cannot get more than one pension because of the things we have been hearing.

Mr. Speaker, we already know in the case of Government pensioners that there are some who get two pensions, like a school teacher who might have been also an organist. He gets a pittance for playing the organ for forty or fifty years, but when it comes to getting an increase in pension, you hear that he can only get an increase on one of the pensions although in each month he gets two pay cheques. In other words, they are individual pensions but you claim there is only one pensioner. We do not want this yardstick applied for only one pension and that you cannot get from here and from there. We want to be assured that we are not here contributing to the downfall of these people or to the reduction of the amount that they presently receive. After all these people have made their contribution, and as the hon. member for St. Philip South - has said, these people are responsible for your and my being here however remotely. They have made their contribution and it is because of all of this that we can stand up here today and talk about sugar and sugar prices and what we expect to get from sugar and what not. If they had been minded to do what some are doing today, to back out of the sugar industry 20 or 30 years ago, perhaps there would be no Chamber such as we now have, no standards such as we now have. There would be nothing upon which to go and we must take all this into consideration. We are appealing to the Minister to consider that if a man has worked in the burning sun and in the rain from the picking of the pond grass days, Government should consider a reasonable lifespan in the industry, say, thirty years, and give an ex-gratia payment as long as it will bring some measure of relief and happiness. It might be as

much as would help somebody who would have been living in a three-sided house to -put on the other side in his old days, but whatever it might be, I venture to assure the Government that this side will give it wholehearted support.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members who have already spoken today on this Bill have to a large extent talked about the kind of problems and difficulties which sugar workers who are at present benefiting from the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund which was set up in 1968 are experiencing, and which, unless something is done to alleviate some of these difficulties, they will continue to experience. I can agree that there are a number of irregularities surrounding this whole Provident Fund, and the sooner we get these irregularities ironed out the better. The problems which I am talking about are problems which have been amplified by the hon. member for St. Philip South, the hon. member for St. Peter and the hon. member for St. Joseph, and I do not think I should for the purposes of this debate delay, or as it were, hold up the House much more with this. However, I think it is important that we should at all times recognise that when it comes to paying benefits to any group of workers who have made their contribution to national development and particularly to workers who have been involved in the sugar industry, we should be very careful to ensure that the kind of benefits which they are entitled to are received without much trouble.

Now I do not think that anybody would deny that sugar has been very important to the economy of Barbados, and we can see that its importance will remain for some time to come, and I think we should have a very careful look again at the Provident Fund legislation and other welfare benefits which are being worked out or are in operation for the sugar workers to ensure that these people who have built up the industry and through whose sweat the industry has been able to continue up to a point today where one can see that it is going to play a crucial role in the economy of this country once more, are taken good care of. I think this is something we should look at and we should be all too happy to ensure that these workers get the kind of benefits that would bring some pride not only to the people who represent them, but indeed to themselves and to the entire nation.

Mr. Speaker, I think that if you examine the working life of these and other workers, you will find that they have the longest span as far as work is concerned, and the returns and benefits which they have been able to get out of this industry which is so important and which has played so important a role in the development of this country over the years do not match the contribution which they have made, and one would hope that now that we are looking at this aspect of pension for sugar workers that we would be able at some time to review the entire situation, and iron out all the irregularities and the problem areas which at present exist. 1. 25 p. m.

I think that the fact that the Government has seen fit to increase this pension is a clear indication that

the Government is aware that the sugar workers deserve more. One should welcome this increase, however small it is, and would also hope that it is just an indication of what will be the future position of what they will most likely get if and when it gets into a better position where they can afford to pay more money to these people.

Mr. Speaker, if you were to really examine the contribution which the Sugar Industry, and by that, the sugar workers have made to the country, and if you were to look at the situation of the sugar workers from your position - not as sitting in the Chair - but from your position as a person who lives and as it were has your being in a rural situation, you will be really convinced that the benefits which these same workers have been able to get do not match the contribution they have made.

This, Sir, is a point that has been made over and over again and I think that it is something which should be recognised and which should be put right. I would hope that in the near future the Government would be able to come up with something which would be much more beneficial to the sugar workers.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to all that has been said by various speakers on this Bill. I want to make a few points particularly in reference to what the hon member for St.

Joseph said. He stated that he was glad to see the hon member for St. Philip South now converted to what they were saying long ago.

The Government, Sir, was long aware and never hid the fact that there were problems with the scheme. We all experience these problems. I happen to be a representative of an urban constituency and there are several persons living in my constituency who worked in the Sugar Industry and also had problems with the Provident Fund.

I believe that every single person in this Chamber has had someone whom he has represented who had problems with the Provident Fund. It is not that the Government is only aware now that the member for St. Philip South has spoken, that there are problems. We have to face facts. It was a new Fund and in any new Fund of this kind you are bound to start with problems.

We also have to face the fact that some of these problems which have been identified or re-identified by members today will only be cured by the fluxion of time, and unfortunately the fluxion of time is death. I regret to say that, but that is the case, Mr. Speaker. In the course of time all of these problems will be ironed out. Those which we cannot iron out by administrative action will be ironed out by Providence. Not the Provident Fund, but by Providence. I have to make a distinction.

We have to face facts. There are weak links as identified in the Fund. Fitness to work is a problem in any area where people are pensioned, and you have to put in certain rules and regulations governing this. Let us look at it this way: the hon member for St. Philip South spoke very passionately about the problems encountered by persons who have given, say, 30 years in the industry, who have reached the age of 64 but have not yet reached the qualifying age of 65, to be able to qualify as of right for pension.

The point is that as soon as one reaches the age of 65 he does not need a medical certificate. All that he needs is a birth certificate to qualify for pension. There are people who may have worked long or not so long in the Sugar Industry but have qualified because they have given ten years service, or at least 60 days in each of those ten years. They reach the age of 64 and they are unable to work any more. They can only qualify for pension on the production of a medical certificate.

Now that would be the case, Mr. Speaker, with any qualifying age. If you reduced the qualifying age to 40 and people started working in the industry from a young age - 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 - a man could still give 20 years service, could reach the age of 39 and be no longer able to work; and it would mean that he would still have to get a medical certificate.

Let us face the fact that a medical certificate cannot be ruled out, but we may be able from time to time to examine the scheme and in case where it is impossible for such a person to be considered medically unfit to render further service in the Sugar Industry, it may be possible from time to time as we go on to continue to examine the scheme; because this is no once and for all thing.

We in the Ministry examine the scheme from time to time, and that is one reason why we are able to come forward now with an increase in pension. Where a person may not be able to obtain a medical certificate it may be possible at some point in time to give that person a grant in compensation for the number of years that he has rendered to the Sugar Industry.

What we have been looking at and will continue to look at is reducing the age for pension purposes. It

may be possible to reduce the age from 65 to 60 or even lower. Anyhow, let us say 60 years, and I believe that that is precisely what the hon member for St. Philip South has been advancing; but I want him to know that if the age is 60 and a person is at 59 he will have to produce a medical certificate because we have to have various rules and regulations.

We know that there are problems relating to persons who have been in the Sugar Industry working on plantations for years, but because of a change in ownership or of plantation managers their service is not easy to be verified. What we have been doing in the Labour Department is that on the production of the necessary affidavits we try to ease those persons in that way; but there are problems. I know, I have evidence of people who have been receiving pensions whom I never knew to have been working in the Sugar Industry. Some people benefit who probably should not be benefiting, and some people find it difficult to receive what they should receive. I know that there are problems. Some will be ironed out administratively and some will be ironed out otherwise,

Mr. Speaker, the level of increase was referred to by the member for St. Joseph. He compared it with what was done for the old age pensioners. The Cabinet agreed to this increase not last month or the month before, but since the month of August. The Cabinet agreed to these increases for pensioners under the Sugar Workers' Provident Fund. We received at that time probably somewhere around £90 or so a ton for sugar produced for this year. Under the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement it was £83 a ton and some was sold on the world market at an average price of £100 a ton... The price today, Mr.. Speaker, is over five times that amount, but we have no sugar to sell now. I do not know what we are going to sell our sugar for next year. 1. 35 p. m.

We could only increase our pension rates based on what we knew at that time; the evidence that was before us. But I would invite the hon. member for St. Joseph to look at it this way. The increases to old age pensions are 25% increase and the increases to pensioners under this Fund, 39% increase; so in fact, in real terms these people are receiving a much larger increase, not in dollars and cents.....

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would give way. Is the Minister trying to tell the public at large that we are working in percentage, with an increase of \$2 as against an increase of \$1. 40, when the same sums of money have got to buy goods at the same price? We are not dealing with percentage. It is a question of a figure of \$2 as against \$1. 40.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Obviously it is a question of \$2 as against \$1. 40, but what I am saying is that taken in terms of percentages, one has to relate it - everything is relative. There are relativities, that have to bear relation to something. What I am saying, Sir, is that the sugar worker pensioners under this Fund receive a much

larger percentage increase than the old age pensioners, and in fact that is true because they are receiving a percentage of 39% as against a percentage of 25%.

Now I want to make it dear that the pensions to be paid to those persons who qualify for National Insurance pensions of \$15 is a minimum pension and we are not changing how many stamps are to be placed on the registration cards because it will be the same as it was last year, the year before, and years before. The hon. member should know this. He must not now tell me he wants to know how many stamps would qualify for this. It is all available in the documents of this very Chamber. Let him do his research. He should not have to ask me for that. It is all readily available and I have no doubt that if he were to do enough research he can find it.

The hospital case was mentioned by the hon. member. I regret to say that these are some of the problems that you encounter. This has nothing to do now with the Provident Fund; this has nothing to do with my Ministry. The member claims that his client is unable to get a medical certificate from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but my Ministry, the administrators of the Fund, have nothing to do with that; but I would have hoped that the hon. member would have some reasonable advice to give to his client, in that if that doctor who examined the eyes of his client is no longer at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, get another doctor to do this - not to carry out any operation on the person's eyes but to certify that the eyes of that person - of his client - are such that that person is unable to work. Because that one doctor is out of Barbados does not mean that the whole medical profession in Barbados no longer exists. So a medical certificate is still available to that person. I would advise him to advise his client - and I hope that he has already given this advice - I would advise him to advise his client to get the appropriate medical certificate, and that person would receive his just and due pensions.

I want again to dispute the question of persons not receiving their pensions, because they have been receiving their pensions; and do not bring to me any argument that the member who said it was told at the Labour Department that the Board is not meeting until January, because the Board does not deal with weekly pensions. The Board has nothing to do with weekly pensions. The Board determines who new pensioners should be, and that is a once and for all. thing. So when the Board decides that I am to receive a pension, the question of my drawing it every week is not a matter for the Board. It is a matter for me and those persons who administer the Funds. So the Board not meeting until January has nothing to do with any person at all not receiving their weekly pensions. That is a plain redherring.

Despite all of this, Mr. Speaker, I think the debate has been very useful, and, as I said earlier, we in the Ministry examine it from time to time and in the light of all that has been said we are prepared to continue our examination, not only to stop at \$5. 00 a week but to give, possibly, increased pensions and other increased benefits.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE MAINTENANCE ORDER (RECIPROCAL ENFORCEMENT) ACT, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 2 standing in the name of the Prime Minister be the next Order of the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1. 45 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, as the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would consolidate and revise the law relating to reciprocal enforcement of maintenance orders.

This matter has been under review by the Cabinet for some time and it is agreed that the additional features of reciprocity provided by the United Kingdom Maintenance Orders (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act, 1972, should be accepted and that amending legislation should be enacted to include these features. It is also agreed that the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) Act, 1922, should be repealed, but that provision should be made in the Foreign Maintenance Orders (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act, 1972, to preserve and keep in force any maintenance orders made under Section 11 of the Act of 1922. So the main features of this Bill would include (a) reciprocity with the whole of the United Kingdom, (b) the definition of Maintenance Orders to include Affiliation Orders, (c) a country to be designated as a reciprocating country in respect of all classes of Maintenance Orders or in respect of certain classes only, (d) Orders to be transmitted from a country other than a country from which it originated and (e) the making of a provisional order, that is, an order made in a Court in the United Kingdom which is provisional only and has no effect unless and until confirmed with or without alteration by a competent

court in the reciprocating country, or an order made by a court in the reciprocating country which is provisional only and has no effect unless and until confirmed with or without alteration by a court in the United Kingdom having power under this part of the Act to confirm it.

The position is further that the Ministry of Legal Affairs has advised that Maintenance Orders which have been made under the Maintenance Orders (Facilities for Enforcement) act, 1922, will be preserved by virtue of section 29(c) of the Interpretation Act, 1966. This Bill and the proposed amendments were referred to the Chief Justice and he has said that it is the fairest to deal comprehensively with the Reciprocal Enforcement or Maintenance Orders generally. So the Chief Justice has been consulted and has approved the new features of the Bill and it can be considered to be quite in order to facilitate maintenance orders and to grant full reciprocity as obtains in the United Kingdom.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On motion of Hon. C:

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

Parts I to XI inclusive were called and passed.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker I think this is a convenient time for us to have a recess.

I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3 o'clock.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 1. 55 p. m.

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER:

The sitting is now resumed.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, there are two replies to questions which can now be dealt with.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 268.

Mr. HOPPIN:

To enquire of the appropriate Minister

Would the government consider the construction of the proposed gas line from the oil well at Woodbourne, St. Philip to pass through such thickly populated areas such as the Glebe Land, Charles Rowe Bridge and Salters in the parish of Saint George thereby enabling those residents in the same mentioned area the opportunity to use this commodity?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is as follows -

"As a result of the very rapid decline which has been experienced our gas reserves over the past few years, and with the present strain being felt on our major source of supply at Turners Hall, it has been considered imperative at this stage that any proven reserves at Woodbourne should be channelled as economically and as efficiently as possible into the system for the purpose of restocking supplies and for alleviating the presently existing state of affairs caused by the decline.

To achieve this objective the route of the new gas pipeline has been designed to link up to the system at the Belle following the old railway line. The pipeline will be used solely as a transmission trunk main and not as a distribution line. It will therefore not be used directly for servicing the needs of areas along which the pipeline has been routed between the Woodbourne and its point of connection with the system at Belle and it would therefore serve no purpose to have the pipeline pass through the abovementioned areas.

We have been informed however that prospects of gas at Woodbourne seem favourable, and as soon as the results of further exploratory work being carried out by the General Crude Oil Co. at Woodbourne are known, due consideration will be given to supplying as many areas as possible with gas, including the -areas mentioned in the Question.

;

Mr. SPEAKER:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 243 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 243 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is ready, and with your permission I ask to lay the Reply.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Permission granted. Question Time is now ended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members are ready to continue with their reply to the Prime Minister's Budgetary Proposals. They are at liberty to continue now in accordance with the undertaking given.

Mr; BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I am not cognisant of any undertaking given because I think that under the Rules two clear days should be set aside after the delivery of the Budget Speech had been made; and I do not think that it was meant, as I interpret the rules, that Private Members' Business - the time allocated for Private Members' Business on any other day should be used for such a reply.

Obviously it would mean that if there are five other members on this side that want to speak, we will be using up Private Members' Business from day to day as the House meets rather than following the rule which says that two full days should be set aside for debate when the Chamber would do nothing else but debate the Budgetary Proposals and the Reply.

So, I do not think it is in order that the Leader of the House should invite members from this side to carry on a debate in Private Members' time whether or not we had something else to do. We would then be writing Rules only for the sake of writing Rules,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In view of what the hon. member has said we then proceed - we revert back to Government Business.

Mr. BOLDEN:

No, Sir. With respect to the Leader of the House, I thought that he was trying to reply to what I said because I am going to ask for one Bill to be done under Private Members' Business today. That is why I said I do not think that we should use Private Members' time or allow that time to be utilised like that,

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would give way. If the hon. member or any member on that side, or the Leader could indicate what days they would like set aside for dealing with the Reply - I have been informed - on the last occasion I did ask that question. I do not think that the hon. member was in his seat.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting mixed up. The Chamber has set aside two days for the debate of the Budgetary Proposals. It is not for us to say what two days. The two days immediately following the Budgetary Proposals should have been set aside for the debate. It might have been concluded in half a day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

All I am trying to point out is that the Opposition or certain members of the Opposition did not appear to be ready to proceed. Even the member who seconded the motion reserved the right to reply. So if the hon. member would follow things closely he would see that I am not suggesting anything wrong. If you will indicate what two days you want, please do so. Up to now I have not been notified as to what two days they want set aside.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I think that is a matter for private treaty. What is therefore before us is whether we carry on with Government Business or whether private members among us would want to carry on with any items of private business excluding the Reply to the supplementary Budgetary Proposals. I am not overlooking the fact that on the last occasion when the House met, the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown

- the hon. member for St. Joseph was not here

- did indicate that at 2 o'clock today he would be willing to begin the debate on the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I say this with great difficulty because the Chair should not get into discussion, but I think that this would assist the hon. member for St. Joseph. So whether the Reply is done now or at some other time is a matter for private treaty. What we should now be looking at is whether we are going to do Government Business or any items of Private Members' Business.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

That may well be true, Sir, but I do not want it reported that the Government is not ready to debate the supplementary Budgetary Proposals; because as you quite rightly said, Sir, the second or third Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for the City did indicate that after lunch he would concede to Government doing Government Business. He is not here, neither is the Leader or the Deputy Leader. I am not sure when that undertaking was given, the hon. member for St. Joseph or St. Peter was here.

But one thing is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Government is not afraid or unwilling or robbing the Opposition of the right to debate the Budgetary Proposals of the Prime Minister. Then we can proceed with the business of the House; but I want the record straight because we can get twisting in reporting that we are afraid or we were not here or we tried to rob the Opposition of their right. We are ready, willing and able, even although all of us may not be in our place at the same time; although I never knew that my constituents voted for me that I must sit down in the House and listen to anybody. But be that as it may, we are all ready if the Opposition is prepared to use Private Members' time to debate the Budgetary Proposals.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

In view of the circumstances, Sir, I beg to move that Government Business be now continued.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 3 on the Order Paper be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE LICENSING, REGISTRATION AND CONTROL OF BUSINESSES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, according to the Objects and Reasons this Bill would provide for the licensing, registration and control of businesses which operate on franchise in Barbados. The position, Sir, is that at present there is no legislation for the registering or licensing of franchises to operate business or service in Barbados; and it is for that reason that the Minister of Trade has advised this step.

Under the Local Government Act 1958, the registration of business places is required for the purposes of calculation in respect of business or trade carried on. Also under the Interim Traders Act of 1909 and the Trade Tax Act of 1910 together with the subsequent amendments thereto, those Bills require the registration of all new businesses for tax purposes. Also in the case of the Companies Act, 1910, these businesses need to be registered.

There is no comprehensive registration of business places, and it is extremely difficult to enumerate these with any authenticity. Surveys carried out from time to time revealed that many undisclosed operations exist.

It is for that reason, Sir, that the Ministry of Trade, Industry and Commerce recommended enactment of legislation for control over the existence and operation of all businesses and services in the country. 3.
10 p. m.

Such registration should provide for registration and licensing and control of businesses which operate on franchise in Barbados, the regulation of franchises, payment of registration and licence fee, the licensing of register of businesses and services, and penalties for breach of the provisions contained in the Act.

I hardly need say any more, Sir; with those few remarks I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive were called and passed.

Clause 4 was called.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, Clause 4 is a very peculiar Clause. What Clause 4 is seeking to do is to turn the Minister now into a judicial authority or some authority to determine the rights and wrongs of objections.

Now I have heard members of that side criticize the late senior member for the City of Bridgetown about how he used to call fathers, or mothers, and reputed fathers before him down at the City Council and hold court over them and tell them what to do. Well, this is exactly what Clause 4 is doing now. Clause 4, in other words, says that if somebody puts in an objection to an application, the Minister may call these two people before him and he can require writing, and he is there to judge and determine; that is all I can say it is.

Now, I do not believe that that is what a Ministerial function is about at all. If the Minister has the right to issue the licence, I believe any dispute or any objection which is lodged against an application, should be determined in some other way than by bringing the Minister in this, because what it is going to do is, give people the idea that if somebody puts in an objection the Minister can have his little shilly-shally.

Now this is the same thing that happens with Town Planners. In Town Planning, somebody applies to develop a particular area in a special way, and you write in an objection. The next thing you hear, is that work is going on, and when you write the Town Planner you hear 'oh, we have your objection and we laid it aside; it did not come into our consideration or something of this nature. Well this is exactly what is going to happen and I think that this is a very badly drawn Clause - Clause 4- and I would have thought that the Government would have seen some other method of determining the rights and wrongs of an objection which is placed, rather than to bring the Minister into the category of having to call two people before him for the Minister to determine. It does not even set out here that the Minister has a right to call in specialist knowledge to help him determine the rights and wrongs of such a business or licence. It leaves everything in the hands of the Minister, which means that it is left to the whims and fancies of the Minister.

If the Minister does not like me and I am the person who applies for the licence, and one of his friends puts in an objection, that is the end of the issue. I do not think that this Clause is good at all. Government should have looked at this before and see what other method could have been devised for determining objections. There are several processes which could have been adopted which could have been written into this Clause rather than to bring the Minister into it, and I would think that this is something which Government should take a second look at, otherwise it is certainly going to spread a lot of rumours as to who gets licence, and who does not get licence, and how people get licence and how people's objections are determined, etc., because if somebody wants to do something of a specialist nature and the Minister just decides. I do not know anything about it, licence not granted, ' that is the end of it.

Similarly it might be something to do with the middle of a housing area; somebody might say the smell or something is going to disturb the people in the area, and the Minister might say 'I want it there and I like the person who has applied, ' and that is the end of it.

I think what we should be striving to do at this period of time is to remove these suspicions or allegations which can be levied against the Minister, rather than to burden the Minister with this sort of thing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, obviously the hon. member for St. Joseph does not understand Ministerial responsibility. If you place a power on a Minister and there is no escape to blame Civil Servants or anybody, and the Minister misuses his powers, you go straight to the public and show it. I should imagine that would be the best way to show in any instance that the Minister is not using his powers in the best interest of his country. So what is the quarrel about Ministerial responsibility? In giving the Minister the power you cannot blame anybody but the Minister; and now he is saying do not give it to the Minister because he wants somebody else underneath to blame.

The Minister cannot escape that he gives his friends, according to the Member; that he takes foolish objections- the Minister is to blame, and that is where the Ministerial responsibility lies.

The amount of times I have come in here, Mr. Chairman, and got blamed for things because I am the Minister, without knowledge of it is numerous, and it is time that this is stopped.

So to put the powers on the Minister where he cannot escape the political or any blame is the correct constitutional position. So what is the argument about?

Now I will give an example. Suppose somebody applies for a franchise and they get a franchise, and they have civil servants or other people put up the signs anyhow all over the island and spoil the beauty of the place, and it is not the Minister to say 'I do not want hamburger signs there' or 'I do not want' what ever it is, but a civil servant will meet and will decide, 'well, you can put up this franchise there. ' then the Minister comes in here and you hear Parliamentary Question No. 167: "Is the Minister aware that the countryside and the scenery is being disfigured because this firm has put up a big hamburger sign, " or whatever sign it is; and the Minister has got to come and say 'The Minister is aware, ' but what can he

do?... 3. 20 p. m.

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, the hon. member does not understand and is completely outside what we are dealing with. The grant of a licence does not deal with where you put up your sign or how you design your building. That falls either under Town Planning or the Trust.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If the Minister gives a licence to operate in the midst of a residential area and the Minister is taking into account the grant of a licence, one would assume that he would respect the laws of Barbados and he would also respect Town and Country Planning. If a Minister gave me a licence to put up in Regency Park a hot dog franchise, do you think that Town and Country Planning can come and tell me I can't put up my hot dog sign? All this law means is that the Minister conscious of the Government policy will take into account Town and Country Planning Regulations, and before he grants a licence he will consider all this; and he can come into the House, there will be no excuses and the Minister cannot shelter behind Town and Country Planning or behind anything. The Minister by the law is the one to blame and in a lot of the laws of Barbados, it is high time that responsibility be placed on the Minister.

I can come in here with a Bill on the Transport Board, and the law says the Minister is the policy maker, he must give such directions. Up to last night a man rang me - I almost had to lose my temper - and told me he could not catch a bus on Fore Shore Road and all that kind of nonsense. When I told him to consult the manager, he said he heard I was the Minister. I am the Minister, so I must tell him whether a bus will come at 9 o'clock or not. It is time to place the responsibility where it lies, on the Minister. Too many laws have "the Minister" who has got to come in here, take the licks and shelter behind what Civil Servants do, and it is time it stops. Hon. members on that side have not experienced the political or ministerial responsibility so their fear of political responsibility is understandable. Do you know what amuses me? I would like them to tell the public that if by some chance they got into power in 1976 they would come in here and alter this and put it somewhere else; tell the public if they will alter the tax, water tax, sales tax and whatever; but they always come in here and criticise because it sounds good and it gets them a few votes. I would like them to tell the public if when they get into power they will reverse this and take off this or take off that. If the laws now give the Ministers too much power, if you get into power will you remove this? I can tell the public what the answer is" Look at what Clause 3 says: "Any person who desires to operate a business on franchise in Barbados shall first obtain from the Minister a licence for the purpose.

An application for a licence under subsection (1) shall be in writing addressed to the Minister and shall be in such form as the Minister determines. "

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is so much accustomed to defending that he does not understand the clause we are dealing with. Clause

3 has already been passed.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am reading Clause 3 to say that if you pass Clause 3.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

But you are completely out of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am trying to show that if you pass Clause 3 saying that the Minister must give the licence, how can you oppose Clause

4 which tells you how the Minister must listen to evidence before he gives the licence?

The question that Clause 4 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Mr. GREAVES; Hon. A. MORRISON; Mr. HOPPIN; Hon. F. G. SMITH and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD-11.

Notes; Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN-3.

Clauses 5 to 20 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time and passed. 3. 30 p. m.

BILL TO REPEAL THE SANITATION AND CEMETERY BOARD ACT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 4 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been promised a long time ago. If I remember correctly, since August, 1973. There have been a number of problems arising since that date which have added to the delay in presenting this Bill before this Honourable Chamber.

This Bill is just part of a pack which is intended to improve the conditions and standards of environmental sanitation in Barbados, the other parts being an anti-litter Bill, Health Services Regulations, collection and disposal of solid waste, and a Control of Dogs Act. The other three Acts we hope to introduce into this Chamber some time early in the coming new year.

I think that it would have created a better impact if we had been able to introduce all of these Bills at the same time, but unfortunately we are only now dealing with this Bill which seeks to repeal the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board Act, 1969, and to establish a Sanitation Service Authority to perform the functions performed by the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, and provide for the payment of compensation to persons who have suffered pecuniary loss or have been otherwise adversely affected by the transfer of functions to the Sanitation Service Authority and to provide for related matters.

When one looks closely at the Bill there are a few outstanding features about it. The first one is the change of the name of the organisation responsible for the collection and disposal of solid waste in this country from the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to a shorter or maybe more nicely sounding name, the Sanitation Service Authority.

Secondly, this new organisation will be a corporate body, a qualification which was lacking in the old Board; and as a result, the individual members of the Board found themselves being sued for matters pertaining to the operation of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board.

Thirdly, under the new organisation you find that, the right to hire and fire will no longer fall under the control of the Statutory Boards Service Commission. The reason for this is that there has been a breakdown in discipline in the Sanitation Service, as it now stands, and part of the reason for this breakdown is due to the fact that the machinery which is at present obtainable for enforcing discipline is a very slow one, slow and tedious, and for the most part ineffective.

It has been argued and accepted that if a new Board, a new Authority, is given the power to hire and fire, subject to reasonable conditions being laid down, one may very well see an improvement in the discipline of the workers falling under the employment of that Authority. This is left to be seen, but at the same time the present situation strongly supports that this step be taken and it has been taken; so in this new Act you find that hereafter all employees of the Sanitation Service Authority will be directly subject to discipline by that Authority.

Now the other point which is of importance in this Bill is the provision for compensation to be paid to workers who have suffered some pecuniary loss or are otherwise adversely affected by the transfer of the functions to the Sanitation Service Authority.

Now there are those who are likely to argue that changing the name and changing certain conditions of

the Board or under which the Board operates is tantamount to a change in employment or conditions of service of workers, and therefore as such they should be entitled to compensation if they so desire, and this has been incorporated in the present Bill.

So these are the four points in which this Bill now before us differs substantially from the previous Act. In other matters one would have to point out that there are no such great differences. In fact in other matters there may be great similarity.

Now there have been a lot of reasons which have prompted this Bill and the other Bills which I have mentioned and which will be brought in here early in the new year. It is not for me at this time, Your Honour, to repeat all the arguments that have gone on here in the past and which you yourself have heard and maybe bore ourselves with this; but maybe there are some people who would be only too happy to rehearse them and bring them back to the attention of the members. In case that happens, I think that I would be bound to reply once again to some of these accusations or some of these comments.

But, Sir, at the moment I am dealing specifically with the Bill. I have indicated that the need for the Bill has been brought about because we realise that a new approach has to be given to the problem of environmental sanitation in this country; and this Bill is one of four which is intended to give this approach.

I have pointed out the major points in this Bill in which it differs from the previous Act, and Your Honour, I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is one thing which the Minister has not really told us about this Bill, and one of the reasons why I believe it is proposed to change the name from the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board to the new Sanitation Service Authority and a bringing about of a change in the actual authority of the Board is perhaps to bring Barbados a good turn.

I believe that what the new Authority will be first setting out to do after it has been established is to remove the stumbling block, the hindrance which is now costing the country so much money. That is, the new Authority no doubt will renegotiate with the Trade Union to see that any 40-hour week in respect of the Sanitation Service Authority must take into consideration Monday to Saturday, and not as it now obtains. Monday to Friday.

That is very important. It has got to be gone into at all costs. We are going to hear a lot, but let us face the facts. We in Barbados are clamouring for a 40-hour week, but what we really need is about an 80-hour week, if not more in some respects. We are watching people outside who are better placed than us, and we are opting for this and opting for that. But if we Mr. Speaker, are to go on with this 40-hour week that we have allowed to be thrust upon us in the manner in which it has been so thrust, it is going to bring us to ruin unless we can assure the nation that it means employment for greater numbers. 3. 40 p. m.

We are not seeking this accompanying the introduction of the 40-hour week. We have not seen it at any particular level; or if it has been it is not so noticeable in the community. You have a 40-hour week in this institution that other department or whatever it might be but you have not seen an increase in staff. We have heard here, Sir that the Government does not see itself at the present moment in a position to increase the staff in certain departments. We have heard this. We have seen, Mr. Speaker, that we have introduced a 40-hour week in other departments but we have not seen in truth and in fact any appreciable number of workers who were unemployed in the past now being brought on the scene that they can now have, let us say, a new lease of life because they are now getting a job and finding something to do that they did not find before. Very little of this; I believe that when this new Authority is established we might be seeing some attempts, and we are hoping to hear how it is all going to be resolved.

Now, if we are establishing this Authority to exercise fuller and greater control over things generally that pertain to the functions of this Authority, we are glad for this; but in truth and in fact we are hearing the Minister speak of the old Board not being able to discipline this worker or that worker. We have been hearing and we know this to be true, that there has been a decline in the discipline in the Sanitation and Cemeteries Department; but, Mr. Speaker, the decline starts from the Board itself; amongst the office staff. I want to say here and now that what the Prime Minister has been telling us that he has been trying to stamp out, that is, people placing their orders where they get commission - the type of thing that he makes us to believe that he has set up Central Purchasing to stamp out, is the very thing that has been introduced and is now being practised in the present Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. Let the Minister investigate.

You will find then, Mr. Speaker, that when that type of thing is obtaining it is not known to any individual; it is known to a Body generally. What reflection would you find then, Sir, trickling through, let us say, even to the road sweeper? Because, everybody is up against the road sweeper; it is said that he cannot be disciplined and what not. That might be true; but there are others over and above who themselves have got to exert some measure of discipline over the road sweeper, who themselves have got to be disciplined first. So if that is the case, the Minister must admit that there is a total collapse in the Sanitation and Cemeteries Department and its operations; a total collapse.

I will tell you this. If he is now going to establish a new Authority and put new wine, so to speak, into old bottles, he might as well keep the old functioning. I would urge upon the Minister, and I mean it now; if you are going to establish a new Sanitation Service and really want to see something done about this place, strip the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board of every individual from top to bottom; but you have to keep the road sweepers because you really cannot find them so readily.

A change has got to come about. I do not want for a single moment, Sir, to reflect back on the garbage and so on piling up about the place. I am telling you, Sir, that garbage is on the minds of some who are to call on the road sweepers to clean it up. Garbage is on the minds of some of these people. We cannot then have it any better.

I welcome this attempt by the Minister if he really means to clean the streets and to have things looking pure and really sanitary; but he must apply the remedies. The first dose of medicine has got to go at the top and come all the way down. It is not going to be an easy task, but when you see that corruption is at the extent it is in this Board, well then, what next?

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. Speaker, I was always told that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose; that that is its first duty, and its second duty is to oppose, and its third duty is to oppose. On this occasion I find myself in the very awkward position where I cannot really oppose, I have to say, the Government; much to my regret I have to say, the Minister, on this Bill.

The Bill sets out to correct the problems of health and sanitation. We have been having over the past years, and to recite all that you have said on public platforms and on the Estimates and so on would serve no useful purpose this evening. What I know is, that we are here as the watchdogs of the money of the taxpayers of Barbados, and though the Minister is setting out to change the system v I hope he does not fall into the trap of putting old wine into a new bottle. I am afraid of that.

Now he has set about to change the name Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. It is now going to be

called the Sanitation Service Authority and it would have the power to hire and fire- All of these things I am going to watch, but I only hope that when they have to discipline any of these workers, that some of the workers do not find themselves down in Black Rock by the Minister asking him to put them back in work, because this Bill would then serve no useful purpose.

I am going to appeal to the Minister to examine the Parks and Beaches Commission Board members; look at that type of member he has - knowledgeable, people who can make a contribution to a very important aspect in this society. Health is nothing that you can fool around. I believe the Minister is sincere. I see the junior Minister - at times I get lost as to whether the member is a junior Minister or Parliamentary Secretary. I normally get mixed up with these terms because I am looking forward to when Senator Leroy Brathwaite will be the junior Prime Minister. They have a lot of junior Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries; I cannot get this understood.

However, what I am dealing with is I observed the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Health giving out little plastic bags, I also would like to draw to the Minister's attention that he would have to get rid of the wild dogs too because the wild dogs are cutting up the plastic bags, and the garbage is still all across the streets. You see, it is all right to get pictures taken of you handing out plastic bags. That is nonsense. 3. 50 p. m.

You have first to correct the Board and remove all the dead wood, and I have been watching it carefully. I hope I do not see any of the Minister's lackeys who go through Carrington Village or the Garden Land with him on the Board because they have not got a clue. I would go further and say that all the members of the former Board should be called upon to pay back every single cent they drew from the Treasury. I was on that Board and I resigned because I could not understand how any person could come in and say "good evening, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to be late; goodbye, Mr. Chairman, I have to catch the bus", and for that he gets \$25 a meeting. That was the contribution they made and I even moved a motion at the Sanitation Board asking that the Minister be removed, and they were all gunning for you, but when I brought it up they sat down and said they could not throw away the Minister. So they served no useful purpose and I resigned (a) because they themselves did not know what they were doing, (b) they did not have the courage of their convictions to approach the Minister, and (c) they were a bunch of dunderheads sitting on the Board.

I am going to watch this carefully, Mr. Speaker, and see whom you are going to put on the Board. Secondly, one of the dangers of this whole exercise is that as long as the Minister has anything to do with it, you are still going to find people coming back when they are dismissed, and the Minister must be very strong on these occasions. You are going to find an environmental technician running to the Minister saying that he was dismissed; you will also find the supervisors doing the same thing. That is the whole trouble; it is a whole racket. I am not going to be critical of the Bill, I am not going to oppose

it, but I warn that I am going to watch the new commission you are setting up. Do not only change the name, it must be the whole system, a new approach to health so as to save the people of Barbados.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I have never agreed with the Government, I am not prepared to agree with it, but I have to say I am going to watch the Minister on this particular occasion. I am not going to salute him"

Mr. BOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, what interests me most of all is that the Minister says he is hoping to bring down a new Dogs Act; there is none in Barbados. I would be very glad to see this. I have listened to many persons in this Chamber and outside talking about the insanitary way in which people keep their houses and that they expect the Sanitation Department to do this and the environmental technicians to do that etc. The Minister himself launched a big campaign in Queens Park where we were told they were giving out plastic bags. Now this is all good, but it is no use anyone of us preaching to the householder about putting his garbage in bags because in the country districts you would have to keep the bags in your house 24 hours until the Sanitation Department's lorry comes outside your door, and that 24 hours may stretch into two weeks, because the wild dog in the Barbados breed proliferously. When you cannot get a pedigree dog to breed, you only have to let it outside your door for one minute and either one of the wild dogs can beautifully serve it for you. Things have reached a point where not only do they attack the plastic bags with garbage, but they attack cows, sheep and any living form of livestock during the day.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that every householder would like to assist the Sanitation Department in keeping Barbados clean and tidy but it is human nature to want to get rid of your waste as quickly as possible; you do not want to see it in your house or back-yard. There were cases in New York last year, when there was a strike in the Sanitation Department^ of people loading up their garbage and driving up State and dumping it, and the police were waiting for them. They did not prosecute them, but they made them take it up and carry it back where they brought it from. People want to get rid of their garbage, and until the Minister can come down with an Act dealing with dogs in general in Barbados, I believe we are still going to suffer from this problem. With all the new laws you bring on sanitation, as long as you have the antiquated system of having open bins placed at street corners, or until you can tell the householders that the lorry is passing on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays and they should put their stuff out at a given time, we are not going to have any improvement because the lorry breaks down because the machinery is old as we have heard the Minister say several times, and when it breaks down on a Monday run, there is no extra run on that day or the following morning to clear what garbage should have been taken. It forgets Monday until the following week and comes out on Wednesday, but in the meantime the householder does not stop producing garbage, and if she throws it out with a sardine tin or something like that in it, you, Mr. Speaker, have driven along the country side and have seen dogs in stuff cans with their heads down and tails up in the air like they are diving sea eggs, and the garbage is being pulled out. I do not believe that you can really blame the householder in this respect. You have asked them to put the garbage in bags, so when they do and the dogs rip them apart, you are creating more work for the environmental technicians.

Another point which I would like to see in this Dog Act from a sanitation point of view is that there should be stiff penalties for those persons who bring dead dogs and dead cats and dead pigs and put them in stuff bins. Until you bring this sort of legislation in, you would be no wiser. There are also persons who cut down their trees and drag the branches to the corner of the road, and this is what is causing a lot of confusion in respect of sanitation.

The next point I would like to deal with is the question of the Board. The Minister must in my view forget political alignments at this point in time. I believe he should put people on the Board who are strong enough to carry out the letter of the law and to make sure that the department runs as a department befitting a new Act. 4. 00 p. m.

It is no use putting people on Boards - no, I have heard it said in here that when you are picking Boards you look around for fellows with the party cards, the party tickets. It may be good in certain instances. I remember when the hon. member for St. George South was on the Sanitation Board - I am not plugging him for the job now. I mean if he gets the job and does not do it well, you know that I would come in here and tell him so.

But I remember you could have called him up and said "the lorry did not pass here this week" and he always had a nice word for you. One of the problems in Sanitation too is that when you call up any Department they use the system of passing the buck. Don't speak to me; speak to Mr. So and So at that place. That is his line, or speak to the Superintendent in charge of that place.

When somebody calls about garbage which has been lying in the streets for two weeks somebody is serious about it. I hope that the Minister will bring down the Bill dealing with dogs promptly, and I also hope that you will no longer see bonfires at the side of the streets where people have taken to lighting these piles of garbage in order to get rid of flies and dead dogs about them. That is the sort of thing that one drives about and sees.

In certain country districts you see old tins that stay there until they begin to rot. I would like to see this new Act cause a serious improvement in garbage collection in Barbados. I have often said that if we are going to save the tourist economy or if we are banking on half of our revenue to come from tourism we have to be more than careful about our health laws.

It is no use talking about agriculture and growing more food when at the same time we are going to have our garbage in such a position that it is going to breed rats and flies, and the rats leave the garbage, go back into the fields and eat your corn etc. You cannot store it because they are moving from out of the field into the storeroom. We have not had any cases again of rats biting children in the hospital, but it could come to this if we go on in the way we are going on.

I want to see the Minister put on the Board this time people who are capable of running the Department as an efficient department. We do not want to hear any more nonsense about the Minister cannot tell the Board what to do, or the Board does something and the Minister hears about it by way of the newspaper. I think that there should be close liaison, and the Minister should have sufficient confidence in the people he puts on the Board.

I am also glad to see that the Minister has seen it fit to make the Board truly legal entity rather than the makeshift thing which operated over the past two years so that when you have to bring an action against them you do not have to find out who is the Chairman and members of the Board.

I know that there was one time when the Board's vehicles were not even insured. I hope that that situation does not now arise. I notice that the Minister was very careful to say that any action which was pending or being carried on against the old Sanitation Board would be carried on with the necessary amendments.

I hope that the Minister will give instructions to his Board to make sure that they pay the insurance dues on the vehicles as I believe they are breaking the law like any private individual who runs a motor vehicle without paying insurance.

The question of insurance I will deal with in another aspect, but I must compliment the Minister for seeing to it that the new Authority is a legal entity and not like the makeshift which was operating over all these years.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, on this new Act, I think that one of the first things I would like to say is that we can bring all kinds of Acts to Parliament and pass them into laws; but it does not necessarily mean that what we set out to achieve in the Acts will necessarily be achieved. That is the point I want to make at the

outset.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, because a lot has been made of what the Minister has characterised as a breakdown in discipline in the Sanitation Services. I think that one of the factors which seem to have been overlooked is the fact that if one would agree that there was a breakdown in discipline, then one of the major factors in such a situation is not necessarily the result of one side, but quite naturally is a result of the total situation.

When one talks about the maintenance of discipline and control and what not, these are just words and really do not solve the particular problem. One of the things of which we have got to be constantly aware is that if you have a situation in which you are dealing with people, you must have those who really understand how to deal with people, and who can appreciate the problems which people encounter from time to time. I think that this is the basic factor.

As I said at the outset, you can introduce all sorts of laws, but if you have a situation where people feel that they are being taken advantage of, where people feel that they do not have any recourse to justice, or where people feel that it does not even make sense to try to present their grievances to those whom they consider to be the relevant authority, then naturally you will get the kind of industrial problems which in situations like these would be created from time to time.

So, Sir, to say that the Act will ensure or will attempt in some way to restore some measure of discipline, or even to assume that this will be the situation is probably losing sight of this very important factor. So that when you are talking in terms of discipline one has got to be very clear about this particular matter.

I say that because a lot of people seem to get the impression that you only have to pass an Act and maybe get people scared about losing their jobs or coming even to the position of going to prison and you will get discipline. People can resist a particular situation in a number of ways - actively by going on strike or passively by putting in their presence and not really working efficiently.

We have to be very careful about these particular matters because they will bear heavily on the future relationships between the Board and the people whom the Board employs. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Minister made reference to the right to hire and fire which is now to be vested in the Board; but again this does not solve the basic problem. Who has the right to hire and fire might eliminate some of

the difficulties, but it does not solve the major problems.

The point that I am making is that one has got to be concerned and very careful with the people who are put to operate the system. This is going to be the crucial thing in this. Any attempt to improve the sanitation situation in this country is something which should be commended, and naturally everybody will eagerly await the other pieces of legislation which the Minister has referred to because all of these, I believe, in some way or the other, have some effect on the system^ and would no doubt attempt to bring about some improvement in the system. 4. 10 p. m.

Now in the functions of the Authority, it has been stated in page 3, Clause 4(1) subsection (c) that one of the functions will be "to provide and maintain in a sanitary condition suitable places, buildings and appliances for the deposit, disposal or destruction of refuse, and (d) - this is the one I want to speak on - "to provide and maintain public baths and public sanitary conveniences. "

Mr. Speaker, I think that at this time in our history this is something which is really needed, because one is appalled at the stench which emanates from these public conveniences. I think they drive people away from them rather than invite people to come to them, and I think it is a sad reflection on our services if we cannot maintain these conveniences in a condition which would really allow people to go into them and to at least feel comfortable when their answering nature is called. This is something which I hope the Minister would look at very closely and the new Authority would also look at very, very closely.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make reference to is the section dealing with pension, and to say that it seems as if the old Board - the Board which exists at present, because after we pass the Act that would no longer be - has created a tremendous amount of confusion for its employees who have reached retirement age. Over and over again hon. members in this House have made references to the fact that there are a number of people who have reached retirement age only to discover that the records could not be found, or to indeed experience tremendous difficulties in getting their pension computed; and I would hope that with the establishment of the Authority, a very serious look would be taken at all of the employees who are presently employed by the Board, to ensure that all information relative to their years of service would be brought up to date so that when they reach retirement age this kind of problem would not arise.

I do not think it would be necessary to repeat that these people are also people, and regardless of the hilarious terms which sometimes are used by people to describe people in the sanitary services, I think it must be recognized that they are people and deserve to be treated as such, and if they have put in any period of service with the Board which will enable them to get a pension or gratuity, they should not have to be waiting for a year or two before they get it.

The hon. member for St. Peter made reference to the fact that one of the first objectives of the Board would be to negotiate the agreement for the 40-hour week with the Trade Union to include Saturdays and Sundays. Well, sometimes the hon. member says things which we can let pass but sometimes one has got to comment on them. All I would say is that quite naturally there is an agreement between the Barbados Workers' Union and the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board on behalf of the workers who are employed there. The mere fact that a new Authority is being created, it does not follow that an agreement would be negotiated; but, I have had my say on more than one occasion on this whole question of the 40-hour week and I think that my position is well known on this, and I do not think that it is necessary to repeat my position on this matter.

I just want, Mr. Speaker, to refer to something which the hon. member for St. Joseph said, and, I think that very often one wonders how cloudy the thinking of some hon. members can be. Now I think this is the second occasion that we have been discussing this Bill relative to sanitation and it is the second occasion, if my memory serves me correctly - if it has not come from the hon. member for St. Joseph it has certainly come from the other side - to the effect that (and I am quoting him directly now) 'if we are saying that we are banking on the tourist dollar we must be careful about our health laws. ' Now, that statement has a tremendous amount of implication. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you are aware of the implication of a statement like that.

It would seem as if the hon. member for St. Joseph thinks that because we are a tourist oriented country we have to be concerned about our health laws. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that whether we are a tourist oriented country or not, we must be concerned about our health laws because our health laws quite naturally would be designed to improve the health standards of the country, and when we talk of the country we are not talking of tourists but we are talking of the country for Barbadians; and I think that this is very important. So that, to improve our health laws because we are a tourist oriented country does not seem to follow, as far as I am concerned, but it follows as far as the hon. member for St. Joseph is concerned.

We must be concerned about the health of our people, and quite naturally if we are concerned about the health of our people, then other people who visit here will see that we are concerned; but we do not have to be gearing our health laws to suit the tourist but gearing our health laws to suit our people,, and our standards therefore must be the highest because they are for our people.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that every effort should be made to improve the health in this community and to improve the environment, because it is important that the nation as a whole be

healthy, because if we are healthy, then quite naturally the kind of response which one would expect to get from people who are healthy and are comfortable, one would be able to get. 4. 20p. m.

It is important that the nation as a whole is healthy because if you are healthy, then quite naturally the kind of response which one would expect to get from people who are healthy and comfortable is greater than one would be able to get normally.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened attentively to the various speakers and I must admit that we should render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. Firstly I would like to commend the Parliamentary Secretary of the Ministry of Health for the excellent job she has been doing and the sacrifice she has made in trying to uplift and improve the standard of sanitation in this Island. We are grateful to her for the effort she is making and we can only appeal to the public to give her their wholehearted cooperation. She has used her initiative at this crucial time in the history of this Island when sanitation is at its lowest ebb, especially with the garbage in this country, and therefore we would be failing in our duty if this House did not express its appreciation for the service which the Parliamentary Secretary is rendering.

Now I would like to say that when it comes to these new laws and the passing of legislation in here, I am one who is prepared to call a spade a spade. Unless we can get the cooperation of the Barbados Workers' Union in this particular matter, it is a waste of time stating that the authority can hire and fire. We must all remember that these workers are members of the Barbados Workers' Union and no Union is going to sit back and allow the authority to dismiss Mr. A or Mr. B and do what they feel they should do. I work in the Ministry of Communications and Works and I am saying that it is a colossal task for us even to discipline anyone because you have to prove your case, you have to give the person a hearing and you have to suspend him on three-quarter pay. This is a casual labourer I am speaking about. All these things have to be done before you can dismiss any person, and in 99 cases out of 100 the person is reinstated; so do not let us fool ourselves, and while we sit here and pass legislation, let us face facts. We must get the cooperation of the Barbados Workers' Union, we must implore them to talk to the workers to increase their productivity so that they can have a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. Unless we can take that course, we are no wiser than the old bird. I am therefore appealing to the public to give the Minister a chance - both he and his Board. I know he may find it possible to reappoint some members of the old Board because you cannot expect all of them to be of the same calibre, and therefore I want to place on record our appreciation in this House for the inestimable service that the Parliamentary Secretary has been doing in this Island for the benefit of the community, and not for herself and her family, not for her constituents, but for the Island in general.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

Mr. Speaker indeed I am very glad to see this Bill introduced in this House because it is about time that the Hon. Minister has the power to deal with people as he should, especially when we are talking about environmental control. It has been very difficult in the past for the Ministry of Health to understand the Board and the time has come at last, thank God, that we should be able to get the right type of people to work on the Sanitation Service Authority in the interest of the country..

As you would know, and as the hon. member for St. Philip South has mentioned, I have been in the field for the last four weeks and no one knows better than I do the tempo of the people and the way they are feeling about the insanitary state of the country. If I were not made of good stuff I would have stopped the whole programme and called it a day a long time, but when I realise that there are people who are dependent on the Ministry of Health and look to the Ministry for guidance., I cannot give up this campaign. It must continue. I have seen for myself frustration on the part of workers who drive the lorries and those who take up the garbage. There are usually three people employed on one truck, and sometimes they do not know the areas which they are supposed to be servicing or what their duties are, because often the management may not tell them in plain terms where they should go. They knew we were carrying out a campaign and although we told management several times where we would be servicing sometimes when we were promised trucks and expected them to come, they did not arrive. Often I have had to run around with the inspectors who worked with me through the campaign looking for lorries to divert into areas where we had previously told people to put their garbage in bags to be collected. Householders are anxious to comply with our wishes because they are willing and ready to keep this country clean, but Mr. Speaker, there is a trend of politics that is moving in this country which is going to bring the country to disaster, because when people take politics and mix it with business, they are looking for serious trouble. 4. 30 p. m,

I am seeing it face to face every day because I am doing a job for the people of this country and people are trying to sabotage me in my efforts. Even people who are drawing Government's money. There are many people, even in this House, who do not know what is happening; but when I have been going among the people as I have been doing I hear what the people have to say, and I see the treatment that is given to these people.

It is thought that it is the ordinary poor class people who do not want to comply and who do not want to do anything; but these are people who respond better to any kind of educational programme than some of the aristocratic ones that I know who bring garbage in their motor cars from all over the place and dump it on the beaches and on people's premises that have previously been cleaned.

I am giving a warning here and now in this Honourable Chamber that this Ministry of Health is a serious Ministry. We are serious with anything to do with the health of this nation. Anyone that crosses the path of the Ministry of Health is going to get it. If the laws of Barbados cannot stand up for us we will have to ask why; because if we can make laws in this House and they are only laws for poor people and not laws for everybody I will have to ask why.

I know that the work I have been doing is recognised not only by a minority but by the majority of the people who live in this country. My work is for the Government of this country. I belong to the Democratic Labour Party Government, and I am not working for my own interest. I am working for the interest of my Government and my people.

I would like to see all people who call themselves Barbadians have a purpose; have a dedication to their jobs and a will to work. Is this what is happening today? I know that if people were told to work, even if the monetary gains were small and they knew that when they did work there would be some sort of recognition for it they would do it.

When I told some of these ordinary workers to take their trucks and go to certain areas they told me -"I do not collect from those areas, but I will go. " These people are prepared to work, union or no union. We get here and talk about the union as if the union is a bull dog or a lion waiting to grabble everybody and eat them.

The strength of a country should be in its Government. It is good for the workers to have a union and to have leaders because we can sometimes take advantage of them; but what the workers and people should understand is that the country should be placed above oneself. I wonder how many people think that way. Most of the time they think of themselves and their selfish aims.

I hope that when this Bill is passed the people whom we put to carry out these functions, to carry out the Minister's instructions, will be the right persons; because we cannot make them. G6d help and give them a mind and help them to understand that we need people to steer in the right direction.

There are people in this country who do not intend to do any better because they feel that those who are above them are not showing them the way to go. If we in Government can sit back and do nothing then something is wrong with us.

This nation needs a change. I say that openly and fearlessly, because time is getting short, and when people are faced with the numerous problems they have - the high cost of living along with the garbage situation as it stands, somebody must make sure that there is a change.

I think that it was the hon. member for St. James who said that I was moving around and getting my picture taken and that I started a programme giving out little bags. That sort of politics does not bother me, because if my Ministry had waited until new equipment and all types of things had come to put a campaign into operation we would have had an epidemic already.

We who are in Parliament get here and shout loud and talk a lot; but are we really interested in the health matters that need to be straightened out? Are we interested in having people keep their premises clean, in seeing that baker shops and others operate in proper conditions and that the health of the nation comes above everything else?

If the health of the people is not good, can the people produce? Can people produce in the conditions that exist? This morning I passed up Mapp's Hill on my way to the garbage dump and there was a dead dog that must have been there for days. Trucks passed and no one took it away. There is a lack of responsibility from the top to the bottom.

A lot of people voted for me I am representing them and I am representing 241, 000 people. That is the national figure. That is something to be proud of. An elected member of Parliament should be serious. He should be prepared to go into these areas instead of playing soap box politics. The politics of what? Let us deal with the fundamental things of the nation.

Let us try to get together with the little resources we have. Let us keep our surroundings clean. Let us get people interested in working and understanding that there must be liaison between all the departments. As I see it, sometimes the biggest fly in the ointment are people employed by the Government. They get a Government salary and they do not give a damn after that. The Minister cannot fire them. Firing them takes a long time.

We have very little control although we in Parliament are the ones who have to answer when things go wrong in this country. It is time we had more control over the Civil Service, over the Boards and things that matter.

We should realise that when the people elected us they elected us to work in their interest and in the interest of the country, for the betterment of the country; and if Ministers do not work in the interest and for the betterment of the country, it is left to the people to tell them to get out, they do not want them any

more. 4. 40 p. m.

In closing I want to say that my Ministry, the Ministry of Health, is leaving no stone unturned, and we are getting very, very serious. I am not throwing any bricks at anybody; whoever the cap fits, they can draw the string. I am saying we have a union and the union must understand the position of the Government, and I am saying that a new concept must be brought into this picture. We cannot go on with this antiquated method all our lives, and, union or no union they must realize that the time has come for a change; not telling people alone about a 40-hour week. This is a time now that, especially with the collection of garbage, people should be able to collect garbage by the ton. Let the people look for it, get it, and, give them a good price per ton for the garbage and I am sure that the householders will have no complaints; but when you pay the workers by the day they can relax as they like because you are exacting an eight-hour work day from them, and as long as you are exacting that from them, some how or other they are going to sit out, they are going to do something so that they can get back at you; but we have got to recognize the fact that the best method is to pay them by the ton and let them have a good salary to take home to their families and let them be recognized by the public, because as it is now they are thought of as part of the garbage; people do not respect them. We must make the public to understand that these people are valuable people and they must be respected.

We, too, must give the workers education. We cannot always think that because they were the bottom people they cannot be elevated. These people have families, they have homes to which to go. They need to sit back in a rocking chair and smoke a cigar; they need to have a good glass of whiskey too. So all people should be people.

Now in this society that we have made - because we, the politicians, over all the years have created a society and it is getting rotten; it is decaying.. This decay has to stop. It is about time that it is stopped, and it is about time that we understand where we are going and understand that the man at the bottom too who is doing the hard work, needs to get a better pay.

Those workers must be recognized, and we have got to set the example and we have not started yet.

I am sure that this Bill is the beginning of better things to come in the Ministry of Health, and if we in the Ministry of Health start with better things, even the workers in Communications and Works - we have to grapple with them. Up to this morning I had to grapple with them. They are out weeding and when they are finished weeding they put all they have weeded by the side of the gutter and then cats come and scatter it about and make a mess of the road.

Now there must be a liaison between Ministries. We have got to come to our senses and understand that this is one Government but there are different Ministers. I am no Minister. I am just a Parliamentary Secretary working for the Honourable Minister, one who is dedicated to his job, and I am prepared to go all out regardless of what it costs me; if it costs me my life I am prepared.

I am asking my Government to look at this situation as a serious situation. We have not only got the garbage to contend with; we have the wells and the drainage problems. We have several problems with which to contend and if we attend to these problems that are really pressing the people at the very core and making the people of this country sort of sluggish and don't care, we can rule for never ending; we can go on for as long as we are alive.

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

I beg to second that.

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

Part I was called and passed. Part 2 was called.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to what has been said with reference to the Parliamentary Secretary and the Minister of Health going from place to place, and what not, in their campaign; but Sir, I was brought up in Barbados and I am sure I am voicing the sentiments of everybody except the Minister and

Parliamentary Secretary.

Barbadians are a people of clean habits. Barbadians are a people who have come along all the way - the first thing on mornings and the last thing on evenings you will find them doing is using some straw broom or some kind of broom sweeping between the rocks and every corner of the yard. (ASIDE) That is the crux of the matter; but what we want to say is this, Sir. I believe that one of the worst things that could be happening to this country is our having two people so highly placed in a Ministry, going from place to place making clean people to believe that they have dirty habits. That has been their function. What we need to do, Mr. Chairman, is this. We have our public health inspectors in the first place. I believe I am right in saying that it is time we increase the strength of our public health inspectorate. 4, 50 p. m.

I believe I am right in saying that it is time we increased the strength of our public health inspectorate. We must try, Mr. Chairman, wherever possible not to remove the politics from them, but to remove them from politics in the discharge of their duties. In other words, do not let us have a public health inspector in the Pine Housing area doing nothing else but going from house to house campaigning for some of our very close friends just an arm's length from you. When you find that kind of thing, it is bringing the type of insanitary conditions that we are now experiencing.

I well remember that in the days of the old Vestry system there were half a dozen of these die-hards whose main duty it was to be attached to the public health service, but they were licensed canvassers more or less for some of the people in authority in those days. I do not want to forget this, Mr. Chairman, but what I want to see is that in these enlightened days our public health inspectors take pride in themselves. They are qualified people and they should be able to hold their heads up one way or another without having to bow to the representatives of this parish or that parish by pulling strings for these officers in the hope of getting by because he belongs to Government. We want public health officers going into the premises of people and seeing in truth and in fact that they discharge their duty, and that the people are taught and advised and assisted wherever possible to carry out the duties around their homes efficiently and effectively.

Now in addition to this we need bins distributed whether by the Service bodies in our midst; not open bins, because every bin ought to be covered with a metal cover and it ought to be so constructed that dogs cannot get into them. I hate, Mr. Chairman, to bring my own case in point, but I have been living there since 1965 and for the first time this year I found a bin placed to the right of my drive-way and one on the left, both uncovered, and you will find all sorts of paper and so on put on top of these bins, and my drive-way is virtually littered day in and day out with refuse that does not concern me. I hate to be putting my own case but it is the type of thing we have got to get away from. If the Minister is willing to entertain me, I am willing to suggest a type of cover that could very well be used effectively in removing

a lot of the fly breeding and stench and so on with which one is confronted in this whole mass of refuse. I feel too, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to go further in this matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of privilege, I came in a bit late and I want to know on what Clause the hon. member is speaking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

He is speaking on Part II.

Mr. HINDS:

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our people would love to know that their premises are kept clean, but what is the point of Mr. A sweeping his yard and having his refuse stacked away at a respectable distance from his house or in the nearest bin, but then you find, as the Parliamentary Secretary has said, that motor cars and else come from everywhere and just pile up stuff, like in the Orleans where you will see piles of garbage put under people's windows so that they cannot open them. Here is a case where a person is accustomed to sweeping and keeping his house tidy, but now the garbage from everywhere is piled up near the person that he cannot open the window. Would that person have any inclination to worry to clean around his yard or anything like that? He would not have that any longer. Instead of engaging in a lot of strife among themselves, the senior public health officers ought to be going around and meeting groups of people early in the morning and giving lectures to let them know how serious the accumulation of refuse is and let them understand that in future the trucks will be operating in an area at a particular time.

I agree 100 percent with what has been said. You have to talk to the workers themselves. I was standing in Hart Street one afternoon when one of these road sweepers came down, and he swept the stuff that he had gathered from the road into the gutter and under a channel, and people who saw it said he must have been a new worker because he did not know what to do with the stuff. It means that the channel must choke and you must have flooding of the roads the first rain that falls. They must be properly tutored. People who know what to do must go on the actual scene and give them demonstrations. I want you to increase the number of supervisors also. You will find that when a truck has come and taken stuff from a particular pile, they have scattered all the stuff and left it to breed flies. We want them being lectured to on all this, and whether you pay them by the ton, by the day or by the hour, I want to know that they are paid because we appreciate the fact that the job which these people have got to execute is one that many of us would not be able to stand up under, but they must understand that their job is a job of cleaning, not littering. Some of the people themselves do more littering, because they go to a heap of refuse and take up what they want, instructs the driver to move and all the time he is travelling to the truck he is littering the stuff about. Often too some of the trucks are not covered or kept

covered when they are filled, and as they go along the stuff blows into peoples cars, faces and along the streets. 5. 00 p. m.

Mr. Chairman, I tell you this. I believe that there is a colossal problem facing this new Sanitation Service; and you have got to bring to bear on the situation people who are equal to the task, people who are determined to see that once and for all we have a Barbados as clean in its habits and in its ways as we had prior to 1961.

The Parliamentary Secretary of Health talked about people and their work attitudes. Mr.

Chairman, you will not be angry with me if I say that it was the present Government who told the young people that they did not have to work; that money would drop down from Heaven if they put in the Democratic Labour Party. They said that in 1961 and again in 1966. The same thing applied to the people in the housing areas. As soon as people stopped paying their rents they lost interest in keeping the houses clean.

All of this, Sir, bears a relation to the task we are now facing. If you are going to tackle this problem, find out the cost and tackle it boldly; and it is not for any Minister or Parliamentary Secretary to be going around making people believe that they are dirty. Our people are clean by nature., and we have a record among our population of people living to 100, 103 and 105 years. If they had been living in these insanitary, dirty, stinking conditions some of them would not have lived for 105 days.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

Mr. Chairman, I object to the remarks that the Minister and Parliamentary Secretary go around making people feel that they are dirty. The Minister does not go around. I am the one who goes around.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

It is not unparliamentary.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I was speaking, Sir. Do I have permission to speak? I am just saying that I object. I am not telling you to object.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

You were on a point of order.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I was not on a point of order. The member is finished and I am speaking. I have a right to speak. The hon. member from St. Peter would like to give the impression that the Minister is going around.....

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Peter?

Mrs. EASTMOND:

For St. Peter, from St. Peter or at St. Peter. It does not matter. The Parliamentary Secretary has seen fit to go into areas and try to educate the people on how they should dispose of their refuse.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order. On what clause or part is the hon. member speaking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

She is speaking on Part 2 and therefore she can speak on any clause in Part 2.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

The Minister has not got to drive around telling people anything. Anything that he wants done I will do for him. (Asides)

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Hon members must abide by Rule 33 (5) and be silent.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

As long as it comes within my duty to the nation and the Minister gives instructions, his Parliamentary Secretary will carry out those instructions. The hon. member talked about increasing the inspectorate body. These people get in here and like to shout, increase, increase^ increase.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, that is a direct refence to me about these people get in here shouting. Let the Parliamentary Secretary beware of using those terms in reference to me.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

What is the use of building up a mass of people who cannot produce? You get people watching each other and the taxpayers' money is frittered away. Sometimes a few people can do more work than a majority. It does not make sense.

The hon member for St. Peter has said that we should get rid of some of the rubbish that we have at present. This Government knows that it is saddled with a lot of rubbish. A lot of people are blaming the Prime Minister and the other Ministers. We have to rely on people who are supervisors and secretaries down the line, who are responsible for the work force, and then the Prime Minister and the other Ministers have to take these people's word.

You know that some of the same people who hold up their hands for Government's money sabotage the Government. They pretend that they like you and pretend that they want to do something, and on the other side they want to see the Government go to hell.

This kind of thing affects all Governments. It may not be this Government or that Government, but it has to be a Government. The time has come in our education when children should be taught dedication to a purpose; tenacity of purpose and the will to work. You have to inject into these people that it is not what they are doing to please the Prime Minister or the Minister of Health or the Parliamentary Secretary. It is what they are doing for their country.

Are we going to let some foreign people come to our country and tell us what to do? If there was a foreign minister in the Ministry of Health perhaps we would get more co-operation. We intend to grapple with the situation and make sure that the people understand us.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I begin by drawing attention to Rule 48(1) which says quite clearly that a committee to which a Bill has been committed should not discuss the principles of the Bill, but only the Bill.

I have sat here and heard a lot of rambling. I was very amused to hear the member for St. Peter making an interesting tirade as to what should be done and what should not be done-Some of the remarks were very uncharitable when one remembers some of his remarks in this Chamber in connection with the disposal of solid waste in Barbados and the Ministry of Health was urged to do something about it.

There has been a breakdown somewhere. I am not here trying to pinpoint who was responsible for the breakdown or the conditions that led to it. Accept that there is a breakdown and do something about it; and the Ministry of Health has embarked on a programme in the last few weeks to focus the attention of the nation on the fact that there has been a breakdown, and on the need to maintain their usual habits of good environmental sanitation.

You heard the hon member trying to suggest that we were accusing people who normally have good sanitation habits of having insanitary habits. I would like to draw attention to the state of affairs that has arisen in this country and to recall that the hon. member has on previous occasions got up in here and waxed and may be waned eloquently on the same subject.

All over Barbados in people's backyards, around their houses, in the streets, in open places, in dumps and quarries there is evidence of an excess of solid waste accumulating in the country. I only have to remind the hon. member for St. James that some time ago he invited me to go down to Robbies to see the number of rats around that area. 5. 10 p. m.

I think it is definitely uncharitable when people are making a definite effort to focus the attention of the Barbadian public on the need to return to their usual methods or their previous methods of sanitary habits in keeping the place clean, and going out - although it may not be part of their duty - going out in the morning to explain to the people the reason why they should try to adopt good habits, why they should try to co-operate in the collecting and disposal of waste it is definitely uncharitable for anyone to get up in here and accuse a Minister or a Parliamentary Secretary of creating the impression that the people of this country have unsanitary habits.

Who is responsible in Barbados for the large amount of solid waste that we now see all over the place? Are the Trinidadians responsible or are the St. Lucians or the tourists who come down here? If the Barbadians are not responsible I would really like to know who are responsible. They are saying that we must try to create the impression in this country, not only in health but in many other areas, that the Barbadians are not responsible for what is going on in this country, but it is the foreigner; it is somebody

else, and therefore we do not have to do anything about it. But if we were to create that impression and believe that some foreigner is going to come in here and solve our problems, then it will be only in a matter of time that we will see a total collapse in the society, and then many of us may not be as fortunate as others who may betake ourselves to more pleasant lands like Australia and New Zealand. We will have to stay here and bear it.

It is all good to be enjoying political discussion and political debate and controversy, but I think when we are enjoying this we should also bear in mind the type of advice which we are likely, unwittingly also, to be conveying to the people of this country. After all it is our country. It is not the country of the foreigners whether they come from the other West Indian Islands or they come from North America or Europe. It is our country, and we can only maintain this country if we the people of Barbados make an effort to maintain proper standards of living and development in this country.

If we are going to undermine people who set about to encourage the people of this country to realize that they have a right to maintain proper standards and demand that proper standards be maintained, then I say all is lost and it is a waste of time anybody taking any particular interest in what is going on in this country.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to look at section 8, (1) and (2). Earlier today you would have heard the Minister of Communications and Works speaking about putting authority in the Minister's hands, in my view, to carry out investigations, etc. Now throughout this last session even the Prime Minister himself made some very disparaging remarks about the civil servants; he called them an army of occupation and said they do what they like, and so on.

Now I would have thought that if you are trying to correct this sort of imbalance between what the civil servant can do and the remedy you should have against them this would have been a beautiful time for the Minister of Health to insert a penalty Clause in Section 8. This would be a beautiful time. Section 8(2). Now we read; "The Authority shall, within three months after the end of each financial year submit its accounts to the Auditor General for audit and at the same time send a copy thereof to the Minister. "

Now there is no penalty Clause anywhere throughout the Act; so what is the good? In today's paper we have printed, "Chairman's Report of the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation for the year, July, 1971 to June 1972. " In every public account, the accounts come to this House from the Auditor General some three to six years after the relevant period. Nobody can keep a check on what is going on because of the lateness of accounts.

Now if you are setting up a new Authority and you want to keep things up to date it is obvious that we will have to vote a lot of money to this department shortly. There is no doubt about that. The Minister himself has said that the rolling stock is antiquated and it would have to be renewed. You vote a lot of money in respect of wages; you have to vote more money, particularly under this Act, when it comes to disposal areas - garbage dumps - ' because the Board is now charged 'to provide and maintain in a sanitary condition suitable places, buildings and appliances for the deposit, disposal or destruction of refuse. ' So we now have to keep these disposal areas far better than they are being kept at present. If that is so, Parliament would want to keep a close watch on the accounts of this Authority.

We have had Housing Authority Accounts which come in four or five years late. We have had several accounts from various Boards that came in three or four years late, My humble opinion is, it is no use asking a public Accounts Committee or asking any Authority to overlook accounts three years after the accounts have been in existence; and I would have thought that the Minister would have seen fit, having taken power unto himself, to deal with the question of the submission of the accounts to the Auditor General.

Year after year we hear the Auditor General complaining that he cannot make his presentation to Parliament or to the Minister of Finance because he has not got accounts from other departments; and I was looking forward to something being done to show Parliament that that side is really honest ^ad earnest when they come in here saying they cannot get accounts. What is the sense writing this?

Mr. Chairman, look at the words: "The Authority shall. " From my knowledge of law, "shall" is mandatory. It "shall within three months after the end of each financial year submit its accounts to the Auditor General for audit and at the same time send a copy thereof to the Minister. " Now it is mandatory, so if you are going to make an action mandatory the only way to really put sting into it is to have a panalty Clause for breach of a mandatory order. 5. 20 p. m.

This would have in my opinion been a move in the right direction, but it is not there, so despite all the "shall's" that have been put in it could as well have been "may", because I am sure the accounts will come very late indeed, and we would be asked to vote very healthy sums of money for sanitation and we will have no checks on it to know where the money is going. The Minister complains of spending thousands of dollars to keep the rolling stock in order, and God knows if the money is being spent on rolling stock. I do not know when last he has seen accounts from the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, and I believe the circumstances will be the same with this new Authority where we will be voting money and will not be in a position to check from year to year or within a reasonable time of expenditure having occurred because of the lateness of the accounts in coming in. I would have liked to see something, and I would like to hear the Minister's views on it.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I myself would like to see a penalty but what the hon. member is inclined not to spell out is how this penalty is going to operate. You are asking people in a voluntary capacity to come forward and serve on a Board and then you want to penalise them. Who is going to pay these penalties or in what way are you going to execute these penalties?

Mr. BOLDEN:

On a point of order, that is not correct because under the Act, as the Minister said earlier, the Board has the right to hire and fire. The Board members who are serving in a voluntary capacity or let us say for a small remuneration will not be the people who are actually doing the accounts. The Board will employ accountants to do the accounts for the Board and the Board will only overlook the accounts and then transmit them to the Auditor General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

No point of order.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is no point of order. The hon. member is only wasting time- The Act says "the Board"; it does not say "the accountant" or "the bookkeeper" employed by the Sanitation Authority, and it is quite likely that if you find a way of putting in a penalty clause there will be no guarantee that these people are going to produce the accounts at the time they should do. What the Minister may very well have to do if they do not comply with the laws and regulations is to dismiss them and put somebody in their places.

The question that Part II stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Part HI was called.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part III stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to talk on this particularly except that I see mention is made of compensation and what not. It occurred about the 10th of last month that the Parliamentary Secretary and a public health officer went into a baker's premises and seized a bag of flour, and up to the present he has not been issued with a certificate of destruction or anything of the kind; and I understand that the bag had two rat bitten holes in it. This is not at all satisfactory and I would like to know how we are going to operate under these circumstances, because the man is entitled to my mind, to some sort of compensation. (Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE That does not come under this.) I understand what the Minister is telling me but this is an opportunity for me to raise it. The man's bag of flour was taken away from him.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I would like the hon. member to advert to Standing Order No. 48 which says

"A Committee to which a BUI is committed shall not discuss the principles of the Bill, but only its details. "

It is no detail to be talking about a bag of flour or else. It is out of order.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I have to accept your ruling, but if under this I attempted to discuss a bag of flour or else, nothing could be more detailed than that. I appreciate the point you are making. You want to perhaps draw to my attention that there is no provision under this particular Head to discuss the item I am discussing. A ruling in that respect is much more to the point. I appreciate this, but our Parliamentary Secretary should know that when she goes around to these bakers and seize people's flour, she only leaves the bakers to feel she has sent it to somebody else, especially since you should give a certificate of destruction, otherwise they should get compensation for it.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, earlier today I heard the hon. member for St. Lucy refer to a statement made by the Minister about the Board having authority to hire and fire. Now I look at Section 16, I am very disturbed. Section 16 deals with compensation for those persons who might have lost their jobs or whose

salaries are going to be affected by the change-over etc. and the appointed person makes a determination as to what compensation is payable to such persons. Section 16 says

"An award of compensation or other determination made by the appointed person in accordance with the regulations shall be submitted to the Minister for approval and the Minister's approval of any such award or determination shall be final. "

Now I consider that as the lever for numerous law suits because I believe this is in conflict with several other laws dealing with workmen and employers, and my submission is that this could not be legal. That is my humble opinion. I do not see if a man is going to lose his job that somebody can say that a Minister's determination of that matter is final. I believe there are laws which say he is entitled to pursue his right otherwise. I would like to hear the Minister on that.

The question that Part HI stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. G. G. FERGUSON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. P. G. MORGAN; Mr. WEEKES; Mr. HOPPIN; Mrs. EASTMOND; Mr. GREAVES and Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD -11.

Notes: Mr. CRAIG; Mr. HINDS; Mr. BOLDEN and Mr. ADAMS - 4. 5. 30 p. m.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to move that Part IV stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND the first and second Schedules of the Bill were agreed to.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

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

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

On separate motions of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND the Bill was read a third time, and passed.

THE FEES AND PENALTIES (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) BILL, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, the next is Order No. 5 standing in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and I am asking leave to deal with it.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill would amend certain enactments to revise the fees, fines and penalties which may be imposed thereunder. The position is that the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning in his 1973 Budget Statement said inter alia -

"In my Budget Speech in 1972, I stated that a review of the fees chargeable' by Government Ministries and Departments in respect of certain services would have been undertaken. This review is expected to be completed during the course of this financial year. An assessment of the amount of additional revenue from these sources has not yet been ascertained, but as I indicated then, the main purpose is to bring fees chargeable in line with present day costs and money values. "

That, Sir, was contained in the Minister of Finance's Budgetary Speech in 1973, and this Bill is really just implementing what he enunciated in that speech. There are many Government Departments involved. For example, you have the Customs Department. The fee for the operation and use of a private warehouse will now be \$600 a year payable within the month of January in each year.

You have the Accountant General's Department. The fee for a banking licence will be \$2, 000 a year. The fee for a place of public entertainment will be \$20 a year. The fee for a motor licence will be \$10 a year, payable and renewable within the month of June in each year.

The fee for trading as a hawker, a pedlar or itinerant vendor will be \$1. 00 a year etc. Then you come to the Collector of Rates and Taxes. Under the Dog Licences Act of 1903 - all this is set out in the Schedule - the fee will be now \$3. 00 per annum. Under the Interim Traders Act of 1909-1 the licence fee will be \$8, 000, and the minimum fee for qualifying for Interim Trader is \$50. 00.

Under the Highways Act of 1900-5 the penalty for unmarked carts is one not exceeding \$25, 00, and the penalty for false numbers is \$50. 00. The penalty for a breach of the provisions of Section 37(9) is one not exceeding \$50, 00 etc.

Under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937 (16) the prescribed fee is \$1. 00. The fee for identification numbers under Section 8(4) is \$40. 00 basic for three numbers and \$10. 00 each for every other number. Under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Act, 1964-4 the registration fee under Section 3 (3) is \$1. 00.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the Hon. Leader of the House, but he is reading things that are not in this document which has been sent to us.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Two hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time. Are you on a point of order?

Mr. BOLDEN:

Yes, Sir. I heard the Hon. Leader talk about a Dog Tax Act of 1902. I do not have that. He just referred to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic (Amendment) Act 1964-4. I certainly do not have that. I heard him talk about the Interim Traders Act, something about \$50. That certainly is not on the papers sent to me. I would like the hon. member to look back at what he is reading because it seems to be fuller than what has been circulated. I would suggest that he take a little break and check it or postpone it until a later date until he can check what has been put up for him today. I would not want to participate in any legislation to find that we have passed something that has not been circulated.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing with the revision of fees and charges. I am explaining for the benefit of members that on the 20th December 1973 the Cabinet considered certain notes and agreed to the revision of certain fees and penalties chargeable by departments under the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

The Ministry of Legal Affairs went into the matter. The Bill would amend the Highways Act 1904-5 in Sections 37, 38 (1) and Section 39.

Mr. BOLDEN:

There is no 1904-5 on what has been circulated to this Chamber at least not to those on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You have made your point. I certainly have a copy of what the Hon. Leader is reading.

Mr. BOLDEN:

We have not.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I am dealing with the Highways Act 1900-5, Section 37. Substitute the words "\$25" for the words "fifty shillings" appearing in the last line of subsection (1); and

(b) the words "\$50" for the words "five pounds" appearing in the last line of subsection (2); and

(c) the words "\$50" for the words "five pounds" appearing in the last line of Subsection (9).

In Sections 38(1), 39 and 40 substitute the words "\$25" for the words "fifty shillings" wherever they appear therein. In Section 45 (a) substitute the words "\$24" for the words "five pounds" wherever they appear in subsections (4) and (5). 5. 40 p. m.

(b) Substituting the words (i) "\$9. 60" for the words "one pound" appearing in the fourth line of subsection (6); and (ii) "50 cents" for the words "three pence" appearing in the second last line of the proviso to subsection (6); (c) substituting the words "\$50" for the words "five pounds" appearing in the last line of Section 60.

The Hawkers Registration Act 1904-1. In Section 2 substituting the words "\$1" for the words "one shilling" appearing in the 5th line thereof.

The District Auctioneers Act 1904-3. In Section 17 substituting the words "\$5" for the words "three shillings" appearing in subsections (1)and(2).

The Licensed Places of Public Entertainment Act 1908-14. In Section 5 substituting the words "\$20" for the words "one pound" appearing in the last line of subsection (3).

The Interim Traders Act 1909-1. In section 3 substituting the words (a) "\$8, 000" for the words "eight hundred pounds" appearing in subsection (1); (b) "\$10" for the words "ten shillings" appearing in subsection (1); and (c) "\$50" for the words "five pounds" appearing in the proviso to that subsection.

The Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act, 1937-16. In Section 8 (a) substituting the words "\$1" for the words "one shilling" appearing in subsection (7); (b) substituting the word "3" for the words "six" appearing in the 4th line of subsection (4); and (c) substituting the words "\$40" for the words "\$25" appearing in subsection (8). In Section 20 substituting the words "\$2" for the words "two shillings" appearing in subsection (1).

The Customs Act, 1962-18. Insert immediately after Section 18 the following new section as Section ISA - "Fees payable in respect of private warehouse; 18A(1) subject to the subsection (2) where any place of security is approved as a private warehouse under Section 18, the owner or occupier thereof shall within 7 days of the approval pay to the Comptroller a fee of \$600 and for each succeeding year thereafter during which the approval continues he shall, in the month of January, pay to the Comptroller a further fee of \$600.

(2) The fee payable under subsection (1) shall in a case where approval is given under Section 18 on a

date subsequent to 31st January in any year, be reduced by deducting therefrom \$50 for each month which has expired prior to the date of such approval in any such year.

(3) Where any owner or occupier fails or refuses to comply with subsection (1) the Comptroller shall evoke the approval. "

The Banking Act 1963-45. In Section 21 substituting the words "\$2, 000" for the words "five hundred dollars" appearing therein.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister should move to delete the word "evoke" in section 18(1) (3) and substitute therefor the word "revoke".

Mr. SPEAKER:

In Committee,

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that anyone reading the Schedule to this Bill would obviously recognize that despite eight years of independence and the changing of our currency, that we are very tardy in recognizing the currency or coinage in which our various legislation is phrased; and it strikes me as strange that it would have taken this length of time for the Government to bring down a composite piece of legislation dealing in toto and not merely in part with rationalization of the fines and penalties of our legislation

I think that the Government must adopt a much more attitude towards its legislation and certainly towards legislation which inflicts penalties on persons. One would have hoped that a Bill of this nature would not only be a rationalization of the charges being made for providing licences for carts and mules and jackasses and at the same time coupling hawkers and pedlars with them, but a complete reorganization of this type of licensing service provided and the sort of penalties which would result from a failure to obtain a licence, 5. 50 p. m.

I hope the Government will go a little bit further and look at the whole criminal content of legislation such as this and have a properly organised system where registration and licensing mean something other than a mere annual extraction of additional revenue for the Treasury. One of the things that we have to recognise is that it is not good enough to penalise people in this way for carrying on their services, but there should be a proper regulation and reason why they are being made to pay penalties in this way.

Now I want to talk a bit about the penalties that we are inflicting in some of these Acts. If one may take for instance people with hawkers' badges, I believe it is frustrating to have a hawker pay a licence every year to walk around Barbados to sell his or her produce. Why should this be so? (Asides) It does not matter whether a pear is sold for 90 cents; the point is that this legislation was framed in 1904 where very soon after emancipation you were controlling people and their movements around the place and really with no proper aim in mind. It was also the type of legislation that extracted a little bit more from people to pay for what was then Local Government services at the time, and there is no reason why because a lady happens to be selling her ware around that she should not be subject to the normal income tax provisions rather than this form of licensing, unless it is proved that licensing is necessary for proper regulation.

The same thing applies to the various licensing fees being charged for people carrying on a profession. Why doesn't a tailor have to pay a licence to be a tailor? Why doesn't a politician have to pay a licence for being a politician, and why should a hawker have to pay a licence for the right to walk around and sell her ware? We can go on interminably on this but I would ask the Government seriously to revoke that type of legislation. That is why I have been calling for some proper system of regulation of these matters. We have taken legislation lock, stock and barrel and kept it on the Statute Book without having any good intention or reason or rationale behind it. I talked about licensing and the concept of licensing. I want to talk about, the concept of penalties. I want to know "what policy the Government now has for tip-to-date ^penalties in relation to our statutes, this type of statute where the penalty will relate to community service, for a breach of certain sections of the legislation.

I believe that not so long ago under the aegis of the Ministry of Health and Welfare Professor Howard from the University of Aberyswyth in Wales came here and delivered a very thought provoking lecture which I hope has been digested by the Ministry, because one of the things that he has been trying to bring to Barbados is something that has been current in proper criminology for a long time, the concept of community service and the concept of making people who breach the law perform community service, since it is a way of motivating the community in being much more community minded and nation building; and rather than Government coming with these bit by bit pieces of legislation, why not bring a proper Bill? The Opposition is quite willing to support you if you have a composite Bill before Parliament, rather than these nibbling little bits of amendments and the continuation of legislation like

making a hawker pay a licence for carrying on her trade. A carpenter does not have to pay to be a carpenter; a politician does not have to pay to be a politician, but a hawker has to pay to be able to sell on the streets of Barbados. I can see no reason for that legislation. It is the type of legislation that in 1974 I cannot support even although it has been on the Statute Book from 1904.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long. I like to listen to the hon. member but I do not subscribe to this idea of making people in any country believe they can get something for nothing. One of the functions of Government, Mr. Speaker, is to provide markets like at Fairchild Street, and Cheapside to provide these same hawkers with some place out of the sun with proper facilities for water and everything. To get in this House and to make them believe that they should not contribute something however small for the provision of these facilities for their own comfort and for the health of the community is to me just cheap politics. It may sound good and when he goes into the market they may say.....

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, the hon. member must realise that he cannot accuse people of cheap politics and expect to get away with that. When an hon. member speaks in here on a matter of principle, it may suit the hon. member to get up always and to damn the speech as cheap politics particularly if he does not understand it, but the point I was making is that it is no more than they also pay to income tax and other measures for other services; so why for licensing their profession?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

If the hon. member gets headlines for what he has just said, he will be the darling of all the hawkers in the Fairchild Street market if he goes there I do not want people in any country to believe that this is a freeness society and that they can get everything on a platter from a Government, and when the Government raises taxes to help meet their needs you hear the same Opposition who can tell you in one breath that you should not tax this or that are the same ones who will encourage people to think that they can get things free. The Government has got to get money. We provide markets, we provide running water and all the facilities. We have just spent considerable sums modernising and repairing. For one thing they are not controlled; they sell their oranges, grapefruit, pawpaw at prices they think they can get at. Is asking them to pay a small fee for the right to sit down in comfort in a stall and lay out their goods for the public to see something for an hon member to get up in here and criticise the Government for? I expect responsibility from him. I do not want to be a darling of any hawkers because they tell you in the markets that you cannot eat the money.

Mr. FORDE:

On a point of order, is the hon. member suggesting that to tell him that his legislation is outdated is an irresponsible statement?

Mr. SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am saying that if the hon. member for Christ Church West gets in the papers as saying that he proposes the removal of a fee for hawkers, in any market or even on the sidewalk market, he would be a darling. I want to make a contribution to my country and I want my fellow-citizen to understand that a Government must get money, it must use the easiest means of getting money, but they themselves must contribute to the development of the country and for the facilities which are provided for their own comfort.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the last speaker who has just sat down does not understand what the Bill is about. First of all if he reads the Bill he will see that it refers specifically to those hawkers who used to go and buy a shilling licence, tie it on to the big bag beneath their skirt and walk from St. Joseph up those mountainous hills right around the country district peddling the pears, yams, mammy-apples and sugar apples. What the hon. member should try to distinguish is between a hawker and a market trader. They are two different concepts altogether. The man who drives into Bridgetown and goes into a stall at the market and puts out his ware for sale is enjoying shelter. He has got the massive investment of Government building a market place for him. He has sanitary facilities etc. in there and he should pay. 6. 00 p. m.

He pays on the basis of service which the community has provided for him. Long ago I have been calling on the Government to provide what is called a native market. I remember the Minister of Labour a few years ago, with independence, saying that they did not need any native market; but I have had the privilege of going to San Francisco and seeing a native market. I have seen a native market in Taiwan. Countries have native markets where they encourage their natives to display and sell handicraft.

The Government should be looking in this direction to that category of licences. If you have a native market in which people will be registered it will solve many problems. Under the National Insurance Act people who walk about and sell are required to pay National Insurance. If you had a native market and you had registration of these people you could trace them and you could make them understand that they are self employed and they have to pay National Insurance.

At the moment I do not believe that the Government has been looking at the question of hawkers, market traders and itinerant vendors in the way in which they should be looking at them. A different category of person is involved, from what I call the interim trader. The man who buys a bicycle and then a motor car and goes through the country Sunday after Sunday from 6 o'clock in the morning these are the people who should pay a reasonable licence and that is where I think you want a classification when it comes to licences. Not what my friend got up and talked about a market providing this and that and when he looks at the Act under which this penalty is being imposed he will realise that he is wrong.

This is an entirely different question, but as I have said to him, he is a defender of the faith. He never gets his facts right. It is like a dog fight. One dog comes up and sees two others fighting and he bounds in. He does not know which side he is fighting for. He is only defending. He is like the man down by long stop when you are playing cricket. You put a man down on the deep third man boundary. The ball is hit and he does not know if it is going to pass first slip, second slip or third slip, point or gully, but he is running. That is what my hon. friend is doing and he is only making a mess of things.

What he should do is to look at the amendment under the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act; because he should be ashamed to get up in here and defend anything when he had been begging pitifully do not bring this Act. We are going to bring in a new Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act with new penalty clauses etc. I bet you that he will tell you again that he will bring it in before the end of the year and next year he will tell you that he is going to bring it in before the end of the year. Instead of amending the penalty clauses of an Act dating back to 1837, he should be introducing the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act of 1974 with the relevant penalties etc. but they look at the poor hawkers. They get up and talk about the small man. I do not see any hawkers coming from St. Andrew and St. John driving motor cars They walk up the hill and catch the mini bus that you want to stop now Mr. Speaker, I apologise. I should never have said those last few words. It is not he who wants to stop the mini buses. I withdraw that humbly. He never put up the proposal and he never insisted that the new buses should have two years free of competition. I should have called on the Minister of Tourism and Information. I apologise to the Minister of Communications and Works. I think that what we should be doing is not piecemeal amendments. You, Mr. Speaker, know that we have had so much piecemeal legislation, particularly in penalty clauses - these are matters that are applied by the courts, and many days you go into court and nobody can find what is the correct penalty for an offence because of the numerous amendments.

I have been trying to trace one of the Acts of 1908 which still speaks of so many pounds. You must receive a licence from some Solicitor General and you pay so many pounds. That has not been amended. I call it bad legislation. You amend one section to deal with dollars and cents and you still have another section dealing with pounds, shillings and cents.

It is clear that this is nothing more than pure Revenue collection irrespective of the bad state of the law under which it will operate, and I believe that if you are going to send down amendments to these various Acts, the whole Act should have been gone through.

Let us look at the Interim Traders Act of 1909 - 1. Section 3 (1) says: "Every interim trader shall before entering upon any business transaction obtain from the Parochial Treasurer of the parish in which he intends to carry on business a license in the form in Schedule A to this Act. Such license shall be granted by the said Parochial Treasurer on payment of a sum not exceeding one hundred pounds and not less than ten shillings. "

If you are amending laws you should make a comprehensive amendment at one and the same time. You will find the same thing with the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. The only thing that is amended is the prescribed license. You do not pay a shilling anymore, you pay a dollar. There are other sections of that Act which still deal with pounds, shillings and pence. This at the moment, ad hoc, catch as catch can legislation is running this Parliament into a situation where one day we will not know what we are doing.

I have seen it in here already, particularly dealing with the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Act. About two years ago when we were going to amend the charges for motor vehicles the Government came here two days in advance and amended a section which had been amended. They came back and amended another section, and when the Prime Minister came and read out his Budgetary Proposals he referred to something different. That is simply because all that we are doing is amending parts of legislation, without making a comprehensive study of what we are doing.

I cannot agree with the Government at this time. Lots of the Laws need amending. We hear a lot of the Law Revision Committee which has been set up. We have heard that Professor Marshall and somebody else had been revising the Laws of Barbados. We have been hearing that since 1962. I heard the Minister of Communications and Works say that they were to be published in November, 1974, but we have been going along in this way all the time. The Government should at least declare their hands. Things are bad. Every Act in Barbados is practically outdated.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to wake up one morning and no one will know where we stand when it comes to our Laws and we will spend more time looking up the various sections of laws that have been amended than looking at what is the substantive law and really carrying through legislation in this House.

I think that the Leader of the House should take a careful look before he tries to put this through Parliament in the state that it is; because surely history will record that this Parliament was one of the worst when it comes to legislation.

I do not see how you can change one section to dollars and cents while another section of the Act still deals with pounds, shillings and pence. Anyone with intelligence who looks at this will tell you that something is wrong, that something is out of order.

I said here today that Ministers should stop reading documents which Civil Servants put in their hands, or do their homework before they come in here. The Leader of the House started by reading about an amendment to the Dog Act of 1902. I do not know if that was put before the Cabinet and the Cabinet changed its decision later and something else was drafted.

Even if this was drafted and sent to Cabinet, the Cabinet should have taken more time to look at the respective Acts they were going to amend. They should have sent it back to the Draftsman telling him that in view of the fact that they were amending, amend all the monetary figures, in the Act and make it look decent. You cannot,

in my humble opinion, amend some sections of an Act and leave others as they are, because you are only creating confusion.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. LOWE in the Chair. 6. 10 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I have been noticing recently that my friend and my representative, in fact the hon.

member for St. Micheal South Central has the habit of speaking immediately after me. I take it that this idea is an idea on his part that he is shadowing me, or indeed, he waits until I have expatiated in order to carry out his usual role of defence of the Government. Whilst I understand his necessity to defend, because I believe, like myself, we are both under a shadow of doubt from common sources, yet I would like that when his defence is being put forward, as in this Schedule, it should be put forward on a proper ground.

I would not like history to record Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member does not understand what the Hawkers Registration Act 1904-1 is about, and for his benefit I would let him know that this was an Act to consolidate laws relating to the registration of hawkers, pedlars and itinerant vendors. Prior to 1904, in this Legislation, there were laws passed to regulate people from selling things like eschalot on the road, because the plantocracy was scared that they were guilty of predial larceny, and, this had nothing to do whatsoever with the licensing of markets as he seems to understand. If the hon. member would read the legislation before he jumps to the defence of the Government he would understand that my duty here is not to appeal to newspaper men. The hon. member should know me well enough, that I believe that I am black and beautiful enough to commend myself to an electorate, and indeed the female section of the electorate, without depending on the newspapers to build me up. (Aside) I am dealing with the Hawkers Registration Act 1904 that appears in the Schedule, and therefore the hon. member must understand that the section of the Hawkers Registration Act which is being amended does not relate to hawkers in markets and paying for the services of markets but it is a penalty being placed on itinerant persons from exercising, as it says in subsection 2, the calling of a hawker, pedlar or itinerant vendor.

I contend very seriously not for any newspapers - I am contending as a matter of principle that it is unfair to put a penalty on a hawker for carrying on his trade and making his living, and you do not put one on a fisherman or you do not put one on a politician, or you do not put one on a mason, and, that the genealogy of the legislation would prove to the hon. member that my contentions are valid.

I would commend to hon. members taking a little time and reading the archives to see the debate that went on at the time that this substantive legislation was passed, so there would not be any misunderstanding. I normally do not like to have to get up and explain myself, but I would not like the newspapers to believe that the hon. member gets in here every Tuesday and speak after me merely because he has a right of reply. I invite the hon. member to speak before me next time.

The hon. member and I have a most perfect understanding; he is a good representative of the constituency. (Aside) My vote is secret. If the Hon. Minister of Housing had any access to my ballot papers I would have to challenge him, but I will say this, that if I voted for the hon. member for St. Michael South Central on his performance so far, my vote would not have been misplaced. That is all I say.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the hon. member that we are merely revising fees, fines, and charges etc., and what we are doing is increasing - under the Hawkers Registration Act in section 2, we are substituting one dollar for one shilling. Is one dollar unreasonable? We are charging a fee of one dollar instead of one shilling. That's all we are doing. Whereas they paid one shilling since 1904 up to here the other day, they will pay one dollar now instead.

The question that this be the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one bill in Committee.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that,

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

**RESOLUTION FOR \$2, 910, 000 TO MAKE ADVANCES OF SALARIES WAGES AND
PENSION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES**

Hon. C E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are proceeding now with the Resolution for \$2, 910, 000 for which permission was granted to be dealt with in all its stages. We decided earlier to deal with it last. This is the last Item we propose dealing with today.

This is in accordance with the Prime Minister's Budgetary Proposal and, the undertaking which he made then, which we are now seeking to fulfil. We have now come down with the Resolution in order to provide the necessary funds for payment in accordance with the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance's undertaking and promise to workers in receipt of \$700 and under per month. 6. 20 p. m.

As the Addendum sets out, it is proposed to make advances of salaries, wages and pensions to certain employees, to assist them in meeting the additional expenses of the Christmas Season. These advances will be non-refundable and non-reimbursable and will be made to government employees during the month of December, 1974.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, hon. members have copies of the Resolution and I suppose they have all read it by now. This is in keeping with the promise given by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance when he presented his supplementary Budgetary Proposals. Workers whether unestablished or casual will receive two weeks' pay provided they worked 220 days or more from January to November and in the case of monthly workers they will receive half of their salary, and pensioners who are in receipt of \$450 will receive half of that amount. This is merely carrying out a promise and the Resolution is to make the money available to have it implemented in time so that workers whether monthly or weekly workers can receive the money before 15th December.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very short on this because there is £ Budget debate which will continue at some stage and perhaps we will deal at greater length then with the country's poor economic situation; but if you would forgive me making a reference to a speech already made in this Session very shortly, on the last occasion upon which the House adverted to this matter, I asked for an assurance that public officers would not have to pay income tax on these advances since not being refundable and not being repayable they undoubtedly qualified under the Income Tax Act as emoluments or earnings or whatever the form of words used as a result of employment. If you borrow and have to pay it back you do not have to pay tax. If you borrow money from the person you work for and do not have to pay it back, I think any tax lawyer will tell you that you have to pay tax.

I regret that the Leader of the House has not taken this opportunity to clear the air. We believe that it is possible, bearing in mind the very large receipts accruing to Government as a result of the new taxation measures, bearing in mind the much improved position of Government revenue as revealed by figures released since the Prime Minister's panic budget, that the Government could give an income tax rebate on this amount. Four percent is a very small amount of increase to give to people to deal with a cost of living that has gone up by 40 percent, and if you take away tax again from that, you are giving them even less of a benefit than you might otherwise give them. I think the Government would be failing in its duty if it did not make a statement about the tax position of these advances. Many simple people who do not normally have to make out income tax returns except for the purpose of getting refunds and then pay for tax liability will be persons affected by this Resolution. Many people will get up to \$350 and technically they are supposed to declare this on their returns next year and pay such tax as may accrue to

it. I think the Government owes it to these people to explain the exact position of the tax. We believe it should be remitted altogether. If you are giving people a substitute for a raise of pay or a substitute for a Christmas bonus, you are recognising their hardship, give them cash money they can call their own and not have to think about paying tax on at some subsequent time when things may be worse in Barbados.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to get into this argument because I am now back, but from what the hon. member has just said there would be something in it if he were making a general statement, but I do not think he can make a specific statement like this and say for income tax purposes the bonus that is going to be paid to these people should be treated any differently from anybody else in the community, because at Christmas time bonuses are paid to other people in other employment and they do not get any tax rebate on them. You will know that if you do this you will have to amend the whole Income Tax Act as it relates to income, because a bonus is not regarded as a gift in that sense; it is regarded by your employer as income. In my own organisation, if we get any additional money we give our staff some present in the form of money and they have to pay income tax on it.

Now I" do not like gimmicks, and I am not Speaking on the bonus payments that are being made, because I regard a bonus whatever it is as only a token, and I do not believe in tokenism. I believe in negotiations and I do not believe you can give me a token of something that I am entitled to by making this gesture. A bonus and a grog is the old time plantation slave mentality business.

Now there is something about lawyers' mentality in Barbados and I would like to take out their brains and wash them and put them back. There is no point in mixing up an economic matter like this with other questions of taxation, because the whole taxation position in Barbados has to be revamped and reviewed in relation to the value of money today. I do not subscribe to the idea that because you had an Income Tax Act in 1925 that it has the same meaning in 1975, fifty years after. That is for little children who went to school and only learnt one and one are two and two and two are four. You must be able to relate theories to what is going on, you must understand simple arithmetic, and you must reach the stage beyond simple arithmetic. I will deal with the income tax matter in a different light, but not on this basis because if you give them off income tax you will be giving them a free gift, and I am not going to accept a free gift as an answer to a negotiating position. The hon. member has not studied the negotiating position and I would prefer to deal with that matter when I deal with it specifically, because I am not going to take one cent in the place of ten cents if you are going to allow me to get one cent and not pay income tax on it. I prefer to pay income tax on the ten cents if I am to get ten cents, but I do not; want to mix up income tax. 6. 30 p. m.

I have never believed in this old fashioned idea of making public workers believe that they were so depressed. This was the old parish pump politicians' days when you gave a man a bonus at Christmas

time. If you produce people who feel that politics means "standpipism" and that you have to do these things in order to get votes you will never get any further. You will have to beg a man for a vote by giving him a bonus at Christmas time and telling him do not pay it back.

I do not believe that we want to get to that stage in Barbados; but you cannot relieve people if you are in the mess yourself. You have to get out of the mess yourself. You cannot relieve people from the point of view of stupidity. If you are going to deal with this matter from the point of view that it is not enough money to give people, it is not enough.

It is nothing to do with income tax because income tax applies to all and sundry. Is it in keeping with what is happening in 1975? I am not dealing with this Christmas bonus that I understand the Government is going to give because what I am talking about is not a matter for the House of Assembly. We cannot negotiate it between ourselves by saying that one side has a point and the other side has a point. You have to sit down around a table and see what you are talking about. What is the economic position? What is the financial position?

When you are here you are not dealing with the economies of the situation, but merely with politics and to what extent you can get points over thinking that this is how you can catch a larger number of people. I do not subscribe to that. When it comes to dealing with people's money you must be prepared to sit down around a table and negotiate. You cannot deal with it on the basis of members of the Opposition making a point and members of the Government defending a point. You are negotiating terms and conditions of employment, and this has to be done around the table.

I do not subscribe to this idea. If you are going to deal with income tax, you will have to deal with a number of things, and the Leader of the Opposition knows that. What things are you going to give a rebate for on income tax? You will have to ask yourselves why a man can win money on a sweepstake or on the pools and does not have to pay income tax, and why if a man gets a bonus he has to pay income tax on it.

These are things that you have to sit down and negotiate. How is it that a man can win a million dollars in Barbados and does not pay one cent in income tax because the law does not compel him to pay? The whole subject of income tax must be related to what is going on in 1975.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a few things briefly. I am tired of the attacks on lawyers in here. If you take out a lawyer's brains you will find the same brains as those of a trade unionist or a doctor. You

are not born a lawyer or a trade unionist, If you are twisted in your thinking that is something peculiar to the individual. There is nothing wrong with being a lawyer.

I have heard my own friend, the Prime Minister, attack lawyers. I am going to stop that once and for all. I am not ashamed of my Profession. We are not different from anybody else. There is twisted thinking in Barbados now, but not necessarily among lawyers. This attack on the Legal Profession must stop.

Now, Sir, I am not going into the merits of this Resolution. What worries me is the reaction of a particular trade union leader to the Resolution. He refers to members of the House as drawing big salaries for a half day's work. Not only is that insulting, but it obviously shows that someone who is leading a trade union does not have the first concept of what representation of people really means.

If coming in here today was all that I had to do, I would be drawing money by false pretences. If that was all that any member who is not a Minister had to do, he would be drawing money by false pretences. If the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers would consult any member in his constituency he would discover that coming here on a Tuesday is for some of us the easiest part of the representation which we render to people.

We render service from 6 o'clock in the morning until, sometimes all hours of the night. To suggest that because he has not got the cost of living bonus which he is entitled to argue with the Minister of Finance is no reason for him to make the startling remark about parliamentarians.

If he thinks that it is so easy, why does he not run and get a big salary for a half day's work? This is a free country. Anyone who is over a certain age can run, and if they can inspire confidence in the people all the big money that Ministers get and all the big money that parliamentarians get is theirs for the taking. They only have to satisfy or convince a majority of people.

This knifing of parliamentarians, and giving the impression that our representation of them extends to a Tuesday is absolute nonsense. It shows that a leader of a trade union does not have the first concept of what representation of the people really means.

If you are representing your people, it is false and wrong to suggest that coming into the House of Assembly on Tuesdays is the Alpha and Omega of your representation.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage the hon. member to speak more regularly before me so that I can agree with him, as I do on this occasion. It is a pity that this matter of a Christmas bonus should have got caught up with the Supplementary Budget because it has allowed the Minister of Finance to introduce in relation to a very simple measure words that are reserved more or less for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, and to becloud the issue concerning this very simple thing which should be normally an advance; and if it is an advance on salaries, it is an advance which is repayable; but the salary itself would have become taxable.

Where the problem has come in here is that it purports to be an advance, whereas it purports to be a loan, and whereas in truth and in fact it is not a gift, but a benefit flowing from the employment of the particular Civil Servant.

I think that the point which the Leader of the Opposition was making was that as a benefit as such it becomes taxable, and since it becomes taxable, it means that it is less than what on paper it appears to be, and it is not as magnanimous as on first sight it appears to be. I agree with that and I also would go on to say that I do not believe that we should really on a matter where trade unionists are involved, try to answer every case which they have to make out by a unilateral type of action that may seem to have some political flavour, but when it is examined is not worth so much.

Either we are prepared to sit around the table with the NUPW and say to them that the economy cannot afford a cost of living allowance of this nature or not; but to come and make a division in the Public Service as has happened, is much to be regretted. I see nothing really in this for anyone who believes that industrial relations should be given its dues place in the social, economic and political life of the country.

I do not even consider this to be clever politics because one is trying by this measure to divide Civil Servants between those above \$700 a month and those below \$700 a month, thinking that by doing so one would keep to the bosom of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance those in the lower income brackets.

The reaction of the Public Servants has been the contrary. Their reaction is to say that in private industry in Bridgetown and otherwise there has been a cost of living allowance and that it is for them to have some sort of cost of living allowance also.

I think that the member for St. Michael West made the point that this savours too much of parish pump politics. It is what the hon. member for St. Philip North, now that he is not Mr. Speaker at this moment, would have referred to in his classical days as panem et circenses. When the Romans were ready they spread on the bread and they gave the circuses.

That is all that this measure is about. It is a pity that the Prime Minister should have put a matter like this into an emergency budget. I wish the Civil Servants well with the bit of money that they are giving them at this time of the year. I hope that they will spend it wisely because they are not promised very much next year; but I still believe that we need to sit down and negotiate with them properly; and we cannot begin a wages and income policy by penalising only the Civil Servants in so far as their income is concerned without having a proper prices policy. 6. 40 p. m.

I for one cannot agree with any such policy which is not based on a proper system, paying proper regard to dividends^ profits, rents and the whole gamut of inputs which go to make up some overall policy; and, it must pay due regard, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said to the differences which exist between the economic situation of a place like Barbados and that which exist in countries such as the United Kingdom and other areas.

Mr. BOLDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I hear a lot about parish-pump politics in dealing with this particular Resolution, but I would not join the crowd in calling it parish-pump politics. What I would say is that it is a subtle form of deception practised upon a few which the many have seen. That is what I would say.

As the hon. member has just said, we heard about this non-refundable non-reimbursable figure in the Budget speech but none of us would have dreamed that the person who wrote up the addendum to this would have written it in such glorious language. Despite all of that, I think this was introduced to remove from the minds of those persons who are about to receive this sum, the fact that it is coming in the middle of December at a time when the Government on the

1st December made increased port charges on essential food stuff including food and medicine, and introduced a 5% purchase tax on top of it, on the 1st December, full well knowing that the Barbadian who will benefit by this so-called gift, shops at this given time for his curtain, his door mat, his furniture

polish and his baking pan.

So when you really look at what is supposed to be a gift, there is nothing behind it. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, when you deduct the tax which will be chargeable on this amount, when you deduct the 5% trade tax which is applicable to the very thing which the people buy with this money, in truth and in fact they have got little or nothing.

I believe the Prime Minister - as he always said in here, there has got to be an equalization of wages; he wants to see the differential between the haves and the have-nots come closer. My belief is that you cannot look at those people who are responsible for the direction of the masses - the working folk - and say to them that 'you are not entitled to any benefits at this given time and tell the other people 'we are going to give you the benefits, ' because at the given point of time you have nobody to control anybody, because the persons who are over the \$7(JO bracket are human beings and they are going to say 'I didn't get any of the Christmas bonus so don't push me too hard. '

Already there is an attitude that has crept into the Barbadian society; when you look at certain people they will tell you 'I don't get any of the sweets'; and I am sure this is exactly what is going to happen as result of this. I believe the Government should have looked at the overall policy. My personal belief is that the separation of certain persons is going to create disharmony rather than harmony. It also is going to force those persons who are not in Government employ, to look to their employers for a gift as well, whether the employers can afford it or not; and I believe this is a very bad principle.

I am not saying that these persons should not have the money, because anything given to people at this time, as far as I am concerned, is welcomed; but what I am worried about is what it is going to create between those who have received it and those who have not received it.

I would hope now that the Hon. Minister would give direction that that sum which is outstanding by those persons who have received this same holiday benefit and have not paid it back, should be written off. We should not be confused in Government accounts any longer now with sums of money lent for Christmas which have not been paid back because one can assume that those who have not paid back were in such straightened circumstances that they could not afford to pay back and therefore if you are prepared to make any monetary gifts to certain people now, write off the balance and let us start with a clean slate.

In 1976, you know everybody will be looking for the big manoeuvres. Elections are coming up, so I hope the Prime Minister would be magnanimous enough now to say, 'those who have not paid back

before do not worry to pay back; we have given gifts for Christmas and you can take that as a Christmas present. '

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$2, 910, 000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmativ^without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER^ who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

? Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now read a first time.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

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 this Resolution be now agreed to.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 6. 50 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. Before adjourning I would like to invite the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to indicate what days he would like to complete the debate on the Budgetary Proposals.

Mr. ADAMS:

Tuesday and Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. We would prefer the usual time for Private Members' Business, and Government Business can be done between 12 o'clock and 2 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

That was the identical undertaking given by the hon. member for Bridgetown when the House last met. We will agree that the House should adjourn until 12 o'clock noon.

In connection with the reply of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the reply has not yet been circulated, and I think we are entitled to copies of the reply. I do not know whether his reply has been laid, so I am just enquiring because if it has been, we are awaiting copies in as much as the hon. member, I think, not only referred to it by way of notes, but to a greater extent in a verbatim manner.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that anybody other than a Minister could make a statement which could be tabled and circulated unless of course the member was making a statement on a point of personal explanation, and I do not take my speech in support of a motion to be anything which is appropriate and which the Rules permit could be tabled. I can refer hon. members to the daily press in which it is being serialised - they can read today's thrilling instalment - and I can also refer them to the Reporters whom I understand have procured my original notes; I do not mean "procure" in any offensive sense; but they are in possession of a copy of my notes which may or may not represent my entire speech as they will discover when they listen on the tape, but I am sure the Reporters can make it available to all the members if the Debates Committee so permits them. But it is a speech made in the House and an hon. member can only look at another hon. member's speech with the permission of the Debates Committee. It was a speech; it was not a statement. It is entirely in your hands, Sir. The Reporters have the notes from which I spoke.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I understand it, because I was out of the country at the time, the hon. member read extensively or exclusively from a typewritten document which was not a document of this Chamber, and I believe the Rules of this Chamber would require any such matter read to be tabled. If it is tabled it would then be made available to members on that side and on this side. It is not a question of members of this Chamber reading it in serialised form in the media. When the Prime Minister makes a statement, it is made available to everybody; it is not a question of our reading it in the newspaper. In other words, what happens is that the newspaper is being treated more courteously than members of this Chamber. Frankly I think it was a breach of the Rules of this Chamber for a speech to be read in the first place, but it having been read, what was read being not a document of this Chamber should have been tabled. Those are the Rules of this Chamber.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker I feel very strongly on this. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to be extremely clever. He is the House in which he reads a document. The very papers are saying that the members of the Government were not in their seats and there are pictures showing members not in their seats, and yet he does not make what he read a document of the House. If he has handed it to the press and they are bringing it out and he is sales agent for them and wants us to buy what he says and get a commission, that is a different thing. If he is not interested in the 23 members apart from himself buying newspapers the facilities of the House to get the document for members of the House could be used. It is so elementary. I do not see any big hulabaloo or smart Alecky about this. If he has a speech, he should pass it.....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, not smart Alecky! I have drawn hon. members' attention to the fact that the Rules do not permit a speech to be read; so it does not need the hon. member for St. Michael West to tell me

that. I have said that I made notes of which I made extensive use and those notes are now with the Reporters. Hon. members who were not in here would recall the same statement being made by the Leader of the House in 1961 when he read a speech, and he did not extemporise as I did from time to time on the abolition of Local Government, and Mr. Speaker Brancker allowed that, and from that day I began to make extensive notes for my Budget reply. I have drawn to hon. members the difficulties under the Rules. I do not mind if the Leader of the House and you give permission to the Reporters to make my notes available but no member can see another member's speech. If my speech is to be read in advance of Hansard, I will ask to read other people's too; but there is nothing in my speech that will not bear careful analysis. I would prefer it to be done informally so as not to create a precedent, and subject to your ruling as Chairman of the present Debates Committee, as far as I am concerned my notes can be photocopied. They are not completely what I read, but I prefer my notes to be photocopied and a copy handed privately to those members who want to see them, because I know the Debates Committee does not allow people's speeches to be circulated, in advance of Hansard. I would prefer that, but I am not stopping anybody from reading what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Very extensive point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, it does not end there. I would put my head and take an oath that not, one Reporter of the Advocate took down the speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in Shorthand word for word. Since they cannot see the speech of the Reporters of this House, then unless the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying that he doctored and handed a speech to the Reporter of notes he made and then after he wrote out a special speech, then that is the only way the Advocate could get it. There are only two ways the Advocate could get it, either by looking at what the Reporters took down or by taperecorder which they did not do, and nobody took it by Shorthand; so what could he have given to the Advocate if he did not have a speech which he read? He cannot remember what he said for an hour and five minutes; so he is now trying to fool this Honourable House. I would really like to know what....

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, what is this about fooling the Honourable House?

Mr. SPEAKER:

He said you were not trying to fool this House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

What can be his basic objection? If he is so proud of his speech which hon. members should read, he should give it to the Clerk with instructions to circulate it to members as was done with the Prime

Minister's speech from which he could even read things that were not properly taken out or altered. He is Leader of the Opposition and a responsible member of this Chamber, and he is asking the public to accept his speech as a proper answer to the Prime Minister. Is there any objection to using the facilities of this House so that every person could have a copy?

Mr. ADAMS:

I have no copyright on the speech. I have said what to do. I have no other copy of my speech whatsoever; the Reporter has my notes.

Mr. SPEAKER:

If I may intervene here, I see no problem whatever, I have been listening quite comfortably to the discussion, but I see no problem. There was no obligation on the Prime Minister to have made his speech a document of the House as he did. As I understand the Rules, if someone asks that the speech that the hon. member in question was referring to rather extensively be made a document of the House, then it is for me to rule whether or not it should be made a document of the House. No request was made in the case of the Leader of the Opposition when he was referring to his notes and so on, It is for him as the Hon. Prime Minister has done to volunteer to make his own notes that he was referring to, euphemistically so called, a document of the House. This is no problem, and if he has not seen fit to do so, he is quite within his rights, and I have no power to deem what he referred to on the last two meetings when the House met to be a document of the House.

The problem here is this: we have to be careful that we will not be doing violence to the Rules of the Chamber namely, Standing Order No. 31, where, if we adjourn until as has been suggested 12 noon next Tuesday, we then postpone discussion on the motion moved by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition on his reply until 2 o'clock, because the Rule says that two sitting days which means two full sitting days should be allocated to the debate on the Budget and in my interpretation the Supplementary Budget thereon. When we meet next Tuesday we should from the word "go" be strictly dealing with the debate on the hon. member's motion. We should be doing it today. I think that while the letter of Standing Order No. 31 has been violated, the spirit has not been violated, because hon. members were not prepared to go along with it, but I would warn all hon. members that we should, if we do meet at 12 noon next Tuesday, be dealing with that motion standing in the name of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker on the last problem which you raised, I am not quite certain that my interpretation of the Rules would necessarily mean that two full sitting days must be devoted to the Reply. Standing Order No. 31(2) says that the total debating time shall not exceed, which does not necessarily mean that the full time must be taken, and I would therefore think that if a 2 o'clock start is acceptable to the Leader of the Opposition that we would be perfectly within the framework of the Rule.

Mr. SPEAKER:

You would look to the question of the hours.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I would like if it is possible for Your Honour as the guardian of this House to try and get the speech of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition by the time this debate starts. I have no intention of buying an Advocate to read his speech serialised? a speech in which hon. members are criticised for not sitting down like dumb animals to have their ears bored. That is something I never promised my constituents I would do; but be that as it may, I would like you to give instructions if it is possible that by Tuesday the members should have the hour long speech of the Leader of the Opposition if the debate on what he said is meaningful. You cannot have a big speech delivered before a microphone and then the members would have to buy an Advocate newspaper to whom he has handed the speech to learn what he actually said in an hour long speech. I am asking Your Honour in all seriousness if it is possible for the Reporters to get the speech on an important matter like this in which the hon. member said that the panic button has been pressed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will consult with the Clerk as to whether the whole Hansard can be brought out. I cannot guarantee that the whole speech alone will come. I think the proper thing is to have a full Hansard in the hands of hon. members and not the speech.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a point on what Your Honour referred to just now. The second point is that we find ourselves arguing about asking Your Honour to look after the majority rights and not the minority rights.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 10th December, 1974, at 12 noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly. 7. 08 p. m.