

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, 10th September, 1974.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12. 10 p. m. was after the Resumption after lunch. I would like to draw Your Honour's attention to this fact.

Mr. SPEAKER:

First mention of your name appears on page 4.

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL. B., (Speaker); Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, (Minister without

Portfolio); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J. P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J. P., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. A. DaC. EDWARDS; Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; His Honour C A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q. C., S. C., B. A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, (Minister of Health and Welfare); 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.

MINUTES

Mr, SPEAKER; The Minutes for Tuesday, , the 27th August, 1974, of this House, are ready for confirmation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to what I consider an omission in the Minutes.

I recall that I spoke on the Second Reading of the Bill to amend the Constitution of Barbados - the Barbados Constitution Bill, 1974. But nowhere in these Minutes is it shown that I spoke on the Second Reading. As a matter of fact it only shows that I spoke on a point of elucidation, and I could only have done that if I had made a previous speech.

I remember that I spoke after the Honourable Leader of the House spoke which

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Yes, Sir, that shows that I spoke on, & point of elucidation. But I also spoke immediately after the Leader of the House and before the hon. Member for the City.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Would it be in order for us to insert that the hon. Member spoke. If this is done, I suppose the Minutes could be confirmed.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

It shows here that Hon. G. E. Talma spoke and then Mr. E. D. Mottley spoke.

Mr. SPEAKER:

We could place the hon. Member's name between Hon. C. E. Talma spoke, and Mr. E. D. Mottley spoke.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Speaker, I distinctly recall that when the House was in the Committee Stage of the Bill there was a vote of 15 to 6, and nowhere in., the Minutes do I see that recorded, and that, Mr. Speaker, is also another omission. As far as I recall it was when we were dealing with the question of citizenship but I would not be too dogmatic on that particularly. However, this is not material so far as the validity of the Bill is concerned, but I think the record should be quite straight.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It was in connection with Clause 4. The insertion could be made and the Minutes will be confirmed. Subject to these corrections, the Minutes will be confirmed.

The Minutes are hereby duly confirmed. PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. G. G. PE8GUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Report and Statement of Accounts of the Public Utilities Board for the year 1973.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to grant the sum of \$16, 500 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, 6, which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

REPLIES TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the House I beg to inform you that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 115, asked by the hon. Member for St. Andrew is now ready.

Also the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 160, asked by the same honourable Member, is now ready.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 194, asked by the hon. Member for St. James is now ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that the Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 209, asked by the hon. Member for St. Peter, as well as the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 210, asked by the same hon. Member, are now ready 12. 15 p. m.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I should like to ask for leave to give notice of the following questions...

Mr. SPEAKER:

If there is no objection, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following questions

"269. Now that a Government has been installed in the Republic of Portugal that is favourable to the nationalist aspirations of the inhabitants of Portugal's possessions in Africa, will the Minister of Trade issue all such directions and take all such steps as will permit trade relations to be resumed between Barbados and Portugal and Portuguese goods once more to be imported into the Island?"

"270. Is the Minister aware that Official Gazettes are being circulated up to three ;, weeks later than the date which they bear? Will the Minister take steps to ,, ensure the early printing and circulation of the Official Gazette?"

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. G. Q. FERGUSON:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

THE POST OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, this Bill was first laid in Parliament by my Parliamentary Secretary who was acting as Minister of Communications and Works at the time. The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Post Office Act in order, as the Objects and Reasons clearly state, to enable the Minister to make Regulations for the payment of gratuities to masters of non-government ships for the carriage of mail.

This provision used to be in the Customs Act but, apparently, when the Customs Act was repealed and a new Act came into force, this provision was left out. We continued paying the gratuities to masters of non-government ships conveying mail from Barbados to other places under what was a provision, but which was subsequently repealed. This Bill is only to insert into the Post Office Act this provision.

I should just like to assure the House that the new Post Office Act is well on the way to being finalised. We have had an expert from the Universal Postal Union who has just left us. He was here for a year under technical assistance. He has drafted a new Post Office Act, which is now with the Legal Department; he has also drafted all the Regulations, Manuals and the directives for internal use. The Report has not yet been returned, because he has to send it to his Headquarters for approval by the Universal Postal Union.

I have had several discussions with him. He is a technical officer who knows his business, and he is prepared to give Barbados the best advice of which he is capable. The total composition will be about cite thousand pages. There are several Regulations under the Post Office Act plus the Manuals for the use of the public as well as the Manuals and directive for use by the internal administration. It will be a

big job. The Legal Department has been asked, specially, to deal with it as a matter of priority. There is nothing more I can say on this.

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow entered the Chamber and took his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity of consulting with the Minister, but I heard him mention something about the payment to masters of non-government ships, and I do not see anything about it in the Bill. As Minister of Finance, I would have thought that, if there had been some irregularity in the payment of Government funds, the Ministry of Finance would have been informed before such information becomes vouchsafed to the public. Because Your Honour was putting the question, I did not have an opportunity to write him a note to find out further about this. I wonder if the Hon. Minister would like to-elaborate on the matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker the introduction of this Bill is as a result of a Cabinet Paper, which was approved by Cabinet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I would

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minister has replied, and that is my Ruling.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Do you mean to tell me that the Leader of the House cannot ask for an elucidation of the matter?

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Minister has replied!

Rt, Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I do not understand Klem and your statement, either.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 and; 2 were called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. Chairman reported to Mr. Speaker who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time, passed and cited as The Final Appropriation (19 73- 74) Act, 19 74.

12. 35p. m.

Order No. 1 was called.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a personal statement. During the course of the discussion

Mr. SPEAKER:

Certainly this is not the point at which to make a personal statement.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

As Minister of Finance.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I will allow you to do that after Government Business for the reason that there is a specific subsection in one of the, Standing Orders under which Personal Statements are made. We are now in Government Business and I would like Government Business to continue.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Can I make a Government statement as Minister of Finance which may have to come before the Public Accounts Committee? I just want to make it clear that during the course of discussion on the last Bill, it came to my attention that illegal payments had been made. I asked for an explanation, it was not drawn to the attention of the Minister of Finance and the Public Officers will be surcharged on that

matter. I am saying that for the benefit of the Public Accounts Committee. I want to make my position clear on this matter, and I will bring further information to the House when the relevant public officers who have made these illegal payments have been surcharged.

While I am on that, for the benefit of the Public Accounts Committee, I wish to inform them that it has come to my attention that officers in the Auditor General's Department have signed signatures which are not their own, to wit, that of the Auditor General, and the appropriate disciplinary action will be taken. We do not have to wait for these reports to go to the Public Accounts Committee. We are not going to have this kind of thing going on in Barbados. It is forgery. No money was lost. In the course of my auditing the accounts as the law requires me, I discovered that.

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1973-74) BILL, 1974.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The Bill which we have before us is the Final Appropriation Bill. The amounts of money in the Final Appropriation Act which has already been voted by supplementary appropriation Bills is the sum of \$14, 242, 723, and it is necessary for us to bring in the Final Appropriation Bill as soon as possible after the end of the Financial Year on 31st March, 1974 in this case. All of these sums aggregated in this amount which I have just mentioned have been voted on by Parliament for the purposes for which we introduced them, and I therefore beg to move that the Final Appropriation (1973-74) 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 the motion of Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, seconded by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill Mr. Lowe took the Chair.

The Preamble was postponed.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed. The Preamble was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. G. G. Fergusson, seconded by Hon. A. Morrison, the Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. Barrow, seconded by Hon. G. G. Fergusson, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and cited as the Final Appropriation (1973-74) Act, 1974. 12. 35 p. m.

**THE BILL TO MAKE PROVISION FOR MATTERS ARISING OUT OF THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY**

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 2 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

It stands in the name of Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to make provision for matters arising out of the establishment of the Caribbean Community including the Caribbean Common Market.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in 1967, the House passed the Caribbean Free Trade provisions relating to the Caribbean Free Trade Area Act, in 1970 the Miscellaneous Controls Act was passed. The Financial Rules were provided in 1971 and on the 4th July, 1973, the Caribbean Community Agreement was signed at Chaguaramas in Trinidad, and it was known as the Chaguaramas Treaty.

The Community came into being with the following countries: Barbados, Jamaica, Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago. There was a further accession by the Associated States, and finally Antigua joined the Community a matter of eight weeks or so ago. So you will see that the Common Market which came into being at the same time with the Common External Tariff now embraces Antigua, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Trinidad and Tobago.;

This was therefore the final stage with the accession of the Government of St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, and Antigua - the final stage in the economic integration process which was initiated in this country on July 4, 1955, consummated at Dickenson Bay in December of that year and further with the accession of the other Commonwealth Caribbean countries in 1967 and the coming into being of the Free Trade Area in May of 1968,

The final process, as I said, was completed on the road to economic integration with the accession of these two countries, formerly Commonwealth Colonies, this year - not so very long ago. I am not going to make any speech on the economic integration movement at the moment because I do not think that it is called for, but with the coming into being of the Caribbean Common Market with its internal free trade and Common External Tariff, the Free Trade Association is adumbrated by the Act of 1967 which then becomes redundant because the Common Market also is a free trade area which is the first stage of economic integration, and in addition to that, it has the Common External Tariff and it has annexed to it various associations and organisations such as the Regional Shipping Council, the Oils and Fats Agreement and the Agricultural Marketing Protocol administered by Ministers of the Council which all give effect to the aims and objects of the integration movement in the Caribbean.

The relevant Acts of Parliament are therefore the Free Trade Area Act which is being repealed now by this Bill, the Miscellaneous Controls Act of 1970 to which reference is made in Clause 12, and the Bill says that the provisions of the Miscellaneous Control Act of 1970 shall not apply in such a way as to prohibit or restrict the importation of goods in the manner in which we have said that goods should move freely under the Chaguaramas Agreement.

The Bill, of course, Mr. Speaker, does not pretend to set out all the arrangements such as the tariffs and so on which have been made under the Common Market Agreement and the Community

Agreement, What it does do is to clear up certain anomalies and perhaps ambiguities which might arise and difficulties of interpretation and to make it clear that the new agreement which was signed on the 4th July last year supercedes any existing legislation made under the previous instruments of economic integration such as the Act of 1967.

Of course the only way that legislation can be superceded in this country is by subsequent legislation which explicitly makes provision for the repeal of the provisions of pre-existing legislation. So that although you may sign a treaty on an international basis, as long as we have legislation which relates to matters which are adumbrated by the treaty itself it is necessary for us to take the necessary steps to put our house in order.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. FORDE; Mr. Speaker, this Bill would give, in this country, legal status to the Caribbean Community and the Caribbean Common Market, two of the institutions of the integration movement: in the Caribbean. This is perhaps not the final Bill on this aspect of regional integratioual movement, but it is certainly one of the Bills which become necessary to implement the prerogative act of treaty making which resides, of course, in the Cabinet acting on behalf of the Grown.

I think that on this side of the House we should like to say that it is only where the treaties affect the internal laws of the country that the Government is forced to come into Parliament to get enabling legislation to give effect to these treaty provisions that the Opposition is given an opportunity in Parliament to debate the measure other than where it brings a Private Member's motion.

We cannot tell the Government what conventions they wish to settle in this country, but we would like to say this: We believe that major issues of external affairs like the CARICOM arrangements should become a matter for Papers to be published and a regular debate to take place and not merely to wait until a specific implementing Bill comes before Parliament.

Mr Speaker, the Opposition not only now, but when it was the Government of this country, had always strongly supported any movement towards regional integration and regional unity. In fact you may recall, Mr. Speaker, that whilst speaking or making the major speech on behalf of the Opposition on one of these composite pieces of legislation, I said quite clearly, and I repeat today, that any step forward no matter how small that step may be, towards regional unity in the Caribbean is a step which we would encourage and seek to improve on.

I want to make it clear on behalf of the Opposition that we will support this Bill. So far as Barbados is concerned we do not, however, accept that mere economic integration is the correct regional direction for our country. It may well be that we speak as idealists. It may well be that we are going to be told that the practicalities in the way of a deeper integration movement at the present, are difficult; but I have never known of any goal which it is worthy to achieve in which there have not been difficulties. 12. 45 p. m.

That is why in the Constitution of Barbados you will note, Mr. Speaker, that there is a provision which allows this country to go into a political union with the easiest of votes in Parliament within any of the Commonwealth Caribbean countries. It was at our instigation and at our origin that such a provision occurred in the Constitution.

So far as CARICOM is concerned, - and I use CARICOM to encompass the different institutions which comprise the Caribbean Community as a whole, I believe that the operation of the free trade area - the seven or eight years of operation of the free trade area - have been years that have given cause sometimes for satisfaction and cause at times for great concern. I believe that there are still serious defects in the movement that call for serious ironing out at the level of all of the regional governments.

I will begin with one that is quite important, Mr. Speaker, and that is in the realm of civil aviation and in the field of the regional carrier for this region. It must be of some considerable concern that the Leeward Islands Air Transport is being now only maintained by the grace of the British Government despite the lip service that we pay to the regional movement in this region; and yet we must recognise, speaking as a Barbadian in this respect, that that airline is as vital to the tourist and economic future of Barbados as indeed it is to some of the other islands in the Caribbean. It is indeed a cause for grave concern on all sides that the level of negotiation at the Heads of Government level seems to be polarized on this issue and despite the leadership which we have, there can be no break through in this very sensitive area of our political affairs.

I have heard - I think the hon. Member for St. John has said - that Barbados will not take over a debt

from the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and I trust that nothing that I say in this speech will be interpreted as advising that we should take over a debt of considerable magnitude; but certainly I believe that there should be room for negotiations, to moving from the realm where we are encouraging exploitation by other outside multi-national carriers and companies in our civil aviation field by trying to create within the region an institution which is viable and which we can call our own. And I would like to say that should Government move in this direction we would be only too happy as an Opposition to support it in this regard.

However, it is not only in the field of civil aviation that we have some cause for concern. We believe that the integration movement so far has not percolated down enough for the benefit of the broad masses of the people; and one of the dangers which are occurring, is the tendency of the foreign multi-national company to localize in terms of its legal structures, whilst at the same time maintaining a strangle hold on the economies. And if you look at the terms of trade inter - Commonwealth Caribbean over the last four years, you will see that it is in the two major countries of heavy external industrialization by external means in Trinidad and Tobago, and Jamaica who have benefited more at the expense of the other territories including Barbados.

I think a review of the vital trade statistics would show that Barbados has had a decrease, or deficit if you like, in its trade statistics with the Commonwealth Caribbean as between 1966 and 1974. The figures are there for us to see. There may be many causes for this, Mr. Speaker. It may be that despite the enlarged market which is made available to us, our industrialists are not seizing the opportunities that are available and are not using the know-how that they should have in order to promote our products much more. It may well be again that the terms of trade that were negotiated in the special arrangement have not been as suitable for us as they ought to have been; and it may be again that on the other hand, foreign external capital will look to the place or the location where it can derive the best benefit, and indeed I believe that that third factor has been a significant factor in the situation.

But we must be concerned as Barbadians and also as West Indians about this trend, and it is one that we will ask the Heads of Government to tackle, as soon as possible, and to see if they can set up and publish the terms on which foreign investment is going to be allowed into the region; to see if they will move not only from having a limited amount of co-operation in the Investment Co-operation established for the LDC's but also to wider participation in each other's economy which would give them greater force to withstand the pressures from outside and indeed from within.

Mr. Speaker, I said that there is cause for concern, and I am going to touch on an area that is sensitive. It is one which I believe - I have always heard what I call the hard men of politics who believe that politics is no Sunday School, - is describe as the dreams of an idealist; but I think that the political unity of the Caribbean cannot forever be relegated to a far off distance with no serious commitment to it. It is

an important factor, and certainly as far as my country, Barbados, is concerned, it must be given high priority.

It is true that we can claim by virtue of being represented at the Heads of Government Conference at ministerial level by our political government of the time, that the people are participating in the process of the integration movement, but that is really only nominally so. CARIFTA, Common Market, CARICOM, - for the average man in the street - are almost intellectual ideas and not realities, and many of them do not find and feel themselves involved because the institutions have been so structured that they have excluded from them any degree of Parliamentary participation by the representatives of the people or the people themselves.

There are other integration movements in other parts of the world, even in Europe, where the antagonisms and bitterness of centuries of internecine warfare have not prevented them from making at least one little step forward on the political level, and yet we seem incapable in the Caribbean in having anything in the nature of a West Indian solidarity.

I would show you the implications of this, Mr. Speaker. It is urged very strongly - and I think that that distinguished West Indian, Mr. William Demas was one of the people who used this argument frequently - that rather than conceding freedom of movement of peoples in the region, that what we have done is to have brought to the particular places so that they have factories and would not have to move out of the region. Yet when you look at the survey done by distinguished economists and even at a

Governmental level, that is only partially so, and when you look at the figures for the balance of trade and the direction of trade you will find that the benefits are accruing to the bigger ones of the MDCs and the Less Developed Countries are themselves constrained to remain within their own borders without savouring of the benefits in which they should participate. 12. 55 p. m.

We think that the area of freedom of movement cannot forever, again, be approached in a haphazard fashion. We must not lose sight of this as one of the goals that we have to work for in concrete terms and with determination, even if it seems that we turn ourselves into perennial nuisances at conferences by raising the matter from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the area of foreign policy, the Treaty provides for co-ordination of the foreign policies of the respective Commonwealth Caribbean countries; in fact, those who constitute the

community. We have had one instance for every one to see of an act of self-determination in external affairs. I refer, of course, to the decision to recognise the Government of Cuba. I believe that it was right that the Caribbean should take its own independent decision on this matter and establish diplomatic relations with Cuba, regardless of the pressures which may come from outside the region on us. I also recognise that no one country would have done this on its own unless it felt secure in the embrace of its other member states in the region; but I am concerned that there are still too many areas of disagreement in the foreign sphere.

If we look at our policy towards China and Taiwan ourselves and the others are out of step. If we also look at our policy towards Israel and towards the Arab States, ourselves and the others are out of step. I could go on ad nauseum, in some instances where the co-ordination that should take place either does not take place, or, if it takes place, one does not know the reasons for disagreement. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the policy being followed by the others is correct and that Barbados is wrong. I am only instancing this as an area that even this Parliament is left, indeed, in doubt as to what steps at co-ordination take place in this respect. We are concerned that either the information is not being fed to us, or that nothing is being done, despite the machinery which seemingly exists for co-ordination.

Mr. Speaker, the position of Anguilla really speaks of the State of St. Kitts, Nevis and

Anguilla being a member of the Caricom arrangement. Legally this is so, but one must face facts. None of these Treaty arrangements will be implemented in Anguilla until such time as the Anguillans themselves, with the consent, or without the consent, of the British Government want to have them applied to them. What the Heads of Government have done is to use the legally plausible story in order to get over what was obviously a constitutional and international difficulty, but it has not solved the problem, and it must not be told to people that the problem of Anguilla in the Caribbean community is a problem which has been solved. It is still unsolved, and it is in this realm of foreign policy, for instance, that the Governments must continue to speak with one voice with, of course, the consent of the people of Anguilla and should, if necessary, take the initiative and continue to take the initiative to bring about a solution of a problem that is a Caribbean problem first and foremost. It is a sore in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, if you canvass opinions between the Governments, you will find that they have different views as to how to solve the problem, but I refuse to accept that within the Caribbean itself we do not have the ability and the idea - we may not show the determination, but the ability and the idea can be found in the Caribbean to solve the problem ourselves. I strongly urge the Heads of Government - that is all we can do who are on the outside - to strive to use every opportunity to bring a speedy solution to the Anguilla situation. Merely issuing a Press Release and bringing a document which carries all of the constitutional niceties will not solve this problem, and we cannot be fooled by thinking that that is the end of the Anguilla problem.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that the first year of Caricom and the years of Caricom gave cause for concern and cause for satisfaction. I am, in this respect, voicing the ideas expressed by others and the conclusions reached by others, but I hope that, as we make the little steps forward, we should be still more determined to grapple with the big problem of removing the concerns and having only satisfaction. I am an unrepentant believer in the final destiny of West Indian people in one unity. I believe that it is achievable, and that it ought to be achieved in the lifetime of many of us. I also believe that, despite the economic integration movement, there is I detect a great fear among many of us to look at the political problems and to solve those problems.

I trust that Barbados, standing in a unique position between the big ones and the small ones

- small as we are in territorial size, big as we are in ambitions, big as we are in ideas - can play a unique role in that movement, and I trust that we will accept our role and achieve it. 1. 05 p. m.

Mr. EDWARDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to challenge a few points made by the hon. Member for Christ Church West, particularly that on the Anguilla situation. Is the hon. Member telling us that we should push CARICOM aside and wait until the Anguillans say it is all right for CARICOM to go ahead and then proceed? I remember when CARIFTA was started Mr. FORDE On a point of explanation, if the hon. Member would give way for me to explain that passage of my speech for the hon. Member I said that legally, it has been done, but it is impossible to effect it in fact. It is de jure but not de facto. In other words, the goods for instance will not necessarily escape customs duty in Anguilla if the Anguillans are not allowing you to bring in the goods. That is what I said.

Mr. EDWARDS:

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that when CARIFTA was started, it was started with three countries, Barbados, . Antigua and Guyana. After the first meeting, it was discovered that CARIFTA would be of tremendous benefit to the whole region and eventually the other members in the region saw the light. I feel that the Anguillans have absolutely no alternative if they are to survive but to join forces in CARICOM whether legally, economically or otherwise. The hon. Member said that he is a strong believer in regional integration; I too am a strong believer in regional integration, but I feel however that the economy of the area depends firstly on regional economic integration. If the Anguillans are to survive, they must participate in the regional economic integration of the area. This is what CARICOM is fighting to establish. Even President Nyerere has seen the problem and has pointed out that the weakness of the small countries in the area is their failure to come together and be united.

Now Anguilla is only a little drop in the ocean as far as the CARICOM area is concerned. Must we, the others who have agreed to come together for the economic benefit of the area, wait on the whims and fancies of Webster and say that we are not doing anything in CARICOM until Webster agrees? We are more responsible than that, Mr. Speaker. We have got to look at this area as an area which has to eventually feed itself. I would have preferred to hear the hon. Member this afternoon congratulate those in the area who have got together to provide food to serve the area and to congratulate those who assembled here in Barbados a few weeks ago to establish the basis from which they can jump off, to provide food so that the area can become self-sufficient. The hon. Member talked about the problems of CARICOM. We are going through the teething stages of an integrated society in the area. We cannot go through it without problems. We must have problems and I cannot think of any economic community that did not have its problems. Look at the problems that face the United Kingdom when it was trying to get into the European Economic Community.

The hon. Member made a very good speech and I must congratulate him on it, but I would have preferred to hear him say that he would hope that the Anguillians would see the light and come willingly and participate in the CARICOM movement, and since he is a strong believer in regional integration, he should be castigating Anguilla for their complacency and hesitancy in coming into the CARICOM arrangement, because as I can see it, and I know the hon. Member can see it the same way, it is the only salvation for the area. The hon. Member has mentioned that the big MDCs have benefited most from the CARICOM agreement or the CARIFTA agreement. This is true, but it does not mean that the LDCs and the smaller MDCs have not benefited to a considerable extent. Let us take for instance the Caribbean Development Bank. Who were the people to benefit most from the Caribbean Development Bank? It was the LDCs who benefited first and foremost from whatever loans were made out of the Bank. They have had priority and whenever there is a conference on Caribbean unity in the CARIFTA area, special dispensations are given to the LDCs. It is perhaps unfortunate that Barbados is considered to be one of the MDCs and might not have got as much as it deserves out of the arrangement, but special concessions are given to the LDCs. Even as recently as in the Regional Research Council for Agriculture, you will notice that these LDCs have not made their contributions. They came to the Conferences and said they could not pay their contributions, but they were not picked out of the regional research arrangement. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that they have benefited more from the Regional Research Centre. Research programmes have been carried out in all of the banana-producing countries for nematose. When we were to get the nematologists that were assigned to the area in the MDCs, they were allocated to the LDCs. We did not have the ecological problems in carrots and sugar cane and other root products, but it was felt that the LDCs were the people who deserved or warranted the greatest help, and we closed our eyes to this and allowed what work was to be done to be done in the area. Work was done on cocoa through the Regional Research Centre in the LDCs when the MDCs were putting up the money to have this done. I could not sit back and let it pass by that the MDCs are benefiting more without saying however that the LDCs are also benefiting. 1V15 p. m.

The MDCs may benefit more from the industrial development angle, but where technical assistance is concerned I can give the hon. Member a lesson in this, because where technical assistance is concerned, the countries that get the most of it are the LDCs. Most of the research work, most of the benefit of the research work, and most of the technical assistance have gone to the LDCs.

So, let us weigh one against the other. While Jamaica may be able to produce and manufacture and process things which Barbados cannot produce, and which Jamaica can export to other countries in the CARICOM area, what we have to do is to cease to be complacent and fight to see if we can get the proper type of industries established in our country by which we can export like Jamaica.

Jamaica had the jump off with its industrialisation programme, and today Jamaica is far in advance of the other countries as far as industrialisation and processing are concerned. Barbados is the less developed of the MDCs. It is midway between the others. I do not know what term we should attribute to Barbados. I do not think that Barbados should be among the MDCs at all. I think that she should be midway so that some of the benefits which go to the LDCs, technical assistance in other words, can come to Barbados.

But what we in Barbados have to do is to see that we give priority to the establishment of certain industries where we can produce not only for our own satisfaction and our own consumption, but for export to the LDCs. There are things which we can do in this country which could bring us greater revenue from the LDCs, and I can assure you that it has been discussed and that this Government has decided to give priority to those things.

I compliment the hon. Member on the address that he has made. He has made a brilliant speech, one of the best that he has made since he was in here; but the point is, do not let us go half way. Let us go the whole way. Do not give the impression that the MDCs are getting all. Let us be comprehensive and let us see the facts as they are and I am sure that if we state the facts as they are rather than trying to give the impression that CARICOM has been of no benefit to the LDCs but has been of great benefit to the MDCs, we must see where the benefits lie. It is not only a question of industrialisation. I grant you that on industrialisation, but as far as technical assistance and other aspects of the CARICOM movement or the CARIFTA movement are concerned, I say that the LDCs get the greater benefit.

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

On the motion of Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill. Mr:

LOWE took the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I intend to do this Bill in parts. Any hon. Member who wishes to refer to any particular Clause can do so. I beg to move that Part 1 stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, Parts 2 to 4 inclusive of the Bill were called and they stood part.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded in each case by Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON, the Bill was read a third time, and passed.

A BILL TO AMEND THE FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND AUDIT ACT, 1964

Mr. SPEAKER:

Order No, 3 is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Financial . Administration and Audit Act, 1964 (Act 1964-23).

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, I will draw to the attention of the House that the Financial Administration and Audit Rules known as the Financial (Amendment) Rules of 1974 were made on 27th June, 1974. There are many matters contained in the Financial Administration and Audit Act which are repeated in the Financial Administration and Audit Rules, for what purpose I am not particularly clear; but there is a certain amount of tautology or redundancy or whatever you choose to call it, Mr. Speaker, in the two instruments. 1. 25 p. m.

In any event, on the 27th June this year, Rule 116 of the 1971 Rules, Rules 125, 126, 127, 128 and 129 were all amended and Rule 133 was revoked.

The purpose of those amendments was to make it possible to increase the amount which could be written off from \$1, 000 to \$3, 000, and also to allow contracts for the supply of goods under an amount of \$15, 000 to be dealt with by the procedure laid out in Rule 126 in which the limit was \$7, 500. That is, one does not have to go out to tender until a contract for the supply of goods was over \$15, 000. And in petty contracts for work other than for the supply of goods, the limit which the officials had authority to negotiate was raised from \$1, 000 to \$3, 000.

The Bill which we now have before us, Sir, amends Section 9 of the Act, and Section 9 is repealed to allow that the amount of public money which may be remitted by the authority of the Minister should not exceed \$1, 000, and, over \$1, 000, it should be done by the Cabinet. It is as simple as that, Sir.

This is all there is to this Bill. It is in my opinion consequential and arising out of the amendment to Rule 116 of the Financial Rules of 1971 to bring it more in line with the provisions of those amendments.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise merely to point out that from what the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has said, we are satisfied that the Auditor General is not finding it convenient to report and to present his report as readily as the law requires that he should so do; and we learnt from the Prime Minister not so long ago when he made a statement, that certain officers have been carrying out functions that give him some cause for concern. We were not told, Sir, if he had been able to ascertain whether these officers who we believe did as much as amounted to forgery, if it was carried out with the consent or knowledge of the Auditor General himself, because, if these officers committed these acts as has been stated by the Minister of Finance but that these acts were committed with the knowledge - or even after they had committed the acts, they found the approval of the Auditor General - we do not think that as much would appear to be wrong as has been expressed.

However, Sir, we are satisfied that something has gone wrong, hence the Minister's Statement; but we believe that there is enough power in the hands of the Minister to take appropriate action to see that nothing like this recurs.

We find that the Auditor General not being able to report as readily as he should, that in itself gives cause for concern, and we do not believe that there is the necessity for an amendment to an existing legislation to afford the Auditor General longer time on anything like this, but that the root of the matter now rests firmly in the hands of the Minister of Finance to take appropriate action, and we are hoping to see that this is done as speedily as possible.

We believe, Sir, that there are numerous Government Departments that are not in themselves supplying the Auditor General with the necessary information to enable him to get on with his end of the work, but we believe that in a matter of this sort the Accountant General's Department is a department that is charged with a very heavy responsibility in this connection, and we are urging upon the Minister of Finance to at least let a glare be cast over the working of this department to see exactly how guilty they may be, and to what extent they are liable to the position in which the Auditor General finds himself eventually and the whole Auditor General's department for that matter.

We believe there is no longer the Question of not having enough personnel to carry out the various functions in the Auditor General's Department, and I can say to a lesser extent in the Accountant General's Department, and that being the case we expect better, and to hear a report which is much better from the Minister when he comes to give us the final statement on what is taking place at this time. 1. 35p. m.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the

Chair and the House go into Committee on this Bill.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER:

In respect of that motion, this Bill has been referred to a Select Committee and that Committee has not yet reported.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that, under the Rules, after a Bill has been referred to a Select Committee for three months - I was reminded of this in the course of a recent debate - it can be referred by the House to a Committee of the whole House. If my motion is carried, I will...;. -.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I just want to be certain of the position. There is sample authority under Standing Order 62(5) which says

"A Select Committee to which a Bill has been committed shall report to the House not later than three months after the committal of the Bill, provided that any period during which the House is in recess shall not be counted for this purpose. "

Standing Order 62(6) says:

"Where a Select Committee does not report to the House in the period set out in Standing Order No. 62(5) the House may commit the bill to a Committee of the whole House and the Powers of the Select Committee in relation to that bill shall cease. "

Three months having passed, I think the proper motion should be that the Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I think that would be a bit too early, Sir. The Motion which I have made is that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day. Until you give me permission to deal with it as the next Order of the Day, I am unable to proceed.

Mr. SPEAKER:

I am sorry.

The Question that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the Day was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

THE RESUMPTION OF INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL 1974

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Interpretation Act, 1966, be now referred to a Committee of the whole House.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. E. W. BARROW:

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

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 the House went into Committee of the whole House on the Bill. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, when this Bill last came before a Committee of this House, I believe that the hon. Member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition; took certain points on the Bill and drew to the attention of the House the implications of including in this Clause the words "or advertisement and making it a sufficient publication of that instrument, or document or advertisement - the words "or advertisement" occurring on both occasions in the Bill. The reason why he did so, essentially, was to point out to the Government that there are many local notices which, at present, are published by virtue of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Judicature in the newspapers, and that the newspapers certainly have a wider circulation, both overseas and in this Island, than can be claimed for the Official Gazette. As a result, many persons know of transactions which affect their property rights and, indeed, sometimes their status through the benefit of the wide circulation enjoyed by newspapers.

I submit to this Committee that that was a very conclusive and, indeed, valid argument, and I would hope that the Government would have accepted an amendment at this stage to delete the words "or advertisement" occurring in lines 4 and 7 in this Bill. Mr. Chairman, if I may instance the question of foreclosure suits, many persons resident overseas in the United States and in Canada are only made aware of fraudulent acts in relation to their particular bits of land when there is a publication of a notice under the Foreclosure Procedure Rules in the newspapers of this Island. Indeed, those of us who have practised in the Courts are aware of the importance of this means of communicating information.

I would like to be able in a Committee of this House to claim that the Official Gazette is so promptly published and circulated that it has a wide enough circulation and is the most effective method of disseminating information available, but I cannot claim that. I believe that this matter has been

canvassed in the legal profession where we have seen from time to time, the problems that could occur if people do not have adequate and prompt notice on matters affecting their status - divorce, for instance, or their property. I have cited the foreclosure proceedings as an instance of property. 1. 45 p. m.

I do not know the necessity or the reason for the amendment really, but it would seem that the conclusion of the amendment would be that it would be sufficient publication of the instrument or document if it appears in the Official Gazette, and that only. I really do not know the purpose behind the amendment, and I do not like to speculate. I would want to hear the real purpose behind it, but there seems to me there is this danger and that we should not hastily pass a measure of this nature.

I regret that the Select Committee has not met. I was not a member of that Select Committee and I cannot say why it has not met, because I had found, Mr. Chairman, that it is easier in the Select Committee, away from the glare of publicity either adverse or commendable, for more information to be exchanged and a much less rigid position to be taken and a better Bill to be produced, and I regret very much that the Select Committee did not meet on this matter. It may well be that arguments to the contrary would have been advanced and one would have seen the full imports of the amending Bill. As it stands, I believe we are having problems for ourselves and that we should not be hasty in publishing that. I would invite the Government to perhaps accept the amendment and leave the matter to apply merely to statutory instruments and statutory documents, leaving out the words "or advertisement" in these circumstances. I invite the Government to take this as one of the amendments that would have been suggested in Select Committee and perhaps they may see fit to accept that suggestion.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I should just like to make the position of the Government absolutely clear. The Government agreed that this particular Bill should go to Select Committee. I was not a Member of the Select Committee, so I can plead innocence in the same way as the hon. Member on the opposite side. The Select Committee comprises both sides of the House. I do not know what happens in Select Committee, but I have said before that if you really wanted to get rid of anything that was on the Order Paper, you sent it to Select Committee where it used to die a natural death. That is when the Select Committees invariably comprised all the senior Members in the House from the twelve constituencies as they then were. From the first time I entered the Chamber in 1951 I was always a Member of Select Committees automatically. Now the Standing Orders have been amended because there was a certain amount of frustration, and it is now three months. Do you mean that Members do, not find it convenient to meet even one day in three months for a short Bill of this kind, that only one word has to be left out of, according to the Member for Christ Church West? Are they taking their work very seriously? Are you taking the public's work very seriously?

I think I should say one or two things. First is that; this Government has no intention of subsidising

Lord Thomson's organisation. There is one daily newspaper in this country. Invariably advertisements go to some weekly papers, but they never go to the weekly papers alone; they go to the daily paper and the weekly papers depending upon the date of publication.

Now there are 166 separate statutory enactments which require publication of certain matters. Of these only 34 require newspaper publications and publications in the Gazette. All the others are in the Gazette alone; so we already have 132 which go to the Gazette, but the 34 which go to the newspapers are also published in the Gazette and four notices are published in the newspaper only. I know a little about the history of Parliament in Barbados, and I will make some disclosures here right now. I have not found in my research, apart from foreclosure matters which we have discussed in here already, and for which I will have alternative proposals to make sure that fraud does not take place, - and I have given the House that assurance. You will remember the last time we discussed this Bill in the Second Reading, that the Leader of the Opposition and I were more or less ad idem on the need to revise the whole foreclosure procedure in Barbados because it is frequently used as an instrument for defrauding people out of their land, but what I pointed out at that time and all the people who have had acquaintance with the law courts will agree with me, was that in spite of the fact that you have by law to publish in a newspaper that somebody is foreclosing, you draw up a fictitious mortgage, and the, next day I say you owe me \$20, 000 and I am coming for my money and I publish a notice that this property is going to be foreclosed on, the notice itself aggravates the fraud; it does not minimise it and this is how it aggravates it, because it puts people off guard. I can publish a notice saying that one rood two perches of land situate at Cane Vale, let us say, in the parish of Christ Church abutting and bounding on the public road to the south, and on the north, east and west on the lands now or late of Cane Vale Plantation and that is the full description. Now there may be 75 or 75, 000, but let us say 75, because Barbados is a small place, parcels of land answering to that description and. the two parties will be Mr. Seifert Gooding, Solicitor or Solicitor's Clerk and somebody that you never heard about in Barbados which could be Mr. Abahoo Singh. It does not have to be a Barbadian name, but neither one of them is related to the people who are trying to get a title to the land. So what good is that publication, to give notice to whom? That itself is a fraudulent publication, and the Advocate-News collects \$70 for that. The composition of the House was such that the people who owned the newspapers were the people who sat in here, and every time they got an enactment with any notice, they said, let us get a little publication in here for our paper.

Over fifteen years ago the then Government decided to look into the question of printing its own documents. The Gazette was not printed by the Government; even the Gazette was printed by a private contractor. The hon. Member for St. Peter would be aware of this although he was not a Member of the House. The Government used to pay out over \$500, 000 for printing. The whole budget was only about \$7. 6 million and out of that \$500, 000 used to be paid out for printing. Fifteen years later when we were discussing it here in the House, and I gave the figures, the possibility of reorganising the printery and bringing in machinery, with all the voluminous legislation that we now have, and with everybody practically, John Doe, Mike Brown and everybody in the public service printing their own Christmas Cards at the Government Printery - all you have to say is that you want 500 Christmas Cards, that you are a deputy Head of Department - with all that going on, - I have now stopped it, and have said that only one set of Christmas Cards is coming out from the Cabinet Office and if you want, you must put in

an order, - with the off-set machinery, which is very expensive, with the photographic plates that have to be done, would you believe that the total bill of the Government Printery was something like \$256, 000, with costs escalating every day? So you can see that all these things about publication in the newspaper was only another device to enrich the proprietors of newspapers who sat in the House of Assembly. 1. 55 p. m.

I do not intend to enrich Lord Thomson. Lord Thomson has no allegiance to this country and he is rich enough already; and further more a lot of poor people - let me give you some of the comparative figures - have to pay for the publications of Probate and that kind of thing, and what do we have? The rate in the Gazette is only \$2. 00 per column inch and \$1. 00 for subsequent insertions. That is, after you have set it up, there are two Notices and the second Notice is one half of the price of the first Notice. As against that the Government has to put in 104 publications a year at \$55 for Probate. Liquor Licences are 70 publications a year at \$70 each. I do not have to say any more.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Is the Prime Minister finished, Sir?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

We are in Committee. I gave ample time to see if anybody wanted to say anything.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I moved an amendment and I am talking.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

It cannot be moved. The time for interruption is up, Sir.

Mr. Chairman left the Chair. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER:

It being 2 o'clock, this Sitting is suspended until 2. 45 p. m. today.

On Resumption

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Sitting is now resumed. It is Question Time. The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 115 asked by the hon. Member for St. Andrew. That hon. Member is not in his place.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The Reply will be laid.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Reply to Question No. 115 is laid. Parliamentary Question No. 160 asked by the same hon. Member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

The Reply will be laid.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Member for St. Andrew I wonder if the other side would agree to hold this Question over. It seems to have a lot of content in it and I dare say that hon. Members on this side and perhaps on that side might wish to ask a few Supplementaries on it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

There is nothing in what the hon. Member is saying.

Mr. SPEAKER:

There is absolutely no rule. An irregular intervention. The Reply to Question No. 160 in the name of the hon. Member for St. Andrew has been laid because of his absence. Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 194 asked by the hon. Member for St. James.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister Would the Minister make a statement on the Government's policy for the recapitalisation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Yes, Sir. The Government is giving consideration to the refinancing of the Barbados Marketing Corporation. The details of the proposal are being worked out.

Mr. CRAIG:

I wonder if the Prime Minister could state about how soon they will be available, approximately.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

As soon as the Public Officers concerned get the work done.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 209 asked by the hon. Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister Is the Minister aware of the numerical strength of the teaching body in this Island? 2. Will the Minister consider the necessity for establishing a Society or Council or other institution for the purpose of determining standards of education and professional attainment for all grades of teachers within the nation?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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

1. Yes, Sir.

2. Under the Education Bill now in preparation the determination of standards of education and professional attainment of teachers will be the responsibility of the Minister. In the exercise of this function, he will have access to the advice of a National Advisory Commission on Education. The Bill will also provide for the establishment of a Registration Board whose functions will include:

(a) the registration of teachers;

(b) maintenance of proper standards of conduct of teachers.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister make use of his five constituent committees as well as the Education Advisory Board?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

In the interest of education, the Minister will make use of all available sources on which he can depend for reliable advice.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Shaker, would the Minister state what is the delay in bringing before the House the Draft Education Bill so that these provisions here can be implemented?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

The delay is one of putting on the final touches at the Legal Department. It is a very comprehensive Bill with several schedules, technical schedules, and the Minister hopes before the end of the year to get the Bill before Parliament.

Mr. HINDS:

Will the Minister say that the occasion for the delay has not been brought about particularly by failure to reach agreement with teaching bodies on many of the terms of the Draft Bill?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Part of the delay is due to the constitutional changes which have come before Parliament and they do affect the final settlement of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER:

The Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 210 asked by the hon. Member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister What provision was made between 1962 and 1973 for the training of persons responsible for the training of children under five years of age in (a) Day Nurseries and (b) Nursery Schools? 2. If persons were trained, how many on completion were assigned to schools or institutions accommodating children over five years but under eleven years of age?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

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

1. A six week training programme was arranged for nursery teachers and began in 1965.

A four week training programme for Day Nursery personnel also began the same year.

2. On completion of training all of the teachers were assigned to the Nursery Departments of Primary Schools. Such Primary Schools normally accommodated children over five years but under eleven years of age.

Mr, HINDS:

In the light of the Reply which the Minister has given, can the Minister tell us how many of these trained personnel were allocated to schools or institutions catering to children under five years of age? 2. 50 p. m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Speaker, there is one school catering to children under five at Government Hill, and another one is in die process of being constructed, and consequently the number assigned to those under five is extremely limited at this point. When the new Nursery School is built at Lodge Hill, trained teachers under this scheme will be involved.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Question Time is how ended.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that Item No. 8 be the next Order.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. SPEAKER:

Item No. 8, Private Members' Business.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Speaker, you will probably recall that when debate on this particular Item began on the 21st May, 1974, and Mr. CRAIG Mr. Speaker, I am not getting up just to interrupt the hon. Member, but, on a point of order. From what I have seen here the hon. Member introduced this Resolution, and I observe that a number of other members of Parliament spoke. I am wondering if he is now exercising his right to final Reply. because there are other Members here who probably would like to speak, Sir.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

I was going to draw to the Speaker's attention that debate began on the 21st May and I wanted to ensure that other Members had a right to speak on the motion before I replied.

Mr. SPEAKER:

Do any other hon. Members wish to speak?

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Speaker, it is merely by looking at the notation here under the Item that I am minded to say what I am going to say now.

This Resolution seeks to bring to the attention of this Honourable House some of the difficulties experienced by workers who are severed from time to time from their various places of occupation. I want to say here and now that if workers have suffered through the absence of ready payment, so to speak, when time for severing comes - we want to say that it is partly due to the Trade Union or unions which represent these workers, not doing total justice to the contractual arrangements in respect of these workers from time to time.

We can hardly accept it, Mr. Speaker, that with the trade union expertise which we are told from time to time we have around us, that you will find any factory or any institution for that matter, severing its workers without communicating and reaching some sort of agreement, because the rights of the workers must be looked after at all stages. If this is the case - and I speak now in reference to our sugar factories, Sir, - when our several sugar factories were going out of existence, it is known that the trade union representing the various categories of workers employed by these factories were called in and were consulted at some stage or other. It is known that the trade union knew well in advance the closing date of each sugar factory in this Island.

We are submitting then, Mr. Speaker, if the Union had taken into consideration all the matters relating to the retrenching of these workers, the Trade Union could easily have insisted there and then that 'your factory or whatever institution it is, is bringing its operations to a close, and consequent upon your closing on a particular date, we must have a binding assurance that severance pay or whatever is due to the workers must also have a specific date by which the workers would receive their just dues. '

You will agree therefore, Mr. Speaker, that for the workers to have suffered to the extent we know they have suffered, there must be accepted by the union that there has been a slip-up - if we want to characterize it as such - in the arrangement or agreement in respect of these situations.

On the other hand, we have come to learn of the cumbersome arrangements that have got to be engaged in, when it comes to processing the payment of severance pay.

These are matters, Mr. Speaker, which undoubtedly must weigh heavily with the trade unionists; these are therefore matters, Mr. Speaker, which you will agree that it is for the Trade Union when they are entering into any sort of arrangement or whatsoever it is in respect of these workers, fullest

consideration must be given to these aspects of the workers' rights.

It grieves us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, to find that factories have closed, and in the face of the existing conditions where those who are still in a job are, finding it extremely difficult to eke out an existence. 3. 00 p. m.

Those who have been retrenched or severed from their employment, are still left almost as if "with cap in hand", What is more, we know that some of them have had to journey from place to place merely to be told as much as to send the fool further and further. Many of those people have become frustrated by the type of treatment that they have received from Government Departments and elsewhere. Some of them have cause to believe that the Trade Union itself should have expedited certain demands from certain factories from time to time.

What we are saying is that the Trade Union has come to realise, as we have on this side of the House, or as any hon. Member who lives amongst the people, or who lives; with the people must of a consequence know of their suffering, and must realise how serious a matter it is. We now realise how serious a matter it is. What one has to bear in mind is that for the most part, severance payment must be associated with people who have been working at Sugar factories for several years. In other -words, this has nothing to do with the young generation or the young workers. There are people who have given their sweat, their blood, and even their tears over a very considerable period of time running into several years. It would mean that when these people can no longer be actively employed, there will be required to provide sustenance at a greater cost than when they were actively employed. You will agree that when the purse, or the weekly pay packet, is non-existent they will have to face great difficulties.

Sir, it is in the light of these things that one has to realise the extent of the suffering and the deprivation that these people have to face, from time to time, while waiting over long periods for what is rightly and justly theirs. It brings us to the point where it is very incumbent upon the workers' representatives at the Trade Union level to be more thorough in the exercise of their duties in respect of these workers, and to leave no stone unturned, at any stage, in order to assist them.

We realise that the proprietors of the sugar factories have been prepared to use people as long as they can keep the factory going under conditions that have often been mooted by the Trade Union as being sub-human.. It is in the light of this, Mr. Speaker, that one has to look at things in their true perspective. One has to place oneself in the position of an unemployed worker, who has to maintain his family without an income, to understand the true position. You will find, Mr. Speaker, that the worker's period of waiting for the payment to be made is as terrifying to them, as it is to the President of the United

States of America who had to deal with similar cases that: he would extend to these people more leniency than he has found it necessary to extend to others. I believe that he would extend more leniency to these innocent people than he has extended to the guilty.

Mr. Speaker, it means that all of us on this side of the House are definitely dissatisfied with the way that these workers have been treated, when it comes to the question of receiving severance pay. It means, therefore, that we do not want to see any recurrence of such treatment. We do not like the idea of workers being left at the mercy, so to speak, of some of these employers. Any mercy, when it comes to these sugar barons, comes to an end when the worker is no longer physically fit to do his employer's work.

Now, in a period such as 1974, we know that the worker's cause has to be seen and it has to be attended to in toto, because in many cases the workers are somewhat unable to help themselves; hence, they rely on the Trade Union not only to put their case, but to take into consideration the loopholes in contractual agreements with these sugar people particularly, and to see to it that the workers do not suffer in any respect.

I feel that each and everyone of us here will be glad to know that when a sugar factory, or any institution that employs workers, is going to be closed at a specific date that a reasonable time after the date of closing would also be announced specifically for the payment of the just dues that should be given to those who have served the institution for very many years.

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

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution has my wholehearted support as you are aware, we represent the people in the rural areas, and in those areas, we have a large number of agricultural workers. A plantation in my constituency was sold, and the workers were sent home without any kind of compensation for the years of service they had rendered as workers at the plantation. 3. 10 pan.

Now, Sir, these workers have contributed to the economy of the Island; and it is through the hard work which they have done in the past that has caused men like you and me to be Members of this Honourable House, and consequently it is our duty to see that these people are protected. Some have not attained the age of 65 to be eligible for benefits from the Provident Fund; and therefore when a

Resolution like this comes before the House of Assembly, it draws to the attention of the Government the condition of these poor unfortunate people. Daily, these workers from this particular plantation which I prefer not to name today, come to me trying to find out the procedure and what course they must take so that they can receive some kind of benefit for the service they have rendered. I am therefore very happy to know that this Resolution has come before this House. It is true that we have legislation to deal with this important matter, but there are certain ramifications which the average worker does not know, and he finds himself having to go here, there and everywhere trying to get the necessary information, and it is only when you reside in the country areas where these workers are employed that you are aware of their conditions.

As a representative of these people I feel that this Resolution will give the Government an understanding and draw to their attention that all is not well with the severance payments and that something should be done as soon as possible to expedite matters and to assist these workers so that they can receive what they are entitled to. This is a serious matter and one which I feel that we regardless of our ideology should be united on in order to see that these workers are paid for the services they have rendered in the past.

Mr. CRAIG; Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quite sure that a Resolution of this nature will have the support of both sides of the House since it affects the people who have made their contribution to this country. It is a rather sad thing to see that in 1974 under a so-called socialist Government which is supposed to be looking after the needs of the poor, backbenchers or Members on the opposite side have to plead Tuesday after Tuesday for support for these poor unfortunate people.

In supporting this Resolution, I should like to draw to the attention of the Government that as far as I am concerned the whole Provident Fund Scheme needs a complete overhaul. I daresay that you too, Mr. Deputy Speaker may have realised that you have a number of these people who come to you day after day asking you to assist them in having their Provident Fund payment straightened out, but worse of all is where you find factories in a particular sugar belt being closed, people are retrenched and through no fault of their own are left without a kind of work after serving 40 or 50 years in the sugar industry, and then they are told that because they did not serve for ten years prior to age 65, they are left out. I know of one who served for some 42 years in the sugar industry at a particular factory. He was retrenched like all the other workers, and went from one person to another doing an honest day's work, but when he reached the age of 65 and applied for provident fund payments, he was told that he did not serve during the ten years prior to the age of 65. I should like the Government to look at this aspect more carefully and see what they can do to assist these people who have served for these long years, and not look at it from the point of view of serving for ten years prior to reaching the age of 65. It is not fair after you have served for 40 or 50 years to be told that you did not serve for the ten years prior to your sixty-fifth birthday and therefore you are not entitled to one cent apart from \$800 a week pension.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order, we are not dealing With the Provident Fund. This Bill deals with severance pay.

Mr. CRAIG:

Fools rush in, where other idiots do not even attempt. I believe that hon. Members on the other side who represent constituencies deep in the sugar belt would realise the problems they have. Not only are we concerned with one section of the community, not only are we concerned with those people who may be severed because of retrenchment and are not entitled to severance pay, but with people as a whole, and that is why I draw to your attention that the Minister in charge should examine the whole aspect of the Provident Fund Act of 1968 or 1969 so that they can do something to assist these people. It would be my submission that rather than have them qualify in the last ten years prior to 65, that they qualify on the basis of the years they have put into the sugar industry.

As a classic example, you have people who have worked for 30 or 40 years and have been turned away because the plantation is sold and cut up into house spots. They cannot work anymore and have to go from one person to another who have small plots of land and do some weeding or odd jobs to keep them going, and then when they reach the age of 65 and apply to get something from Government which I believe they are entitled to after serving this amount of years, they are told they can get nothing. That is why I am asking you today to examine the situation. You can put up suggestions for which you have the numerical strength to put them through, but it is my suggestion to Government that they should examine the whole aspect of the Provident Fund for the sugar workers in the country and see if they can make it a little easier for these unfortunate people. I do not even like to use the words "poor and unfortunate" because I believe it is trying to catch a vote. I feel that the suggestion coming from this side is one worthy of being put into operation, because I believe that if a person works for 40 or 50 years, he should qualify on that basis rather than on the last ten years prior to reaching the age of 65. 3. 20 p. m.

It is very difficult for them. I have seen them butting about, Mr. Deputy Speaker. They are told that this is the position and they cannot get anything. They have to live on a paltry \$8. 00 a week and God in Heaven knows how they make out.

It is my suggestion to Government, my simple contribution, that they examine the Provident Fund Act again find see if they can do anything to make it a little bit easier for the people.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

I happened not to be in this Chamber when this matter first came before Parliament. A number of

persons have spoken on this previous to today's debate. I want the hon. Member who has just sat down, the member for St. James, to know that any time it is brought to the attention of my Ministry that there are any hardships suffered by workers in this country in respect of any laws that operate from the production of workers, my Ministry will be quite prepared to take some corrective action.

This Resolution before us really deals with Severance Pay and not with the Provident Fund. The hon. Member chose to deal with the Provident Fund for what he had to say. I think that one of the salient points in the Provident Fund Act is that the person who is now applying for pension must have attained the age of 65 before his retirement. I think it is well known that in jail retirement plans one must have reached an age. Under the National Insurance the age is 65. Under Severance Pay - this is not retirement, but the person is being retired - if the person is beyond the age of 65 Severance Pay does not arise.

In the Government Service there is a retiring age of 60. At the moment our laws do not operate so as to enable workers who are in the prime of their working life to retire before that age, an age at which we feel a person can make a useful contribution to the country in that chosen field of his.

Now when we are dealing with the sugar industry, it had been felt that this Provident

Fund on the operation of the Provident Fund was not a matter solely for the Government. It was dealt with by the employers, the employees and the Government; and I believe - this was of course before my responsibility for Labour - I believe that those persons who made the proposals on the basis on which the law had been framed had some good reason for choosing the age of 65 because, as I said earlier, I believe that at the age of 65 a person can still continue to make a useful contribution; and if you retire a person before the age of 65 it might mean that you are forcing that person on to pension at an early age when perhaps it might have other responsibilities - you are forcing him to accept a pension which would be obviously lower than take home pay. As a matter of fact there would be no take home pay. It would be a pension obviously lower than his earnings. So you are forcing the person on to a pension when he is still strong and able enough to continue to work until he is 65 years old.

I am not too sure, but I believe there is some qualifying basis for a person at 65. A person cannot retire before he is 65, unless he is medically unfit. A person can get his pension on those grounds. As far as,, the question of 10 years continuous service in the sugar industry is concerned, I presume that must have been a reasonable time period envisaged by the drafters of the proposals.

As regards this question of Severance Pay before us, as I said earlier, in the first place I believe from what I have seen here that this Resolution is in fact in two parts. The first is: "Be it resolved that this

House take the necessary action to ensure that the severed workers receive the money to which they are entitled without any further delay. "

The second part says: 'Be it further resolved that statutory provision be made to ensure that if Severance Pay due and owing to a worker is not paid within two months to the worker severed, interest at the rate of 8% per annum be added to the amount due and owing.

Now I believe that this first part of the Resolution is no longer necessary because it is my understanding that the workers have been paid; but what I am interested in, and what my Ministry is interested in is the second part of the Resolution to which I think we should give serious attention. We have to face facts. The employers know that they are severing workers. They know that if they sever workers they must compensate the workers for severing them. They know too that if they do not compensate the workers the workers have some redress under the Act. They know all this and yet for reason or other, employers knowing that they cannot get away with it still postpone the time. They delay and they delay. The matters go before the National Insurance Board which administers the Severance Pay.

I think that it is really unnecessary, and I think that it is important that there should be some penalty attached, and this is an interesting penalty here. It has not been studied by me and my Ministry, but it looks interesting to me and I think that some penalty should be attached; and this penalty is one of imposing an 8% per annum rate of interest on whatever monies are due and owing to the workers. It is about time.

If the workers are not getting their money promptly it is time that some penalty be attached to force employers, when they are severing workers, to pay the workers whom they have got rid of compensation because, let us face it, these workers have no employment, and this compensation is perhaps all that they have to live on. When payments are due for four, five and six months what do the employers expect the workers to live on? They must accept that if there is a reasonable sum of money to which the workers are entitled, it should be paid to them to tide over until they can get another job. My Ministry would be quite sympathetic to imposing some kind of penalty on employers if that would help the worker to get their money promptly. 3. 30 p. m.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are a number of points which have been made in this debate that I would like to take up and reply to, but before I do so I would like to indicate to you, Sir, that the Resolution as the Hon. Minister of Labour pointed out, dealt with a number of matters one of which has been settled. The other two parts state "Be it resolved that this House take the necessary action to ensure that the severed workers receive the money to which they are entitled, without any further delays; " and "Be it

further resolved that a statutory provision be made to ensure that if severance pay due and owing to a worker is not paid within two months after a worker is severed, interest at the rate of 8% per annum be added to the amount due and owing. " I think this part of the Resolution is the one which should exercise our minds at this point and time.

However, before I come back to that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to refer to some comments which were made by the hon. Member for St. Peter. It is always amusing to me, at least, to sometimes sit and listen to the hon. Member for St. Peter holding forth in his past ignorance of history and facts. Now he said in the course of his address on this Resolution that the workers referred to were suffering because of the Trade Union which represents them. Let us examine this, Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I never said that the workers were suffering because of the Trade Union which represents them. This hon. Member is not ignorant of facts, he is ignorant of honesty Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER Point made.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you were following what the hon. Member for St. Peter said - and I usually take a note whenever there are things dealing with the Trade Union movement particularly when it comes to the hon. Member because I know the hon. Member is disposed towards anything relating to the Trade Union movement; so I take particular care in taking notes of what he says.

Now there are some hon. Members who talk things and do not remember what they speak, and I suspect that this is his case. Sir, I want to remind him of a number of facts and also of some history. The very first time that the question of severance payment was raised anywhere here in Barbados by the Barbados Workers' Union. It was the Barbados Workers' Union which first introduced the concept of severance pay as far back as 1954; as a matter of fact, I think a Resolution to this effect was brought into this Honourable Chamber by the hon. Member for St. Michael West who was at the time representing the constituency of St. Peter, and it was the Trade Union Movement that sought to get severance pay into its agreements. As a matter of fact, the severance pay legislation which we have now is really an enactment of what used to obtain in agreements which the Barbados Workers' Union used to sign with employers, and there were a number of workers who were not within the scope of the agreement who were brought into this by this legislation.

So to say that it was due to the Trade Union which represents them is not in truth and in fact having a correct and an honest look at the facts and at history.

What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that it was because of the Barbados Workers' Union and

because of the foresight of the Barbados Workers' Union that provision was made for severance payment for Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

What have you risen on?

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Let me hear the point of order.

Mr. HINDS:

To object to the hon. Member saying that I did not take an honest view of what the Trade Union position was in respect of severance pay. It is imputing improper motives to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Did the hon. Member say so? May I hear you again please? May I hear the hon. Member for St. Peter again?

Mr. HINDS:

The hon. Member remarked that I did not take an honest view of the situation to which he is referring, and that is imputing improper motives to me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I do not see that as unparliamentary. (Asides.) Order please.

Mr. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the point I am making, I am sure I have made it as succinctly as I could make it. And it is on the question as to who were the people who looked after this. So that the kind of attitude and the kind of approach which the hon. Member for St. Peter has adopted in this particular matter, as I said, his sole purpose is to, whenever he gets an opportunity..... and we notice this in any debate we have

in here relating to workers, we know the trend of his argument so you can almost anticipate anything he is going to say in this particular matter.

The hon. Member for St. Peter went on to make the point about it being incumbent on the workers' representatives to be more thorough in their duty. It is because of this thoroughness that we have brought this Resolution here before this honourable Chamber, because we realize that the legislation which is now in existence contains a number of loopholes which were being, for one reason or another, taken advantage of, and we therefore felt that one of the ways of getting around these loopholes would be to ensure that some statutory provision is made to close these loopholes and to impose some penalty on employers to ensure that the loopholes are blocked and that if they for some reason or another - when they are advised one way or another how to get around the law - we would have some way of exercising some control over them, and I am sure Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you will be in agreement with some control over the employers in their attempt to get around the law, and therefore impose a considerable amount of suffering on people who are definitely in need of this kind of remuneration and indeed are in need of any reward or any monies which would be due to them as a result of the service they have put in with their employers.

Now, it would seem to me that the hon. Member for St. Peter is not aware that there is in existence a Severance Payment Act and when you have a law of this nature naturally the law operates, and we operate within the law. This is why I say the Barbados Workers' Union had severance pay in its agreements even before law was put on the Statute Book, but now that the law has been put on the Statute Book we operate within the law, so that we operate within that framework. So that the kind of binding assurance that he is talking about that we should go into, these are just words. What is a 'binding assurance' when you really examine it? It is nothing but mere words; but this is generally in keeping with his whole tenor of speeches.

I am sure that if - and I do not believe that any Trade Union in its right senses would call a strike on the basis of people not receiving their severance pay, because the workers to whom you would first have to apply this would not be working, so it would be nonsense. So when you talk about a binding assurance, this to my way of thinking, is absolute nonsense.

So we have got to look at the law, examine the areas where there are loopholes and try to stop these loopholes and try to avoid any kind of cumbersomeness which might be involved in the law.

Now I recall that on the first day that this Resolution was introduced, the hon. Minister of Communications and Works was pleading with me to withdraw the Resolution because he felt that this

was something which could be dealt with elsewhere, but as far as I am concerned I consider that it is an important Resolution; it is one which I want to ensure that the Government takes some action on, and that is why we decided that it should remain on the Order Paper.

So that I am sorry that I have to disappoint the hon. Member that we would not withdraw this Resolution but that we would put it to the vote so that we would ensure that we would get something done about it. 3. 40p. m.

I want to make a promise to the Hon. Minister of Labour that, if he needs my services to provide the draft to alter the legislation, or to add to the legislation, as the case may be, I would be quite prepared to do that.

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

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It appears that this brings us to the end of Private Members' Business. Government Business is the next Order of the Day. When the Sitting was suspended, the whole House was in Committee, and to that it now reverts.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into a Committee of the whole House. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.

RESUMPTION OF THE INTERPRETATION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

At the time of interruption the hon. Member for the City was speaking, and he may continue if he so desires.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to move an amendment to Clause 2 of this Bill. The amendment reads as

follows

Delete the words "or advertisement" appearing in lines 7 and 10 of Clause 2 and insert the word "or" between the words "statutory instrument" and "statutory document" in line 6, and insert the word "or" between the words "instrument" and "document" in line 9.

That is the amendment I propose to move, Sir.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that. We would like to have this amendment inserted in the Bill, because from what has gone on before, it would appear that this whole matter stems from the Government's unwillingness to support further Lord Thomson's newspaper. We are not particularly concerned with the Government and Lord Thomson. We are concerned with the rights of individuals. I am sure you will agree that we will appreciate anything that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister might say with regard to ensuring that there are guarantees to prevent fraudulent exercises in matters in the court pertaining to dispossessing people of their property and so on. We appreciate all of that, but we still feel that the Government is using only one eye to see the complexities surrounding a matter as great as this.

As to the Official Gazette, we have heard the Prime Minister - I thank him for the figures he has been able to bring to bear on his argument resulting from, perhaps, considerable research in the matter. However, we have to admit that the Official Gazette in itself does not reach down to every property owner. In truth and in fact, it is not available to every property owner, because enough copies are not printed to supply all property owners. There are cases in point, Mr. Chairman, where members of the business community, who would have to rely on the Official Gazette from time to time to bring important matters to their notice, find it difficult to get the Official Gazette. We are not worrying ourselves further with the accepted fact that many days on which the Official Gazette should appear it does not appear, but we are hoping and praying that this situation will be overcome. What we are really looking at is that a notice appearing in the Official Gazette in truth and in fact is a notice appearing to too limited a readership. 3. 50 p. m.

Really and truly it is only someone who has connections with the Official Gazette, who is expecting something to appear in the Official Gazette - the business sector proper -, that would get it, and I would say that there are many people in the business community who do not see or read the Official Gazette. If it is accepted by Government that the Official Gazette in itself does not carry out or offer a sufficient notice to people who have or are likely to have the kind of business which the Official Gazette caters to by its publications, we would like to know exactly what would be the position with the very unfortunate situation to which reference has been made so often touching on people's properties and other matters related thereto. It is a very serious matter and this is why we are moving that the fullest protection

possible should be given to persons who own property and who these statutory instruments and documents and notices of that kind are likely to concern.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on the amendment having spoken already on the substantive motion. I believe that the amendment provides the necessary protection for the public in circumstances where as has already been said it must be admitted that the Gazette has not got a wide circulation nor does it appear regularly, and it has not got the communicative impact of the newspapers, even the week-end press. I would want particularly to deal with the question of foreclosure again to show the problems that can arise in this aspect of legal affairs if this amendment is not accepted.

Let us assume that notice is given of a sale of a particular piece of property and that the notice is published in the Gazette. As I understand this amendment, if it is passed without the amendment suggested by the hon. Member for Bridgetown, it would mean that prima facie that constitutes notice to the world at large, and it would throw the burden of proof back on persons who were overseas and may not have seen the Gazette at all, or even in this Island who do not buy or subscribe to the Gazette to disprove the very thing that the hon. Member for St. John is so anxious to prevent from occurring in these foreclosure suits.

Let us take the question of status again, Mr. Chairman, an advertisement dealing with a substituted service of a right affecting a person in England who is married to a husband in Barbados. That advertisement is hardly likely to be drawn to that lady's attention if it occurs in the Gazette and the Gazette only, and I think that the Government is genuinely mistaken if it looks at this matter as a matter simply between the Government and Lord Thomson. Whatever may be the Government's difficulties with Lord Thomson, those difficulties are not synonymous with the wider public interest, and the wider public interest demands a wider look than looking at this as a question of whether or not you are giving Lord Thomson \$X or depriving Lord ' Thomson of \$Y. Frankly I do not think that has anything to do with this matter at 411. If you want to deal with Lord Thomson, use other methods to deal with him but beware of the proverb which says "do not cut off your nose to spoil your face. " I would suggest that the amending Bill without the amendment being suggested by the hon. Member for Bridgetown is simply cutting off our noses to spoil our faces and that mature consideration of this Matter would show that Parliament should pass proper legislation to deal with an issue of this nature.

I agree with the hon. Member for St. John who said that there are about 34 Bills where advertisements are called for, but a lot of these concern vital private interest, and not the private interest only of the big man that we are so accustomed to hear in the House, but of the small man. The whole area of land titles in this country has given us cause for concern, and during the past ten and probably fifteen years attempts have been made to use the Assistant Court of Appeal procedure in order to remedy those

defects in the absence of a composite legislation being passed by this House. I have known personally of many instances during my fifteen years of practice where, thanks to an advertisement appearing in the daily newspaper, the Advocate or the Daily News, people in the United States and indeed in some parts of this country have become aware of their rights being affected. I would again counsel this Committee and appeal to the Committee to delete those words that are being suggested by this amendment, and to put this issue on the wider ground in the public interest rather than on anything to do with Lord Thomson. I am not interested in Lord Thomson. Lord Thomson has the right to operate here. There are ways in which the Government can deal with Thomson if they have a dispute with Thomson. I believe this is the same Lord Thomson that has been welcomed by the Government in other respects and who was in partnership with the Government in other respects, and if they have fallen out, they have fallen out, but I do not believe that this legislation should be used to solve that sort of dispute. I appeal to the House to pass the amendment proposed by the hon. Member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that this Bill went to Select Committee for three months. The Opposition had ample opportunity. I do not know whose fault it is that the Select Committee did not choose to meet, and I am not going to do in this Committee what they should have done in Select Committee. It is very simple. We have a lot of anachronistic, law in Barbados which was devised for the sole and exclusive benefit of the people who used to run the legislature. I do not know any other civilised country in the world where people who have matters to be dealt with in a juridical way have to go and pay any private newspaper for the publication of a matter which is strictly a juridical matter, no matter what the nature of it may be, and one that affects that person's rights. At the same time the individual litigant or whoever he may be has no control over the unconscionable escalation of costs for newspaper advertisements, and this is what we object to. The Government really does not lose a lot of money by this, not anymore, because it is the poor litigants that have to pay, not the Registrar. We have the Official Gazette and there are over 130 statutory requirements which are published in the Gazette, but not only do the litigants have to pay the two dollars per column inch for the advertisements in the Official Gazette and \$1. 00 for subsequent notices, they have probably to pay five or six times as much for advertisements in a private newspaper, and that is what I object to. 4. 00 p. m.

Even the advertisers in Barbados who provide the greatest amount of revenue to the sole daily paper have no control over the unconscionable escalation of costs, and I see no reason why the public should be called upon to pay continued tribute to Lord Thomson or any other proprietor of such a newspaper. It is as simple as that.

I just want to say this in conclusion if you will allow me. They complain about the escalation of water rates from \$1. 50 a quarter to \$6. 00, but I have not seen the churches or the Church Lads Brigade or anybody else complaining about the escalation of costs ever since they closed down the Daily News and the other competitors in the advertising field.

The Question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES - 12.

Notes: Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY - 3.

The Question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES - 12.

Notes: Mr. W. C. B. HINDS, Mr. H. deB. FORDE and Mr. E. D. MOTTLEY - 3.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in a Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, the Bill was read a third time passed and cited as The Interpretation (Amendment) Act, 1974.

A BILL TO AMEND THE TRADE UNION ACT, 1964

Order No. 5 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that according to the correct procedure, since we are not following the Order Paper, I should move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day. I do not think that the Acting Clerk of Parliament is entitled to call Order No. 5 because it does not follow Order No. 6. I therefore beg to move that Order No. 5 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. Deputy Speaker, this is a very important matter before the House today. It may be popularly described as a measure covering the entire employment of workers in Barbados. The purpose of this legislation is to give effect to certain conventions of the International Labour Organisation.

There is convention No. 57 which deals with the freedom of association of workers and the right to organise, and Convention, No. 98 which deals with the right to organise and bargain collectively. The main principles of Convention No. 87 deals with the rights of workers and employers to establish, organisations, and subject only to the rules of the organisation concerned, to join organisations of their own choosing without any interference, or the rights of employers and workers organisations to draw up their constitutional rules and to elect their representatives in full freedom without interference from public authorities and take all necessary and appropriate measures to ensure that workers and employers

may exercise freely the right to organise. 4. 10 p. m.

Now this is Convention No. 87 of the International Labour Organization. These Conventions - the two Conventions I mentioned just now - have both been ratified by the Government of Barbados. We have been advised that it is not necessary to enact any further legislation to give effect to this Convention - that is, No. 87; the constitution already gives that right, prescribes that right, therefore it is not necessary to enact this in any further law because already the Constitution which is the supreme law of Barbados gives that right.

Now, Convention No. 98 which as I said earlier is the right to organize and collective bargaining, the purpose of this Convention is to ensure that workers enjoy adequate protection against acts of anti-union discrimination in respect of their employment; more particularly in respect of acts calculated to make the employment of a worker subject to the conditions, he shall not join or relinquish trade union membership or cause the dismissal or otherwise prejudice a worker by reason of union membership or because of participation in union activities outside working hours of the consent of the employers within working hours, and to ensure that workers in employers' organizations enjoy adequate protection against any acts of interference by each other or each other's agents or members in the establishments' functioning and organization. Sir, these are the main provisions of Section 98.

I think it is well known that this Act is indeed very timely. This amending Act goes further. As a matter of fact, in Clause 2 of the Act it exempts persons from civil process for interference with the contract of employment or with business, if that person was acting in furtherance of a trade dispute. Now that is Clause 2 of this Bill here this afternoon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it has been well known within the past few days that one employer in this country is reported to have said that he has no intention of dealing with the workers' representatives but he will deal with the workers directly. I am not saying that because he said that, he does not recognize the union, The union has means at its disposal to have its members recognized; but this Act, Sir, would prevent persons from - because of union activities - interfering with the employment of a worker. Now this employer refused to deal - certainly in the earlier stages of the dispute - with the workers; and this is not the first occasion that this has happened within the past four years, because I remember distinctly that one commercial bank in Barbados refused to - as a matter of fact I believe he put pressure on its workers to force them to relinquish their union membership when the workers of that commercial bank were putting some kind of Trade Union pressure on that Bank. Now this legislation here will deal with that.

We think that this is very important, and that is why I said earlier that it is an important bit of legislation, because one would hardly imagine that? in the year 1974 there would be employers in this country who would make this legislation necessary; but it only goes to show that one in fact cannot be really too careful in what one is doing.

The Act is a very short Act and one of the further things it is doing is tightening up on persons engaged in trade union activity, because we have seen from experience in the United Kingdom that had a similar draft for the Trade Union Act of 1964, that the provision of the Act, in fact, were not tight enough to prevent what the Act set out to prevent, from happening. Now the same thing could probably have happened in Barbados if the same judicial interpretation is placed on whatever Acts there were that occurred; and in order to prevent this we are now taking legislative action that would cover those workers who are in fact acting legitimately in the furtherance of a trade dispute.

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

Mr. E. E. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in seconding the motion I would like to make some comment on the factors surrounding the introduction of this Bill.

Now I do not think that the Bill could be more timely than it is. However, I would like to say that it has been long in coming and this is an amendment which the Barbados Workers' Union had been pressing for, for some time, and the point of time at which it has come has definitely shown up the need for legislation of this nature.

Sir, in Barbados a number of difficulties and a number of pressures are placed on workers when they seek to join a Trade Union. In some places of employment a worker has only got to mention the name of a trade union or mention trade unionism or mention the Barbados Workers' Union, and this is enough to cause him to be dismissed from the job. We do not consider that this kind of situation is one which can be tolerated and indeed which should be endured in this day and age; and this is why I say that this legislation is a welcome piece of legislation because it gives considerable amount of strength to workers who seek to organize.

We can cite a number of instances where workers have attempted to organize but unfortunately the employer being in a stronger position, could bring all kinds of pressures to bear on the workers, could

issue cheques to workers in order to keep them away from exercising what is their legitimate right.

The Hon. Minister in introducing this bit of legislation made reference to two situations which we have been experiencing, one relating to a commercial bank in Bridgetown which used subtle pressures on its employers to get them out of the Barbados Workers' Union after they had joined the Barbados Workers' Union; and we welcome the penalty Clause which has been placed in this legislation. As a matter of fact, from a personal point of view I would have liked to see the penalty even higher because there are some employers who might not mind getting a conviction and paying \$1, 000 as a result of a conviction as long as they can keep the Barbados Workers' Union or any Trade Union out of their workplace. 4. 20 p. m.

We maintain that it is the legitimate right of any employee to select a Trade Union of his choice, and to be able to exercise this very important right. We want to be sure that the fear which at present occupies the mind of a lot of employees, and particular employees who are working in a number of concerns in Barbados where management do not think it is good for their workers to associate with the other workers in the country because they feel that to do so the workers would be stepping down a peg, should be removed. We feel that this kind of fear which is injected in workers in this situation should be removed.

There are also a number of small employers on Swan Street and so on who, over the years, have exploited the workers and have used every form of subterfuge, every form of inducement, and every form of fear to prevent their workers from coming together and forming a strong bloc in order to avoid exploitation which is, obviously, taking place in that area of employment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, another area to which we would like to draw attention is the general attitude and the general approach of investors who are being lured to these shores to set up factories and to manufacture various goods. The kind of attitude and the kind of approach which they are adopting is something which is abhorrent to the Barbados Workers' Union and indeed, should be deplored by any forward-thinking and progressive person in this society. We have to make provision to ensure that if this policy is pursued, then some kind of penalty apart from the penalty which the Trade Union will impose on them when it gets the workers organised and, if necessary, call them out on strike if the occasion deserved it. We feel that some kind of statutory provision should be made to impose certain penalties on employers who behave in that manner. I indicated that we had been pressing that something should be done to give statutory effect to this convention, and I recall that it was some years now -that representation had been made to get this provision incorporated in the Trade Union Act. Coming as it does today and, particularly, with the kind of attitude which we see is being adopted as well as the pressures which are being brought to bear on people and the kind of inducements which are being offered to keep people away from the Trade Union Movement, we think this is a welcome piece of

legislation.

I would, therefore, like to second the motion.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is going to demonstrate the hypocrisy that you have been seeing demonstrated here a couple of weeks ago, and I intend to expose the hypocrisy. Earlier today you had an example of some of it. The Trade Union Movement, by innuendo, was attacked for not taking any stand, or taking things easy, regarding the Severance Payment Act. We do not have to wonder too much about that, because there are some people who live and trade by those methods. What we have been able to see is that the methods that have been employed by some of these employers are coming to light in an international manner.

I am glad that the Prime Minister is in here today, because 'some of the Members on the opposite side, when they have nothing to say, talk about the union. During the constitutional changes debate, again, by innuendo, they tried to associate the Barbados Workers' Union with some inaction in this matter as a result of some proposed legislation. Well, I am going to deal with them today. It is the persons who make up the Opposition that form the greatest danger to this society. I can prove why they form the greatest danger to this society. They will get on a public platform and make the most damaging statements about the total integrity of this country to the world. They say that the country has no money; the Government or anybody associated with the Government has no integrity or morality, and in the same breath they will underwrite some of the actions of some of the most rapacious type of employers you can find.

Now, the Chase Manhattan Bank is controlled by the Rockefeller family. He is now one of the Vice-Presidents of the United States of America. I have had my say already openly. Now, if the Prime Minister of this country had been involved in what the President of the United States had been involved in, and one of us had asked for a pardon, I do not know what I would hear from the other side. This legislation is bringing to light several things for the Prime Minister and his Government to see.

Yesterday morning I heard over the radio that the Nixon administration had spent \$11 million to overthrow President Allende in Chile. It was not used only by the Central Intelligence Agency, but by the I. T. & T. which was one of the big international conglomerates. It was brought out in evidence that this was one of the institutions that had been used. We have some of those offshoots in Barbados, and the employers over there will go into the court and represent them fiercely against the workers. We are now in a battle with one of them. Whether it is Standard Memories or Dynamics "- they only have to fix

a name in Barbados and the name has no relationship with anything other than in Barbados. What do you find in Barbados? If laws like these are not passed to take care of this type of foreign investment - it is not an ordinary investment; it is a satellite investment - the Government will only realise the problem when something happens. They are not doing something to help the Trade Union, but the workers must have their freedom. When they encompass so many workers in a plant, or in an area, the Government then becomes afraid, because if the workers have to leave - if they have 10, 000 workers employed and they control the 10, 000 workers, then the Government becomes very sensitive to any of them leaving. That is one of the areas where some of these people even try to control the Government by those methods. They have done it in Latin America. One of the results of these Trade Union repressions is the kind of guerrilla organisations that they have left behind them. When people cannot fight you four-square and openly, then they are forced to go underground. I do not intend to go underground in the land of my birth; I intend to fight on the level.

Sir, I feel that these amendments do not go as far as I would like to go. The time has come in Barbados when there should not only be the right to join a Trade Union, but it should be made mandatory that when an agreement is made on, behalf on the Trade Union, in the same way as the Bar Association has passed an Act that you cannot practise unless you are a member of the Bar Association, then there must be a law in Barbados that when an agreement is made on behalf of the people who form part of that agreement that the agreement should apply to everybody, and those people must become members of the organisation which signed the agreement as is done in small Antigua where they have just passed legislation for an agency shop. 4, 30 p. m.

You have the Agency Shop where there is no question of if there is an agreement by law. Mr. Walter got in, they fought it and Mr. Bird on the other side took an opposite view and lost, and therefore you have to understand that this is one of the modern concepts. The Trade Union is not a pressure group in any hyphenated language. A Trade Union is part of the institutional life of a country if you are talking about industrialisation and modern concepts. You must have them. People must have the freedom to join an organisation of their choice. You may have cases where, as in our country, you exclude some people like the Police and Fire Service, but in other countries they are members of a Trade Union; you give them the freedom to join their own organisation because in a small community we have not been fully emancipated to the concept that these are people who will be able to handle their affairs, but there can be no question in my mind about what is happening.

With all due respect to courts all over the world, judges have made some of the worst decisions about the Trade Union Movement all down the ages and in Great Britain where they have been known for - the preservation of law, order and justice, the Rootes Bernard's case is the most recent where a judge peeped through the window and bent over backwards and sideways to find an interpretation though the Act was quite clear there from since 1906, nearly 70 years. You find that a judge is going to look over and say that a contract of employment is different from a contract because you had a contract with B. O. A. C. not to strike, and the injunction that was brought against the Trade Union showed that that contract was

broken, and therefore they had to change the law in Great Britain, and it is not a contract of employment anymore, but a contract. So you have a strike and because you may stop a man who is a bread vendor selling bread maybe independently, they bring a case against you because he had no contract of employment with the person, he was an independent contractor, and therefore it means that by stopping the bread cart on its way, that is an infringement, and up to the courts you go and the judges only have to give you one cuff as in die United Kingdom where the Transport and General Workers¹ Union had to pay 155, 000.

In Barbados they tried to hit the Barbados Workers' Union so that it would become a memory. All over die world judges put on some severe penalties when they want to deal with you. Two weeks ago I showed the hon. Member for Christ Church West a book written by Pritt and I told him he should read it. In that he would see that even now the law on conspiracy is still on the Statute Book, and we are not asking for an amendment to that. That is why I say I am not afraid I am a Trade Unionist because they can still get me for conspiracy, because I do not have to prove what I have to do. The hon. Member for Christ Church West knows very well that on one occasion he was advising the Union on a Trade Union matter, and he advised me not to take a certain action, but I refused to take his advice. He told me I would be sued for false imprisonment if I closed the door of the building, I said that far from closing the door I would set a fire underneath if that is the only way to get them out, and I succeeded, they are out today, and that building is now known as Unity House. You have to take a stand in these things. I am not vexed with the hon. Member; it would have been improper for him to have advised me otherwise. He gave sound legal advice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no statute law which compels an employer to employ any person. An employer can terminate the employment at any time, and the only thing that can force the employer to do otherwise is the unity of the workers themselves. We want to make it clear that we regard the unity of the workers as supreme We are not going to say that the Constitution of the Union is supreme; we regard the unity of the workers as supreme because when it is not there, everything is lacking.

This amendment, Sir, is to bring into focus what is taking place at the present moment. Rt. Hon. Prime Minister spoke about the newspapers. I have finished with the newspapers for many years and when we used them for any purpose, we; pay. We pay to allow them to publish what we say, so that if they change it, we will say they would have to discount it because they too would have broken the contract You will remember the famous May Day on which I had to tear up an Advocate-News as a demonstration of how useless it was.

Now we in the Trade Union in Barbados take our orders here, not from London, and the newspapers have not done ? job on behalf of the country to show why these Acts should be changed. All they have tried to do is to denigrate the worker and make everybody believe that the worker is a lazy man, aided

and abetted by some of the Members of the Opposition who believe that the Trade Union is a lamp that you blow out when you want to go to bed. They have been fighting a vain and hopeless battle against what is part of the will of the people.

There are a lot of reservations that we in the Trade Union have about things here, not on a personal basis, not on a narrow partisan basis, but on a national basis. We are satisfied that the stand we are taking against these employers is a national stand. We support jobs, we support employment, but we realise because we listen to them, we hear them and we are aware that what they are saying to us is that when they get enough power what they say to the workers, they will say to the Government also because they would get the Government in the position they want. They are arrogant and haughty and feel that they can come here with a new type of colonialism. There was a political colonialism, but now there is an economic colonialism that they want to exploit, and it is here that we have the problem. We have dealt with nearly all the local people, but it is the imported ones, that we have to deal with. I remember in a strike reading the newspapers, and I have them here, and they were speaking in terms of food and the consumer as if the workers do not eat food and are not consumers. 4. 40 pan.

The workers are the biggest consumers in Barbados. The workers are the biggest taxpayers in Barbados. The workers eat the most food in Barbados. Progress rotates around the workers. It is on this basis that this amendment is very vital to the future of Barbados. It does not go far enough for me because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have passed the stage of having to rely even on conventions from the ILO; because this convention of the ILO was passed in 1949, 25 years ago, and I am not coming now to underwrite legislation of 20 years ago. We are more modern than this.

Twenty five years ago this was done because it was rampant in Europe. Quickly after the end of the last war it was necessary to underwrite again the democracy they fought for, and the European countries felt let us put this now in a convention so that pur stamp of approval for the fight that we had would be there.

But, Sir, we in Barbados waited a long time. I would say that the last real amendment to the Trade Union legislation was in 1964 which was 10 years after. I remember a gentleman from the other side, but not one of those gentlemen nowhere, protesting peaceful picketing at or near the home where the person resides - a Minister of Labour. I do not want to describe it. I do not even regard it as an unusual performance where a Minister of Labour in a country like ours protested and called it obnoxious legislation to introduce peaceful picketing at or near your home.

I do not worry normally about that. All the Ministers of Labour in the Caribbean have been giving

themselves new authority. They have formed Councils of Ministers. Unfortunately the Permanent Secretaries in the Ministry of Labour seem to believe that one of the main functions of these Councils of Ministers in the area is to set out now on a new civilising of the workers and they want to impose a new type of legislation which is going to restrict the activities of the workers. But instead of restriction, that will lead to explosion.

I have visited all the Caribbean Islands, and the smaller ones. I do not like to use the term "smaller" in the sense that we are larger, but I am concerned about my brethren in the Windward and Leeward Islands because they do not have the economic and financial inputs both in personnel and material resources to withstand what is going to be inevitable if those countries are allowed to be the hunting ground of the new type of employers that we mature.

I say as a socialist that we do not have to make any excuses for saying to an employer that the worker has a right - it is not a privilege has a right to join an organisation of his choice, and this must come without any question. Therefore, after that there is the question of how a man behaves. It does not give him any more right than that. It does not give him any right to misconduct himself. It does not give him any right to fight on his job. It does not give him any right not to do his job. All that it gives him is the right to join an organisation, and that organisation will have the right to negotiate on his behalf.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if the Trade Union movement in Barbados wanted to show irresponsibility, when you are talking about a strike there could have been a strike on the docks of this country three weeks ago. The Union has been negotiating with the dockers of this country since May. May, June, July, August and September - four months. We could have called a strike quite easily as a rejection of what the employers want to do; because it is the most silly thing that we came across where employers make an agreement with the workers, but now the employers would like the officials of the Union to rescind the agreement surreptitiously and want us to remove him from the embarrassment he claims that he is now suffering. The Union said no. We will not be a party to that.

We could call a strike if we were irresponsible; but we do not call a strike for the sake of calling a strike, because the members of the Opposition cannot call one. They cannot make the workers work when we say that they are not to work. We know that, but I do not have to do any idle boasting. It is only that we do not want to see bloodshed but if someone wants to organise a fight, you bring in your troops if you are like Jamaica.

I went to Jamaica in 1945 and when I came from my hotel, a man met me at the door with a club nearly a yard long and told me that he was my officer. He lined up alongside of me, guarding me until I

got to the place where I was going; because this was a PNP man and therefore if a BITU man met me, well trouble in town. We cannot operate in that sort of jungle warfare business that you cannot walk across Water Street or King Street, and if you get across the boundary line there is trouble. That is how our landships carry on their internal movements by saying that you come out of territorial waters if you come out of Britton's Hill and you want to go down in Chapman Lane; therefore if you come out of territorial waters you have to turn back or trouble is on.

We do not operate on that basis. If you organise your demonstration or protest march, at least let it be seen that you have people who are sensible enough or foolish enough to follow you. We are not going to call a national work stoppage. You do not call for a national work stoppage and then cannot even get a pipe to stop because it shows what influence you have. The national work stoppage at least must show that you can get some of the people to stop working so that this is a protest; but we do not subscribe to the idea that a strike itself is an answer to the problems.

Strikes are blood letting. They can be very vicious. They can lead to a lot of bitterness, and for that reason the Union regards the emphasis of dealing with those areas before you reach a strike. We have in Barbados a record for industrial peace which can be compared with any in any part of the world, and moreover it is only in extreme cases, low wage cases, where there have been strikes. Very rarely will you get people who are better paid and who have better conditions of employment going on strike or the Union being forced to call a strike.

As far as this Bill is concerned, the Union in accepting these amendments does so to avoid what would be regarded as strife; but I have Stated at the beginning that I am conscious of what is happening and what has happened in Latin America, and I feel that all members of Parliament - this has nothing to do with the Trade Union - must understand that the workers of Barbados are Barbadians, and if you allow any one to come here and deny them the right to live in their own country in the manner in which they have a right to live, then we are not truly the people's representatives. That is fundamental because sooner or later these same people will take a turn on the Ministers.

Some people believe that until you offend a Minister you are all right. I went to a place one day and the man asked me if I am a Minister. I do not know how a Minister looks or how I looked in his eyes. I said I am not any Minister, I am not even a Deacon. I am the General Secretary of the Union, and I told him that I came about the women that he had stopped from working. I told him that unless he was prepared to take them back everybody would be outside; and in less than five minutes everybody was outside.

He started to call for the police. I told him that I would give him the Police telephone number at Hastings and that I knew the name of the Sargeant, because the police never work so easy as when they come around Trade Union strikes, because all they do is to come around and see what is going on. There is no fuss. We do not get on with this type of behaviour. A strike has been on for the last week and you have not heard that a factory was burned down or anybody's hand taken off. You have not heard of any threat against the man where he lives; but what you will find is the intimidation which takes place, 4. 50 p. m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member has two minutes more.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Yes, Sir. And the two minutes I will spend in saying to the Members of this House that we are very disturbed about the attitude of some of these employers to the people. We have barristers on both sides - or Attorneys-at-law - it is stupid for a man to say that you are going to meet the people, you are going to talk to the people but you are not going to talk to the people's representatives. You would not be talking to the people then, because it is just like if you go to court and the judge says 'I want to hear the litigants, I do not want to hear any Attorneys-at-law in here'. People must have the right to have their representatives without anybody saying who those representative should be.

This is where we want to get through to these people, and we hope that with the passing of this law and with the threats that they make that they will withdraw, all I would say to the authorities, whether they be the IDG or the Ministry of Trade, let the people who come here, know that we welcome them; we look forward to their coming but we expect them to treat us with dignity and respect, and they will get the utmost cooperation from this whole nation.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, most of the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member for St. Michael West are sentiments with which I could say that Members on both sides of the House would agree, even if not entirely.

We have been saying on this side of the House during the period of time that the Member for St. Michael West was not with us - I remember when I came to this Chamber in 1969 there was a very lively debate on the Shops Act - the Regulations or something like that, of the Shops Act - and this party took a very firm stand then on the question of the investors coming to Barbados and investing in Barbados. I believe that at that time, the hon. Member who just spoke was a Member of the Barbados

Industrial Development Corporation; and what he has said today is identical to the stand taken by the Barbados Labour Party, that no investor, foreign capitalist coming to Barbados should be allowed to come here unless it was made absolutely clear to him that a condition of his coming to invest in Barbados is that he must recognize the right of the workers to organize and to belong to the Trade Unions. This is something, Sir, that we said in 1969 when I came here. I myself said it; and I remember that during that debate when we took the Government to task on the question of advertising at the time in the New York Times the fact that there was cheap labour in Barbados, we said then it would have serious repercussions here because advertisements such as that would not help the workers in Barbados, because if you advertise in that sort of fashion, then the investors coming here get peculiar attitudes towards the workers and believe that the workers are here to be exploited at the mercies of these foreign investors.

So I would agree with the honourable Member for St. Lucy that perhaps there should be legislation covering this aspect of it, that the workers here, and particularly where foreign capitalists are coming from outside to invest in Barbados, that it should be made absolutely clear to them that the workers in this country have the right to join any association and the right to be represented by any workers' organisation. I think, Sir, that at that time it was a question of International Scientific Limited and problems which arose at that industry, that were being debated.

It is significant again to hear a statement attributed to the honourable Member for St. Michael West in his other capacity on one of the news media when he said it is the right of the workers to belong to an association - the right of the workers is more important than the job itself. Again, Sir, this is something which on this side of the House the Barbados Labour Party during the campaign in the last election, prior to the election, and, all through we were saying. That is why at the time the party was very critical of statements made to the effect that cheap labour is better than no labour at all, because when you make statements like this, it reflects adversely on the workers in this country.

Now, Sir, the honourable Member for St. Michael West has said that certain investors when confronted with the right of workers to organize, they want to withdraw from this country. I think that the whole relationship between the persons coming to invest - foreign capitalists investing in Barbados - and the Government is one that needs to be reviewed, because the time has come when the Government must not allow itself to be put in a position where it can be blackmailed. It is significant to hear the Minister of Trade at this stage, some ten months after the Leader of the Opposition had said so in the House, the Minister of Trade now appreciates the difficulty in which the Government finds itself as regards the monopoly which it granted to Mobil. He now realises the difficulty when he says that the conduct of Mobil leaves a lot to be desired - or words to that effect. But, it suggests that the conduct of Mobil was such that it was trying, because of its monopoly in regards the petroleum in Barbados, to blackmail the Government and trying to get higher prices out of the Government; but this is so in respect of many other things.

You are going to see it sooner or later in respect of the Pine Hill Dairy and its operation with the milk produce in Barbados. That is only in passing. But when you relate it back now to the foreign capitalists here threatening to withdraw from Barbados if they have to recognize the workers, that is a situation that should not be allowed to even exist at all, because you should not get to the situation where somebody can come into Barbados and then can say 'if I have to recognize die unions I am going to leave Barbados' "That is the situation which should not be allowed to exist at all. It should not reach that stage where they can say 'if I have to recognize you I am going to withdraw, ' because recognition should be a fundamental prerequisite to the granting by the Minister, as in the case of the Trade dispute which the workers in this country now have- I think that this is one of the industries that were approved in the year 1971 under the Industrial Development Export Industries Act, 1969 - and it came to this country in 1971, but as recently as 1971, there was a company coming to Barbados and it was allowed to establish operations without at th6 same time being made clear to them that a prerequisite to their being allowed to come here is that they recognize the workers' representatives. 5vOO p. m.

The Minister concerned has the right to grant approved status, or to withhold it. I daresay that one of the factors that the Minister should take into consideration is the unwillingness of the foreign investor to recognise the right of the workers of this country to organise and to have workers' representation. You have a situation now where the Government can be confronted with the fact and be told that, if we have to recognise so and so, we may have to go. As I have said, this leads to a new relationship between the Government and these foreign capitalists. It may very well be that the Government would see it fit in future that people coming here to invest should be allowed to come if they so desire, but they should come on the terms that this Government sees fit and not on the terms that they want to dictate from outside.

As the Member for St. Michael West has said, we are concerned, as representatives of the people, with the rights of the workers, therefore the Government should lay down quite clearly for these people the terms on which they would be allowed to come to Barbados to operate here. They may well feel that the time is coming when the Government, without actually contributing money, or taking shares in any investment, may see it fit to have a nominee appointed to the Boards to ensure that a company is operating in die interests of Barbados and not purely in the interests of die company itself. I think that we, on this side of the House, support this legislation, and I just made those comments by way of passing.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, my contribution to this amendment is one in which I share the sentiments of the honourable Member for St. Michael West. (Asides) I am unlike you; I am not always right; I share the sentiments from the point of view that I have always been one of the people, regardless of which political party I am in, who see the rights of die people first, I have always been that way. I am nothing

to do with the days of the Barbados Workers' Union and the struggle they had with the Barbados Labour Party, or what struggle they may be having now with the Democratic Labour Party. I see the Union as a body of people coming together for the salvation of one and all. That is how I see it.

Sir, I was very depressed when I read in the newspaper on Sunday that the Member for St. Michael West, in his capacity as Secretary of the Trade Union, made a statement to the effect - he says that he pays, but maybe he did not pay for this one, or he may have been misquoted - that he does not know who are the people, or the person or persons, inviting these people to Barbados. I would like to say now that this is the Government of Barbados of which the Member, in the capacity of Secretary of the Trade Union, who are inviting these people to Barbados. If he does not know who are inviting the people to Barbados, then I can tell him that the Government is inviting them. I was very depressed when I read a statement of that nature coming from the honourable Member for St. Michael West. I know that he is a clever boxer, but he cannot box his way out of this. Only this evening the Member for St. Michael West said in this Chamber that he has to pay to make sure that they do not say anything wrong otherwise they will discount it. On Sunday he wanted to know who are the persons that invited these people to Barbados to exploit the workers of this country.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. Member should not be talking about they. I was speaking in relation to the media I was using. I said that we pay them for their advertisements to make sure that we can have them discount the errors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Point of explanation made.

Mr. CRAIG:

I understand that is what you are saying. What I am dealing with is, that you did not pay for that one on Saturday. It is the Government of Barbados - I. D. C. - which Senator Branford Taitt formerly directed when he was in New York. He was the one who used to go around and invite the people to come to Barbados. He used to have seminars showing them how good the climate is; the literacy rate; the low wages and all of these things before they came to Barbados. After they came to Barbados, they realised that they had been confronted with a bull. That is what has happened to the people. They came here knowing that the wages were low; the people were intelligent; there was a high productivity and low wages, so they decided to come over merely to find that they now have to deal with the Trade Union boss. In the circumstances, you must have these problems of conflict of interests. That is why I am always talking about conflict of interests.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is how I always feel, regardless of how the Member for St. Michael West feels. Though he may be in this Chamber and will make a contribution, it is regrettable that he has to sit in this Chamber, I believe that he will be a more effective force outside of this Chamber than in the Chamber. I am not concerned with the political party of which he is a member. I have divorced my thoughts from that. He was a member of the Barbados Labour Party and they were responsible for the union; they tried their best; he came along in his time as Secretary and made it a more militant force, but this is progress. You move from strength to strength. Whether he had to burn out the old fogies or not, he has succeeded. We sit in here on both sides as members of a community, or leaders of a community, to see that the needs of the workers and the rights of the workers are well protected.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not only in the garment industry that you are having problems. Some of the biggest criminals in this country are the Jews and the Syrians. Right now in Swan Street, under the nose of the Union, you will find people exploiting the workers. You will find some of them along Baxter's Road. They are the criminals, and not only the people in the garment industry. I would not expect the Member for St. Michael West to come here and say, at this stage, in his life, that he cannot get those workers organised. I cannot expect that. Do not say that you cannot get them organised. You had enough time; you had everything at your disposal; you had the might of the Government and the might of the Trade Union at your disposal, but under your nose you have the exploitation of the workers.

My view, Sir, is that until Government set about to have a minimum wage for all categories of workers in this country we are going to have this problem all the time. You cannot afford to pay a worker \$18 or \$20 a week and sometimes \$16 a week. Some days they come to work and are sent back home. If you go to Elizabeth Park you will find a number of St. Lucians working for \$18 and \$20 a week. The Syrians and Jews are paying the workers such low wages. Sometimes I hear the other side talk about the Chamber of Commerce. Sometimes I wonder whether the Barbados Labour Party does not put a case well enough. We hear about the Big Six and the Chamber of Commerce. We have always been tagged to the Chamber of Commerce, but the present Government can say that they are tagged to the Syrians and the Jews. They are the worst vagabonds that ever came to this country. They are tagged to the Democratic Labour Party, Sir. They are the people who exploit the workers in this country. Go through the garment industry at Grazettes, in the Pine, and down at the Deep Water Harbour, and you will see Hasson, Moses and so on. I do not see any Walcotts or Fergussons. You see the Israelites, Jews and that gang. When you look at the Democratic Labour Party's passports and membership cards, you will find in the same Democratic Labour Party Abed going to receive his passport. That is the whole problem. You cannot serve two masters at the same time. When you have Bernstein and so on in one front row, you will have to look for trouble. 5. 10 p. m.

They go to Trinidad and rent a house and they pay the owner of the house five months' rent to get out the little tenant. They use their money to push people around, and in Barbados that is exactly what is happening. I am glad to hear the hon. Member for St. Michael West speak in that vein, but I cannot

accept the fact that when the hon. Member for St.. Michael West is responsible for them coming into Barbados. You cannot answer that question. This was reported in the press.

Mr. WALCOTT:

I do not know what the hon. Member is talking about. How am I responsible? I was never in charge of the Immigration Department. How is the Union responsible for bringing people into the Island?

Mr. CRAIG:

You invited them to Barbados to set up industries. I am ashamed to think that a man who sat at United Nations between some class Would try to get away with these sly, slippery remarks. How do you mean you do not know? The Government of which he is a member is responsible. They are in charge of Immigration. I am not saying that the Trade Union has to go to Seawell Airport and stamp the passports to see if Doc key Doyle is coming in or going out. It is the policy of the Government to encourage foreign investors into Barbados, and when these investors come in they pay low wages, create bad conditions, and it is the Union that has to rectify this, and I brought a classic example that right in Swan Street you still have young girls working by the day for \$18 and \$20 a week. A proper minimum wage Bill is the only answer to that, no matter how much the Union fights. I remember there used to be a saying that the merchants have the money and the Union has the men; now the Union has the men and the money, and I do not expect to see a Bill of that nature coming from that side of the House. I do not agree with the hon. Member talking about exploitation of the workers of this country, and it is his duty and the Principal of the College to rectify this, and with eighteen seats on that side, he should not be saying anything about this, this evening at all.

Mr. FORDE:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, let me begin by assuring the hon. Member for St. Michael West that contrary to some of his fears, all six Members that constitute Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition support this Bill. Let me also assure the hon. Member that some of his great defenders lie on this side. Let me also assure the hon. Member that the Barbados Labour Party as he very well knows has fought alongside him before in defence of the rights of the workers and will fight alongside him again in defence of the rights of the workers. Let me also assure him that in Barbados today I doubt whether any of the existing political parties will ever consider that they can ride rough-shod over the rights of the workers. That myth has been put aside in the struggle which went on from the Thirties, even pre-dating the foundation of the Barbados Progressive League, from 1933 right up they have fought strenuously with the hon. Member for St. Michael West, the hon. Member for Christ Church East, the late hon. Member for St.. Joseph, Sir Grantley Adams, the former hon. Member for St. George, Mr. Hugh Springer, and the latter day saints as sometimes used for various constituencies including the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central.

I have to get this clear because no matter how much we may vary - let us face it there is a variance of political power in this country - the hon. Member must know that if the Opposition were the Government, the Opposition would be committing political suicide if they thought they could ride rough

shod over the Union and did not involve the Union at every stage of National Government, and that is why when I see a very good speech as the hon. Member is capable of making, I sometimes recognise that like me he occasionally has a little rush of blood to the head on things, like a red flag to a bull, and certainly he has had some great difficulties with the Barbados Labour Party. I believe that the time has come for that to be forgotten. That is past history. I recall very well the takeover of the building in Roebuck Street. I will say that I thought I give the correct legal advice, but I was taken by the courageous stand then taken by the hon. Member. The sequel to that is that eventually I came in and compromised the situation, and all is well that ends well. I am not going into the history of Unity House.

What I want to say on this Bill is that I think that as Barbadians we should be very concerned that it takes us such a long time to pass progressive legislation. I heard the Hon. Minister of Labour say that this is one of the greatest Acts being put on the Statute Book and that it is a great day in the history of the Trade Union. (Asides) He said that it was an important bit of legislation in the history of the Trade Union. Let me state that it should not have taken this long. These amendments and almost the wording of the amendments come straight from the United Kingdom legislation. It has been there for a long time, and why Government does not take a much more pressing look at the necessity to update the whole field of labour legislation, I cannot understand. Certainly by now it should have the personnel to do this, and I am deeply concerned when every time the Trade Union has to waste its strength in fighting for what should be an undoubted right of recognition in this country, and yet today on the Statute Book of Barbados there is no law which places an obligation on any employer to recognise a Union that has a majority of workers in that establishment. I do not believe that you cannot have in fifteen years of Barbados Labour Party rule and then fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party rule people who are dedicated to socialist principles and who do not put first things first.

I think that it is a waste of the workers' time that they have to be called out on each occasion to demonstrate to somebody like the Standard Memories Ltd. that the Union now represents the majority of workers and that they have an undoubted right to be recognised as the bargaining agent.

I want to talk a bit about the role of lawyers because I think sometimes our role is misunderstood in this House, and mention was made of it in this debate. A lawyer is no different from a shopkeeper or indeed from an undertaker or indeed from a Priest. We sell our services to whoever comes to us and just like the undertaker buries the good and the bad, we represent the good and the bad regardless of whether on moral grounds we support the stand they take. 5. 20 p. m.

Contrary to what the hon. Member thinks, today it is not true that the new industrialists are represented by Opposition lawyers. That is not true at all, because part of the impact of the multi-national, the very fear which he has, has been that it comes in and takes up a political stand and subverts the political party in power regardless of whether it is the hon. Member's party or ours.

I would like some time, if the hon. Member has a chance, in conversation to show him the trend which has occurred in Barbados today where the choice of lawyers, if you like, or the choice of political parties is not being made on the basis of belief or conscience in whether they are good or bad, but on the basis of experience.

The hon. Member for St. James talked about a lot of people who have jumped on the band wagon. I in my short years of politics have had the experience of members, particularly the mercantile members and the members of the industrial sector wanting to assure both the Government and the Opposition that they are supporting them, and indeed in the industrial sector particularly today, you are getting this two faced approach in order to divide and rule.

I would like to tell the Democratic Labour Party that they are making a sad mistake if they assume that every member of the party who carries a passport genuinely believes in the philosophy of the party. One of the things that greatly concerns me, because I was born here and I expect to die here, is that we should allow multinational corporations to use every device to divert from us the benefits which should accrue, especially to those in the lower segments of our community.

This amendment does not go far enough. I want to hear from the Minister when he is going to introduce legislation dealing with the question of unfair dismissals. We should put an end to the system whereby we can give a man the relevant amount of notice and get rid of him, not with severance compensation, even although you know that there are no disciplinary reasons on the basis of his performance on the job. There is only one way that you can rectify this situation. It must be by legislation.

I have had the experience of advising an industrialist. I told him that it was his duty to recognise the Union. He thanked me, and promptly paid me and left. He did not last long in Barbados because he came up against the full impact of the strength of workers, unity. Yet, in these troubles, workers have to lose days of work, and productivity suffers only to prove a point that should be as clear as ABC.

There is no justification for the delay in bringing down this legislation. The Ministry of Labour has had a new Minister now for at least three years and I do not believe that the Government should pat itself on the back where this matter is concerned, when it has taken it so long to do so little in this field of the National life.

There is no great distinction between the political parties on this subject of safeguarding the workers' rights. The point remains that when it comes to the basic right of the working class man all of us are from working class families - well almost everyone of us, not all of us. I think that the hon. Member for St. John came from a middle class family. I think that all the others of us in here came out of a working class family including myself.

The Leader of the Opposition is middle class in the second generation, but his father was working class. This is so. Unfortunately this is what happened. Hon. Members move into brackets. They earn more money, they get classified, and this is not said in any sneering way, but I want to make that point clear.

The former Leader of the Opposition was frequently told that his father belonged to the plantocracy and I think that he shares that in common with the Member for St. John. They both came from the same background, but that does not detract - I want to make this clear because I am not making a sneering speech. That does not detract from my assessment of the interest which the former Leader of the Opposition or the present Leader of the Opposition or indeed the hon. Member for St. John have shown in working class rights.

Indeed in many instances they have shown more forthrightness in defending working class rights at times than you have found from the people who belong to the working class themselves. What I am saying is that I think today in Barbados it is a recognisable fact that both political parties will support any legislation like this which gives adequate protection to legitimate workers' rights and particularly workers' representation.

This is what this Bill does. We share the same regrets that we do not have composite legislation to deal with other areas in which the Trade Union needs protection. Not because the Trade Union has not got the strength in numbers or de facto to make its force felt and get its point, but we believe that the workers should not have to waste their energy, their money and their time at this stage of the game in fighting for certain areas of legislation that should be obvious.

There are many precedents, and I appeal to the Government to use these precedents readily and fight in this area as soon as possible. On peaceful picketing, I recall very well an hon. Member of this House having reservations about peaceful picketing. It was the then senior Member for Bridgetown, and when I

made a speech on this matter as a panelist at the Union, he took me myself to task on the issue. He felt the matter was an issue of conscience.

Peaceful picketing legislation was passed by this Government and indeed it is a valid and proper piece of legislation, and it has been used very sensibly. Even in the last set of disputes that went on in the hotel industry here, tempers were frayed, and everything was not done as well as I think the Union would have liked it to be done or the employers; but by and large I can still say that Barbados came out of that dispute not sullyng the name of the workers for proper industrial practice or indeed courage in the face of what they considered to be a legitimate grievance.

I know that some employers wanted to resort to court action. Some of them were advised out of court action. Some of them actually took court action, I believe. Some of them thought that, although the law should be referred to, if you told them that it would have been stupid to pursue that action you were being a traitor as a lawyer. That is what we lawyers face at times in advising. 5. 30p. m.

I assure the hon. Member that these hang-ups about lawyers are not fair. A Priest can go into the prison and bless and commit a murderer; nobody gets annoyed about that. A doctor could come along by the way side and rescue a rapist; nobody gets annoyed about that. A shopkeeper can sell to a man who has just burgled a house and raped an innocent child; nothing is said about that. But the moment any lawyer represents a client, no matter how honestly he does so, he is being castigated as being on a particular side. I think that this must stop. He does his job. It is where the lawyer takes his own independent stand, in my view, on an opinion that could be criticised, that then one could say, castigate lawyers in this way.

I am satisfied that if you talk to most of the lawyers, regardless of the political parties to which they belong in this country, you will find that the majority of them - I am not saying all; certainly the young attorneys-at-law and certainly those who have come back here in the fifties and in the sixties and some of the forties - strongly support progressive labour legislation.

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

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

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

Committee on this Bill.

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 1 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

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

Hon. A. MORRISON:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I have to move some amendments to Clause 2. They have already been circulated, and I move that all the words appearing in sub-clause 1, Clause 2 immediately after the word "8A" be deleted and that these words be substituted therefore (A) which is in parenthesis. Delete subsection 1 of that section and substitute the following (1) an act done after the commencement of the Trade Union (Amendment) Act, 1974 by a person in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute shall not be actionable in tort on that ground only (a) that it induces another person to break a contract to which that other person is a party or prevents another person from performing such a contract; or (b) that it consists in his threatening, (i), that a contract - and in parenthesis the words (whether one to which he is a party or not) will be broken or will be prevented from being performed, or (ii) - Roman letters - that he will

induce another person to break a contract to which that other person is a party or will prevent another person from performing such a contract, or be capable of giving rise to an action of reparation on any such ground only.

And in subclause 2 of that same clause, delete the word "Act" beginning with a Capital A appearing in line one of that subclause, and substituting the word "act" appearing with a common a, and then insert the word "act" with a And in line three of that same subclause delete the words "this Act" and there insert the words "The Trade Union (Amendment) - the word "Amendment" is in brackets - at 1974. And in lines 8 and 9 of this same subclause delete the words "the commencement of this Act" and there insert the words "such commencement".

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that, and in doing so, I think that this is a very important amendment that we are dealing with and it replaces some of the wording in the Clause there, because as I said earlier, this is where we found that in the Rouche Bernard case, the judges went against the union.

Mr. Chairman, you know it is amazing sometimes when you have to look at these things. The hon. Member for St. James in the Second Reading was talking about conflict of interest, but I would not take him up on that because I believe this was a word that they like pelting about, just like you throw about stones. But I am not going to deal with the hon. Member in here on these words "a conflict of interest". I have something that I will deal with the hon. Member on, and I promise the hon. Member that I will deal with him on a political platform. This audience is too small; therefore I am not going to deal with him. I do not want to deal with him in here because I am going to challenge the hon. Member. It is not going to be any conflict of interest, it is going to be a statement of fact that I am going to be dealing with.

Mr. Chairman, only an idiot dealing with the Trade Union Act could tell somebody who is a Trade Unionist in here that you have a conflict of interest. When the former leader of that party was the President of a Trade Union - he is the only President of two Trade Unions. He died as the President of something we have here - the report of the Registrar of Trade Unions records the Barbados Sugar and General Workers' Union - and all of them who have their names on it should be locked up for the people's money. Now they have the effrontery to talk about a conflict of interest when they have actually fraudulently used money belonging to people, that they cannot account for. And then you get these statements being used about people whose whole life is one that can stand any scrutiny. He is now talking about a conflict of interest.

Now why should there be a conflict of interest? Ernest Bevin had a conflict of interest because he was

Foreign Secretary but he was also the Trade Unionist - he was one of the greatest Trade Unionist in the United Kingdom in this century.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. It is immaterial to me whether the hon. Member takes offence or not. What I did say was that the hon. Member, to my mind would have been in a better position outside of Parliament because he has a contribution to make where he can stand firmly and where he can be on firm ground, rather than being a Member of a political party inside of Parliament in fear of being a conflict of interest. That is all I said. 5. 40p. m.

I am not saying that there is any conflict of interests, or money carried away, or anything like that. It is immaterial to me whether he deals with me on a platform. It is never a one-way traffic with me. He will attack and I will attack.

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

Let us deal with Clause 2.

Mr. WALCOTT:

Mr. Chairman, Clause 2 is very important, and it deals with the Trade Union. Are you going to say that a Trade Unionist is all right outside, but not in here? It is the most snobbish, stupid statement to make. Now, the Trade Unionists outside must vote for somebody else to come in here and represent them, but they are incapable of representing themselves. I have never heard such silliness. Now, the Trade Unionists have made it easy. When you talk about the party, it is known that party politics are here. I do not subscribe to the view that there is anything wrong in giving one party all of the seats. I hope to live long enough to see the day comes when you will run 24 Candidates and we will run 24; the people will vote for our 24, and you can say that that is undemocratic. I am not going to tell anybody who is a member of my party that we are only running a Jack and do not worry to vote for him. I want all of the votes. If the people vote for all of our candidates, I will accept that. There is no point when we come back here to talk of any one-party State. This is a one-Government State, because you do not have two directors including an Opposition director in business. I do not see any conflict of interests.

Sir, I will say to the hon. Member that he must stop using an argument that is really not logical. I would agree with the hon. Member that there would be a conflict of interests if I, a trade unionist, had been occupying a position where I would have been the Minister of Labour and General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union at the same time. We have gone on record as saying that we do not subscribe to that. We do not subscribe to a Minister being a Minister and holding an important position too, but

you get that in other countries. I am not a Minister of the Government. I know what comes before Parliament like you do when it comes here.

I should like to say that this amendment is very essential indeed, and I hope that the Judges will not cause us to amend this again. We cannot swear that within this Clause that we are amending that there is enough room. The hon. Member says it is one-way traffic. Nothing the hon. Member says to me in this House is not going to make me say what I intend to say now. This is one time where I am going to use enough tolerance and reserve not to reply to him until the appropriate time. I see that the hon. Member is smiling, and I hope he will smile then, too. The hon. Member feels that there is a conflict of interest. If there is a conflict of interest, then I will continue to have that conflict of interest, if there is a conflict of interest by representing the workers in this Chamber and being the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, then I will continue to have that conflict of interest until the people decide otherwise.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Chairman, this a very important amendment being made to the Trade Union Act, 1964. I regret that the record does not give the full history. The Minister, of course, made an introduction assuming that other Members of the House were as fully seized of the background of this matter as he was. I do not intend to give any history of this matter, because I think we have sufficient justification for the amendments which we now propose.

Unfortunately, Your Honour accepted the motion that this Bill be now read a second time before I had a chance to get to my feet, and I am not going to make a Second Reading speech. In view of the amendment which has just been interpolated, I think that I have some entitlement to give the background. I am saying it because future generations may come and may not realise, especially now when I hear what I call the "dog dancing" of people who are now trying to get the record straight as to which side they are on, when two weeks ago nobody knew which side they were really on. I do not want to go into recriminations, but there are certain things I want to clear up.

Let me at the outset say this quite clearly. I do not think the member for St. James really understands what the Bill is all about. He came in here and delivered an attack on minority groups in this country; he accused the Government of favouring Syrians and Jews, and we had all of that rabid anti-semitism that symptomatized the pre-1939 days, or the Reichstag fire in Germany, when the second republic was terminated by the acts of the fascists in Germany. I do not want any of that being introduced into Barbados. This is not an anti-semitic community. (Asides.) If I am a Jew, I am proud of it, as I am proud of being an African. The Member accuses me of being a Jew. Guilty. Now, let us get locked up for that. If in your regime we have to be purged and put into the gas chambers, well, you can only hope that your day will come when you can carry out your extermination and have the final solution to the problem with which you are confronted. Your problem is not the Semitic problem; your problem is me, and until you get rid of me by the gas chamber or otherwise, you cannot aspire to those heights which you hope to gain.

I want to say that we come from an oppressed people. I have the double disadvantage of coming from two oppressed races genealogically. I do not apologise for it, therefore, I cannot stand or sit in this Chamber and listen to any talk about racial minority, and the Government bringing in Jews and Syrians. The persons to whom the hon. Member referred were brought up and bred in this country and are citizens of this country, and are as much entitled to political or Trade Union affiliation as any other citizen in Barbados. Anyone who takes the Oath of Allegiance and subscribes his name as a citizen of Barbados cannot be and should not be referred to, whether he be an Indian, a Jew, a black man, or a white man. The position of this Government is that we believe in a free democratic society.

With regard to the question of ownership, I remember the day, and you will remember the day as a business man, when you could walk down Swan Street, and I could recite the names of the people in Swan Street. I could go from one side to the other side. You had names like Grannum, Nicholls, Wharton, Browne, Cozier, Todd, Carew and so on, all the way down to Clarke. There was not a single Indian except the big Wee Wee man, and I think that place was taken over by Nicholls. It was a very small shop next to where Barbados Hardware is. Every single business in the 1920s and 1930s were owned by what the hon. Member for Christ Church West refers to as middle class, - whatever that is, - families. I do not know what middle class means, neither do I know of the middle class political party that Mr. Jack Dear wanted to start. I really do not know; I am not race or class conscious. What I am saying today is that it is the easiest kind of method, when you have deficiencies yourself, to look on minority groups for your own woeful condition. 5. 50 p. m.

If there are Syrians and Jews in Broad Street or Swan Street today it is because we the Barbadians were too busy studying law, to carry on the business in Broad Street and Swan Street. It was through snobbishness and the stupidity of the people who had control over our tertiary education or through our own social ambitions, and if we are not in Swan Street today, it is not because we were driven out, it is because we walked out thinking that we were going some place which was better, that is, in the legal and other professions. I want to get that position straight. No one came in here and had any purge of black people and drove them out of Swan Street. I can visualise the businesses now from one end of Swan Street to the other, and everyone was owned by a black family with the exception of Mr. Nicholls, and he was as good a Barbadian as anybody else.

Now do not let us get into this talk about minority groups because we are getting into very dangerous waters. If wages are being paid which are not up to standard, then the workers themselves should join the Union and get organised, and it is equally their fault. In the same way that their employers are not the solid Barbadian families that used to control that district, it is their fault that they are not there. If the Commission Merchants' Association are now in Roebuck Street and in the country and closing down all the small shopkeepers, it is the fault of the Daniels, the Tudors, the Maxwells, the McDonald Sealys and

all those people who instead of bringing their sons up in the business, gave them too much food; to eat, too many motor cars to drive about in and sent them to hifalutin places which alienated them from the surroundings which had made their families rich. I am saying that categorically. Do not let us look to any racial division or pigmentation to blame for our evils. Barbados is one of the few places that did not have a major problem with multi-national corporations, and I say that the question of wages is one that has got to be controlled by the Trade Union; but the Trade Union cannot represent workers only when they get fired, if they do not join the Union, and this is happening all too frequently.

The other thing I want to say is that it is partly the fault of the Trade Union maybe because they have been preoccupied with the genuine people. You cannot have a genuine workers' organisation unless you have the white collar workers solidly behind you, and I know the white collar workers tend to feel that they are superior. They have got to be brought to Christian understanding as well, and I want to say these things to disabuse the minds of any hon. Member that the Government is recalcitrant or is not doing its job, because we do not have a universal minimum wage. We certainly have a minimum wage under the Shops Act for all the workers working in the places to which the hon. Member for St. James referred.

Now if these workers allow the employers to make them sign for less than what they actually take home, apart from National Insurance deductions, that is entirely a matter for them. I do not want to say anything more about that, because even then, you are not sure that it is going to be paid into the appropriate authority when they deduct the National Insurance deductions, but your take home pay should be the particular wage with income tax deductions taken out, and with National Insurance deductions taken out. if after you do those two things, you find that the worker instead of getting \$27 is being given \$17, the worker is at fault because he should go to the Police and report the matter or to the Department of Labour, and furthermore he should organise the workers in that place and go to the Trade Union. The Trade Union, I know, has intervened in a lot of matters where the workers did not even take the trouble to join the organisation. So do not let us go off and attack the Government on grounds of encouraging bad practices among employers. It is for the workers to protect themselves. The Government cannot be under every shop counter with a detective inside a pickle barrel. That is impossible.

Having straightened out those aspects of the debate, I just want to say one thing with your indulgence, and it is this: Trade Union legislation is something which has not been accepted by those with the vested interest, the conservative elements in this society, or by the law courts. I can tell you my personal experiences.. My personal experiences are that I had to take all the Federal Judges up to the Privy Council because when I started to argue Trade Union law with them, they told me that I could talk until Christmas, and it was only October, because their minds were made up already. Those were the highest law officials you had in the whole of the Caribbean, and I had to take them to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to bring them to Christian understanding of what Trade Union law was about.

First to begin with, let me take up and support the hon. Member on the Trade Union Act of 1906. Kay Hardy went into the House of Commons round about that time. I cannot remember the precise time and whether he succeeded in 1906 or 1911. The backbone of the British Labour Party was the Trade Union movement. How can you talk about conflict of interest? You only have one interest and that is the interest of the worker, and if the interest of the worker is not being preserved, within the context of the social values and the legal values in the community, the way to change these values is to get into Parliament and change them. Now you must remember that we had Liberal Government round about the turn of the first decade, about 1910, and the Liberal Government was partially sympathetic to the Trade Union Movement, but you have to remember something too, that both in Barbados in 1939 and in the United Kingdom up to the 1906 Trade Union Act, any organisation for the control of the conditions of employment, wages and so on of workers or anybody else, was a conspiracy in restraint of trade. Up to 1939 in Barbados, Trade Unions were illegal.

As a matter of fact, I will give you a little bit of history now. The way that Captain Cipriani, Mr. Crichtlow in Trinidad and my uncle here in Barbados got around the laws of conspiracy, was to form "Working Men's Associations" which were supposed to be friendly societies, but in truth and in fact, they were Trade Unions, but the law said that Trade Unions were illegal when I was going to school. I gave the first public lecture in Barbados because not even the people who supported the "Working Men's Associations" had the nerve to get up in public and say anything about Trade Unions or Trade Union Organisations. I, at the age of seventeen, gave the first public lecture on Trade Union Organisations in Barbados as Trade Union Organisations out and out, and labelled it as "Trade Unions in the new Society". - Hon. Members on the other side are laughing. - They are latter day saints. They do not know anything about the history of the working man in this country. I am saying that nobody talked about Trade Unions as such. People talked about Working Men's Associations, but they were afraid to talk about Trade Unions. In 1939 the Trade Disputes Act and the Trade Union Act were put on the Statute Book in this country, and up to that time at common law, Trade Union Organisations and what Trade Unions stood for were illegal, therefore you could not expect anybody who was trained as a lawyer and subsequently sat on a Bench, to be sympathetic either in the United Kingdom before the 1906 legislation or before the 1939 legislation which is model legislation sent all the way down from the Colonial Office as a result of the riots, which we had here in 1937. Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Morgan Jones were Trade Union Members of the Royal Commission. He was then Walter Citrine and he was General Secretary of the T. U. C. Mr. Morgan Jones was a Welsh miner. 6. 00 p. m.

A lot of people in Barbados here in politics felt that it was indecent and not respectable to associate with Trade Unionists when we - I say we because my grandmother had to feed the waterfront workers out of her own pocket - during the strike on the waterfront, fed the waterfront workers from our kitchen.

The Leader of the Barbados Labour Party - it was not a Party then, the subsequent Leader - he is part

of the history so you have to refer to him in a historical context, called him the Emperor Duncan, and said that he was some self ordained Emperor who was taking undemocratic action by telling the workers that they should not work for miserably poor wages.

Let us now talk about Trade Unionism. I was brought up in it and steeped in it. I helped to stir the pot down at the corner of Reed Street when the dock workers were lined up when they were on strike, and had no money at all. And all that was financed by my grandmother.

They talked about women's organisations, about "NOW" and all other kinds of organisations. They do not know anything. You will not find a single working class girl in the YWCA or the Business and Professional Women's Organisation, because the Business and Professional Women's Organisation by its very title is an excluding organisation. You cannot be working class and get into that. None of them are prepared to go and work among the working class people and give the leadership where the leadership is desired.

I want to say this. I am speaking on this amendment to give you a history of it. Trade Unions being illegal, it was not difficult in my lifetime for a judge to say to me that you can talk till Christmas. These people do not have any right to picket outside a man's house. He told me that, when I was trying to work for a living, and I had not been on my feet for half an hour. Sir Donald Jackson asked me how much longer, and I said that I was only on my first point, and that could last a day, and I had five points, so those were five days. He told me that I could talk till Christmas, that their minds were made up already. That was before they even heard the case. That is the kind of thing that you have to put up with in the Caribbean, ignorance at a high level, sophisticated ignorance, "sports model" ignorance.

I feel very strongly about this. I am no latter day Trade Unionist. I think you know my credentials, Sir. I have been in this for a very long time. I have been studying it for a long time and I am not likely to pass over this or gloss over this on the ground that "we in the Opposition will support it but you are not getting wages for the people".

It goes deeper than that, because right now in the middle of the 20th Century, you had English Judges - and we take our case law from the English law courts - deeming the actions of a Trade Union to amount to a conspiracy because they encourage a breach of contract. The English Act -. there was one in 1906, then 1914, then it was 1926 and then there was the general strike; and Mr. Winston Churchill said that you had to have "contracting in".

Anyhow the English Trade Union legislation, starting from 1906, made it abundantly clear that an act done in the furtherance of a trade dispute was not actionable in Tort. It was clear, clear, clear; but you have these people with their social and political prejudices, and the general feeling in England was, that the workers were getting too much money and causing "balance of payments" problems and a price and wages spiral, and that you should have things like wage freezes and so on. So anything to hit at the Trade Union was a way of hitting at the British Labour Party. It has been changed back now.

I agree that we took a bit long, but I want to make it clear that we have on the front bench here present and voting three members of the legal profession and the fourth is absent. But it is not our job to draft legislation. We have our 23 Crown Law Officers - I do not mean Magistrates, I mean Crown Law Officers - sitting in offices at Marine House. Sometimes I see some of the young Counsel make mistakes, but I just quietly tell the Attorney General because it is not my job to advise the Government of Barbados on legal matters. They do not pay me to do that. The Attorney General, Solicitor General and the 23 people are working in the Crown Law Office. It is their job to advise the Government. In the last analysis, the Attorney General has to take the responsibility, but they do not pay me for that. They pay me for something else.

I saw that the Bar Council was very quick to meet the other day on the constitutional amendments. They are many bits of legislation that we have sent to the Bar Association and they never even summoned a meeting. The Leader of the Opposition has corroborated that because before the statute law made it compulsory for him to join the Association, he refused to join or refused to pay the subscription. I do not know which, but they are both synonymous because if you do not pay, you do not belong.

I do not know his motivation, but he professed the uselessness of the Bar Association; but apparently it is only useful when Mr. Jack Dear summons them to further his political ambitions, because we have sent Bill after Bill, and I am prepared to bring in a list of these Bills which are being prepared, and we have waited a whole year. We have sent them letters and asked them "Will you please comment on this bit of legislation?" and they never replied at all up to now.

I only said that parenthetically. I will get back now to the business of Trade Unions. It is necessary because our Trade Union Act reads the same way as the British Trade Union Act; and right up to the case of *Rootes vs Bernard* - this was a case involving BOAC, - right up to that case, all the courts in the Commonwealth had taken it that a Trade Union or the Officers of a Trade Union who are acting in furtherance or in contemplation of a trade dispute, would not be subject to any liability, in Tort that is any civil action for damages.

The case of Rootes vs Bernard then came along and this completely reversed all the concepts that Trade Union lawyers and other enlightened people had about the interpretation of the Trade Union Act. Our Trade Union Act, since it came from the British Common Law, was of novel vintage in 1939, but it followed almost slavishly, because it was model legislation sent down to all the Caribbean countries in 1938. I refer to our Trade Union and Trade Disputes Act.

We had before that, a Conspiracy and a Protection of Property Act which dealt with cases like watching offences rather than what you were entitled to do. In other words, they made picketing illegal, and that was the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act.

Those were the social concepts of the time of how you should deal with workers who protested about their conditions.

That was changed with the advent of the Liberal Government and then the Labour Party Government in England, and it took riots in the Caribbean. The legislators here in the Caribbean had to be told. They had no intention of introducing any legislation for making it not punishable in the Common Law - I put it in an inverted kind of way but that is how it has got to be dealt with - for anyone to introduce a breach of contract or tell somebody even if he was losing his money, to close down his business.

They did not want any Trade Union Act and this had to be forced down their throats as a result of the riots of 1937, and because Sir Walter Citrine and Mr. Morgan Jones were very prominent members of the Commission, as you will remember, Sir. So do not let us hear anybody say that the Labour Party introduced this legislation.

The Labour Party was not even in existence. It was Colonial Office legislation and it followed the interpretation of the British Courts right up to the case of Rootes vs Bernard. Now, since we do not publish our own Law Reports, we have to depend on the British Law Reports and the judicial interpretation of statutes which are similar to ours; and the judicial interpretation of Common Law are the precedents by which we are bound in Barbados.

Similar to the case brought against the Trade Union officials at the time of Rootes vs Bernard. Trade Unionists would find themselves liable for doing something which the Law, as far as we are concerned, tells them that they are entitled to do.

Therefore, Sir, this amendment is to put the record straight, no matter what the sort of legal indoctrination of a particular Court may be. Most people over the age of 50 did not do Trade Union Law. They will now have to follow' the Statute Law of Barbados. They cannot follow the Statute Law of England because we are a sovereign independent country and enactments of the U. K. Parliament at Westminster do not have any kind of application even by explicit expression as they did when we were a colony. Therefore, this amendment is not only necessary, but is long overdue. 6. 10 p. m.

The Question that Clause 2 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to move an amendment to Clause 5. It is that the words 'or proposes to become' be inserted after the word 'is' in subparagraph (i) of paragraph (a) of the proposed section 40A of this Clause 5.

So it would then read: "Is or proposes to become an officer, delegate or member of a Trade Union. "

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. M. GREAVES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Trade Union (Amendment) Act, 1974.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. There is only one outstanding Item on the Order Paper and that is Order No. 7.

There is notice of one Resolution for the sum of \$16, 500 which is not a matter of great urgency, and, in the circumstances I propose that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 8th October, 1974 at 12. o'clock noon.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

The Question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 8th October, 1974, at 12 o'clock Noon, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. Deputy Speaker adjourned the House accordingly. 6. 15 p. m.

It would be well if the Leader of the House who is standing in for the Minister of Agriculture could give us some more information. As if to show the country how serious a view the Government takes of agriculture, you will find that when we had what one could call an experienced Minister of Agriculture, I think I am right in saying that he had a Junior Minister to assist him whom we called a Parliamentary Secretary. I think I am right in saying that at one time we had a Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, and at that time when we had what we call an experienced Minister who threw his life, so to speak, into agriculture - I am not saying whether he threw his life into agriculture for the nation or otherwise - we had a Parliamentary Secretary, but now that we have a Minister who has got to fork and hoe his way in, there is no one to assist him such as a Junior Minister for Agriculture. That only shows the way Government looks at agriculture and what it really means to us. However, Sir, we are hoping that we will not be faced with this milk shortage. We are hoping that the role of the agricultural stations will reach the stage that they reached in previous years. We want to see, Mr. Chairman, additional extension officers to carry out these programmes. 4. 35 p. m.

We want to see, Mr. Chairman, additional extension officers to carry out these programmes. We want to see these agricultural stations equipped to serve the farmer, to give him the incentive and the encouragement to produce something that he can say he is producing better to serve the nation. We hope to see some improvement in the situation as a result of these proposals by the new Chief Agricultural Officer.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Before you put the question, Sir, I just want to mention as a reply to the hon. member for St. Joseph that as a result of certain representations which were made when I was in Taiwan we will soon have a Veterinary Surgeon from Taiwan to help. I hope that the Minister who is there now will follow that up and see that the Veterinary Officer as well as the Livestock Officer are, if not on the same plane with him, on the next following that. That has been agreed on already and was communicated to the Ambassador for China, Dr. Yao, who is stationed here. We have hopes of getting assistance from the Republic of China.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister would tell us if any Barbadians are being trained abroad.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I think we have two, subject to any amendment by the Minister of Education, Veterinary scholarships being undertaken now.

The question that Head 25(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology - (3) Markets - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 (3) stand part.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. HOPPIN:

Mr. Chairman, you only have to pay a visit to the Cheapside Market and you will realise that there is great need for improvement there, As can be seen, even in the display of meat, there is no proper display nor are you sure of getting your proper weight. I feel it is high time, when people are paying such high prices for beef and pork, that they should know if they are getting their proper weight. Scales should be put where the consumer would be able to see if he is getting his weight for his money.

You can also look around and see rats running all over the place, and I feel there should be some great improvement. The gutters are clogged up occasionally and people drop all sorts of things around there. There should be some notice displayed in the market warning people against such dirty habits. The Ministry of Health at present is engaged in a clean-up campaign, and I feel that the markets should be kept in a sanitary condition.

Here it is they are asking for more money even for travelling. I would like the Minister to say what this

travelling is for, I do not see anybody travelling from one market to the other and if money should be spent it should be spent in a proper way. I think there should be some improvement at these markets where we have to buy our food, and especially there should be scales for everyone to see they are getting their full weight for the amount of money they have to pay for these commodities which are so highly priced.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, it is said that Parliament is a place of moods. You come in and there is a resolution or bill before Parliament which the introducer may think is straightforward, then there are times when you find the hustle and bustle and the roughness of

"V the thorns in the bed of roses in Parliament. There are other times when we hear from members on the other side of the House over a period of three or four years about one speech or two sometimes, but what is really puzzling is that when a speech is to be made in Parliament all those who seldom make speeches one would expect to make some of some substance but to hear the hon. member and Deputy Speaker talking about the butchers not giving people their proper weight, does he want the Minister to go down there and stand up to see that the people get their weight? The position is that the people cannot even get enough to put into the scales far less give proper weight. Every time we get up and say something we are told that we had better not talk because if they say something we would run out.

I am saying that it is the responsibility of the Government to straighten these things out, and that it is a really serious admission by the Deputy Speaker of this House when he is in a position to detect that you have rats running about the market, but they are not only in the market they are all over the place. Perhaps it is the poor policy of the Ministry of Health, not the Minister of Health, because if the Minister had his own way these things would not happen. This Party built the market and they added to it. Instead of Government putting this money in the areas where it is most needed they find areas to put it where it is not needed, All the time you get this garbage problem, you find the rats, mosquitoes and everything that is detrimental to the public of Barbados. Nearly everything the Government was looking after in this country within the past four years is bad. There is always criticism of the Government because the priorities are wrong. Here it is you are hearing from the Deputy Speaker of the House, and a former Chairman of the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board, a complaint about rats in the market. The only contribution he has made within the last eight years is that the butchers are not giving people the proper weight. Go down there and tell them so and let them chop off your head. If that is your only contribution it is a very sad thing. You should be criticising the Ministry of Health, not the vendors, for the conditions which have prevailed at the markets. 4. 45 p. m.

You have to take it, regardless.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG:

Don't you have rats in the markets?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

The Ministry of Health is not responsible for the markets.

Mr. CRAIG:

Who is responsible for the markets and the slaughter houses? Well the Cabinet then. Collective responsibility. The Cabinet of which the Minister of Health is a member. Nobody is responsible for the markets. Anybody can go into the markets and do anything at all. The Minister of Agriculture? It is collective responsibility. The Cabinet is collectively responsible.

If the Agricultural Department has the responsibility, they should ask for the co-operation of the Ministry of Health. It should be brought to the attention of the Ministry of Health that they have rats in the markets. It is not we who complain about the rats, it was the Deputy Speaker. I am saying that he is a member of the Government Party and was critical of Government's policy. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I will ask hon. members to adhere to Standing Order 30. (ASIDE The first time a member of the public got bitten by a rat at the hospital was under the Barbados Labour Party regime.)

Mr. CRAIG:

That is why we built a new hospital.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to enter into this debate- I was sad to see the attitude that Parliament has taken. We came here to discuss things seriously, but one Minister said that he is not responsible and was laughing. Another Minister was saying that' he is not responsible, and he was laughing. The result is that the people of this country are suffering and we have members sitting down in here laughing.

I heard the discussion on agriculture. It turned out to be a big joke for the Government. People are starving and it turned out to be a big joke for the Government. I really feel that the debates in this House should be broadcast to let the people know the sort of nonsense that goes on Tuesday after Tuesday. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. HINDS:

Mr. Chairman, as for the markets, I believe that the markets should be equipped with glass counters where the butchers would be able to display their meat and do so without having the visitation of flies as one can witness from time to time by visiting the markets. It is high time that they should be provided with that kind of counter for the display of their meat. (ASIDE) Mr.

Chairman,

Mr. CHAIRMAN:

I am listening to the hon. member.

Mr. HINDS:

The butchers have to go somewhere else and cut their meat. They do not cut it on the cement counter that they display it on. Some people are not as fortunate as the Ministers. They do not have to go to the market for meat, The Minister of Communications and Works does not even know that the butchers are provided with a log of wood on which to cut the meat.

Mr. Chairman, that is not all. The stalls in the market ought to be made to present sanitation in its every form on every occasion. All of the stalls are untidy and unkempt, They do not provide the appearance which would encourage any of us to make our purchases there; but I believe that every butcher tries his best to keep his stall clean in his way, but the space is so limited, that when he has a quantity of meat there is hardly room, and sometimes you will find that there are two butchers carrying on the same business in a stall, and accommodation is very limited.

It is about time that no matter which Ministry is responsible, consideration should be given to having these drains covered - the drains that run through the markets next to these stalls, and that everything

should be done to have places like the markets rat proof so that the meat can be kept free from being contaminated by rats and flies and what not.

It is all right to come here and talk about the weight of the meat. I believe that some of us in this Hon. House live on scales and weights. Some of us are shopkeepers, and butchers and others in the markets are engaged in the same way of saying that 14 ounces make one pound or whatever is the new avoirdupois. I do not castigate the hon. member for St. George for what he has said, but one will find that what happens in the fish market is that if a purchaser attempts to ask a vendor to put the fish into a scale, that would be the last purchase that the customer would be able to make there. 4. 55 p. m.

The purchaser would be trying to see that he has been given justice with the scales provided there, but it does not always work so, because you will find, Mr. Chairman, that there are policemen there from time to time whether on duty or otherwise, and there are also market constables who are on duty there, and if a purchaser were to attempt to make a complaint the market constables turn their backs and try to get away from the scene where the action is, Policemen who happen to be on the scene at times try to make themselves scarce because they do not want to be involved in this, because for them to take appropriate action, they too would find themselves not being able to get a pound of fish or whatever the commodity might be from time to time. So all these things have got to be taken into consideration. If Government is going to provide these scales and customers are to get their just due, all that has got to be done is that the scale must hang in front of each stall or the stalls so provided that a pair of scales can accommodate two stalls so as to reduce the cost of these pieces of equipment; but the weighing must take place at a height that every customer can see whether he is getting his weight or not.

I do not believe that there is every case where a customer will get his due of sixteen ounces. There are some cases where the vendors have a means of slamming down the commodity on the scale making it go down and snatching it out before it can balance. All these are the tricks of the trade. I don't want to say that we must continue to put up with them and ways and means have got to be found and can be found for countering such situations, and I would like to see the Government taking the initiative and getting the market to look sanitary, and let us know that in truth and in fact it is somewhere that customers can really go and do their little shopping without encountering all these difficulties that we hear about from time to time.

The question that Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology (3) Market - stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology (5) Fisheries - was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25 - Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology (5) Fisheries - stand part.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

Head 26 - Ministry of Communications and Works (1) General Administration - was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, this is to cover the payment by Government to the Light and Power Company for street lighting up to the end of the financial year. In the Budgetary

Proposals an amount of \$450, 000 was set out for payment of street lights. I think anybody who has driven from the hills of Barbados must feel a sense of joy to see how Barbados is lit up. However, Sir, with the fuel crisis when it first started we had to disconnect 757 lights in an attempt to conserve on energy. There were 635 lights of 175 watts and 122 lights of 80 watts. At the moment the amount of lights in service are 7334, and I am not going to give you the various wattage; but it should be of interest to know that this Government in its street lighting programme established in 1971-72 some 3, 200 lights, in 1972-73 another 1, 260 and 1, 171 in 1973-74. The Light & Power Co. is charging us at the moment \$1, 044 a month for servicing the lights that have been cut off. We have been arguing strenuously about this charge, but after consideration it is a charge which in order to keep these lights in condition so that when we are ready, if conditions permit, we can put them on, we have to pay this small charge for those lights. They have to keep them serviced so that if they get the go ahead, if the situation improves, then they will be able to function without any difficulty.

You will see, Mr. Chairman, that we have an allocation of \$450, 000 and we are asking now for \$90, 000 and that is with 750 odd lights not working, deliberately so, and I would like to say that the Government is committed to expanding and continuing this programme because it has social benefits

and is in the interest of the country, and I want to tell the public that with the present position as it stands economically as well as fuel charge-wise, we cannot put back on these lights that have been temporarily not working. They have got to stay off because the bill at the end of the year would be over \$1.2 million as it is. If we put on these 757 lights, this supplementary would not be for \$90, 000, it would have to be for \$135, 000, and if we continue our programme we would have to have come down here with a supplementary not for \$90, 000 but for \$250, 000 to \$300, 000 in addition to the \$450, 000 that have been allocated in the Budget. Well Barbados has got to understand that committed as we are to extending street lights, we have got to take a responsible position. We are committed to extending it, and we intend to as soon as circumstances permit. If the price of oil drops, within reasonable limits and this is purely oil because oil generates electricity and we are using it, the minute that is done not only would the 757 lights that have been disconnected be put back on, but the programme will recommence immediately because we have got the areas where we want the lights established. The public has got to understand, as I have said before, that in the present economic situation, that there have got to be cutbacks on matters and on things which basically do not affect the physical living of the individual.

Street lighting is necessary, it beautifies your country, it enables people to get home, it has a social and economic benefit, but a Government has to be responsible. I as Minister make no apology because I am as committed as the Opposition. I wish I could keep the lights going, but I have still got, as a citizen of Barbados realising what the position is, to hold my hand until the economic position improves. I want to give the public the assurance that the moment it is economically possible, the lights that have been cut off will be put back on and the programme will continue apace in the interest of the entire Island of Barbados.

I therefore beg to move that Head 26 - Ministry of Communications and Works (1) General Administration - stand part.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that. 5. 05 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the resolution for \$554, 209 do now pass.

Mrs. EASTMOND:

I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of two resolutions in Committee of supply, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Mrs. EASTMOND, the resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in accordance with the undertaking given by me earlier on, one which I usually observe, I think the Opposition has some matter which they consider important. They will speak under Private Members' Business, I presume. It is probably on old age pensions, one of their pet subjects.

I beg to move that Private Members' Business be now taken.

Mr. ADAMS:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Item 6 be the first Order of Private Members' Business.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

**RESOLUTION REQUESTING GOVERNMENT TO SET UP AN ALL PARTY COMMITTEE
TO MAKE COMPREHENSIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE
CONDITIONS OF ALL PENSIONERS**

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Item 6 is in my name, but I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention what seems to be an error in this resolution. The resolution which was printed does not reflect the original resolution as was handed in. The original resolution which was handed surely did not reflect what is in the printed copy, and therefore I would like to move that the words "all over the world" in the first line be deleted and the words "in Barbados" substituted, and in the second line substitute the word "years" for the word "months". The amended copy reads as follows

"Whereas there has been a rapid increase in prices in Barbados during recent years;

And Whereas these recent increases in prices are causing undue hardships on all persons who receive pensions;

Be It Resolved that this House requests the Government to set up an all Party Committee to make comprehensive recommendations for the improvement of the conditions of all pensioners. "

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am quite sure that this resolution needs no debate. I would like to feel that I could just introduce it, have it seconded and sit down, because I am sure that on both sides of the House there could be total agreement that the conditions which exist for pensioners as a whole throughout the country are not very rosy. The Leader of the House said that this was my pet subject, but what is a pet to me is that I am always sympathetic towards those persons who gave so much to this country and now receive so little. I speak for all the pensioners in this country, with special reference to the old age pensioners.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of order, I do not want to interrupt, but I have a printed copy here which I gather does not reflect what he intended to say. Is he speaking on an amendment which has been proposed and seconded? What is the position? I am at a loss.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Hon. Minister for Communications and Works is quite correct. The hon. member asked that the resolution dated 5th November, 1974 be amended and he stated what the amendment was. He continued to speak on the amendment right away because he said that there was no need for debate, and I gather that the hon. member is speaking on the amended resolution.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, I would be rising to support the amendment in the fullness of time, but there is some substance, I would submit, in what the Minister is arguing. My impression was that the hon. member was being given an opportunity to correct the wording of the resolution, the reason being that he was not in the House when notice was given. In a way I am to blame for it because I have the original draft which he showed me in connection with this matter and it does not read what the printed form reads. It is in the Clerk's handwriting and he would know the original draft. I am in a position to support what he says about the language in the printed form not being the language he intended, and therefore I was under the impression that we were correcting the wording of the resolution and we would then proceed to discuss its merits rather than moving an amendment separately. That was my Impression (Asides) It is not as tabled but I had the impression that he was asking leave to correct it. The Clerk knows the original form in which it was and if hon. members remember the hon. member for St. James was not present in the House the day notice was given of this so I would respectfully suggest that if it be treated that he is moving that the words in the circulated copy be substituted for those in the tabled copy and then proceed to the merits, if he moves that I would certainly second it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would like the hon. member for St. James to make that motion. 5. 15 p. m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I think that the Leader of the Opposition has made the position quite clear that I was not present when this was handed in. It was given notice of by the Leader of the House, and when I rose I gave the impression that I was moving that the words in the printed copy should be deleted and the other words substituted. I agree with the Minister of Communications and Works that I should have moved that the printed copy which I have - that the printed copy as circulated and amended - should be dealt with this afternoon. I now make that motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I beg to second that.

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

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, if I may recite what I earlier said before the misunderstanding arose, I believe that the House will take this Resolution as a matter with which we all agree. I do not think that there will be any debate on it all. I think that we are all mindful of the hardships to which pensioners as a whole are now subjected and to which they have been subjected for the past year or two.

With the spiralling cost of living in Barbados today, I am sure that you will agree with me that \$8. 00 a week is not enough. I am submitting that a committee be set up for the purpose of examining the possibility of reviewing the whole situation of the pensioners in Barbados, with special reference, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the Old Age Pensioners.

There is no doubt in my mind. Day after day people come to your office asking about the Provident Fund. They sometimes find it difficult to get bus fare to get back home. To go into a supermarket with \$8. 00 on a Friday or Saturday would be an act of madness,

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw it to the attention of the member for St. Lucy that he should stop interrupting me in my speech; otherwise I will say something about him that will cause you to ask me to leave the Chamber. I am asking you to defend me. (ASIDES)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am only hearing the hon. Member.

Mr. CRAIG:

Ask the hon. Member for St. Lucy to behave himself. I do not understand this. Anyone can see that I am a lot of man. I do not draw up under Fairweather all the time. It is my honest belief that a committee should be set up to deal with this, to deal with a programme for the pensioners as a whole.

Some time ago when Resolutions of this nature came up, there was always talk about a means test. From 1966 I have been hearing about a means test for pensioners to find out how they are living before they get something,

I am asking that a committee be set up because the pensioners cannot continue under the present conditions. You know what the cost of living is. Day after day there is an increase in prices in the shops and markets and in the stores, and these people remain at \$8. 00 a week.

In 1969 old age pensioners were raised from \$3. 00 to \$5. 00 a week. In 1973 they went to \$8. 00. In 1969 I brought down a Resolution asking that they be carried to \$10. 00 a week. The Government ignored it. The Minister said that the Government could not afford to give one red cent more to the Old Age Pensioners.

Since I cannot submit a figure which I believe is adequate for them, I am asking this House to set up a committee for the purpose of going into the whole situation of the pensioners and coming back to this House with an adequate figure. You have the unions representing the workers on one side and who negotiate for better wages and better living conditions. You have the NUPW asking for a cost of living bonus to keep their members abreast of the cost of living; but there is no one to ask for one single cent for these people who gave so much to this country, whatever prosperity they may have failed to gain in the process. There is not one single person to ask for a nickel for them. Day after day you see in the daily paper pictures of people living in some of the worst possible conditions. 5. 25 p. m.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I speak quite strongly on this, though I am not prepared to speak at length in order not to hold up the House. I think the facts are clear and that Government should be aware of their responsibility to these people. We on this side are aware of their problems, but we are not in a position to do anything for them except to come in here and voice our views, but the Government should be aware of their responsibility to these people who made their contribution.

Let us take for example the agricultural workers, an industry which is completely neglected, and you too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, represent an agricultural district and know how these agricultural workers go in the sun and the rain to bring prosperity to this country, and now in the evening of their years when they should be resting and relaxing with something to go by, they find themselves looking to God with a Bible in their hands going to Church and hoping that manna would come down from Heaven. I am asking this House to support this Resolution. It is not an unreasonable request, and if any hon. Member on the other side votes against a Resolution of this nature for the purpose of setting up a Committee, he would have to answer to the electorate for this. I, dare say that after hearing from the other side, as the Mover of the Resolution I would have a right of reply, because it is not a Resolution critical of the Government.

I therefore beg to move, with these few remarks, that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. ADAMS:

I ties to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am afraid that we cannot support this Resolution at this time, commendable though the efforts of the hon. Member may be. The terms of the Resolution are such with which we generally speaking agree. We all know that the pensions were based on the old salaries, and we know the increases which have taken place over the years, but this is a financial matter and a Budget is being brought in on Thursday which probably will deal with matters such as this. What is more, this will create a charge on the Treasury irrespective of how you turn and twist it, and furthermore the Cabinet has not considered the question of increasing pensions and cannot agree to the setting up of a Committee at this stage, although we will have to agree to that eventually. We agree with the principle of increasing the pensions and so on. A magistrate who drew \$600 twenty years ago and retired would not be on a proper basis with one who is now drawing \$1, 400 and he should be put on the prevailing rates if possible, so that pensioners alike, whether they served and retired ten years ago or recently will all enjoy fair rates of pension.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we, agree with the principle, but we cannot tie up the Government with this at this stage until the Supplementary Budget is presented by the Minister of Finance and Planning who will, have to take into account finding money for paying pensioners and everybody for that reason. On these grounds, while we agree with the principle involved and the terms for the increases embodied in the Resolution, we cannot at this stage tonight agree to the Resolution, and it is for that reason that I will have to make a motion to the effect that further consideration be postponed until such time as the Government has considered the implications of a Resolution such as this.

Mr. WEEKES:

I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr, Deputy Speaker

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Are you speaking on the motion for further consideration to be postponed?

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I am. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not think you need a Resolution like this for anybody in Barbados who is in touch with the working classes to know that in 1974 with inflation and with the cost of living as it is, people who are depending purely on \$8. 00 a month must be experiencing untold hardship and deprivation. I- know that with the increase in electricity people are suffering. Even with the increase of water, rates thousands of poor pensioners come to me with tears in their eyes, and if I had the right and the law permitted me, in many cases I would remit the water? charges which they have got to pay. I keep in touch with working class people and I know they are experiencing great (difficulty).

I am objecting to this on two main grounds: that an all-party Committee is going to stretch it out for a long time and by then mote old people would be six feet under, therefore we have got to act. I do not think that anybody who lives in Barbados who loves people and cares for them can be oblivious to the fact that people are suffering and need assistance not from a Committee; they need assistance now, and therefore the Resolution from the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition should not be asking for a Committee, because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition knows that a Committee is one way of killing something. You do not get a quorum, you get a,. quorum, Christmas comes and goes and the Committee has not had its first meeting. A Committee is not the answer to this problem. I realise there is constitutional restraint and I do not know who is the legal adviser on that side who told you to word it this way SO that the charge of introducing a Resolution which might impose a charge on the Treasury might be circumvented, I know- your restraints; I am not a fool. (ASIDES) I was only making a joke. You drafted it even without the advice of the Leader of the Opposition who is a lawyer, and I think that you are well aware of the constitutional position, I think the Leader was trying to point this out to you.

Mr. ADAMS:

, On point of order, let him not take the Leader of the Opposition's name in vain. I absolutely assure the House that I had no hand in drafting the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

I shall not be long. That is not something you disclaim, or something that lowers your prestige. If I help my colleagues to draft as a lawyer, it is nothing degrading. That is what I would be expected to do, to bring my legal knowledge to help a layman in my party; but I was only pointing out to the Deputy Leader that the reason why he has asked for a Committee is because of the constitutional restraints which prevent a Resolution being introduced which imposes a charge on the Treasury, and I think the Leader of the Opposition realises that a Resolution of this nature has to be cleverly drafted.

I am opposing it on the grounds, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a Committee in a matter of this nature is delaying, is a waste of time, and cannot come to any greater or more sensible conclusion than a Government or an Opposition can come to who knows the sufferings of the people, and secondly the people do not need a long term. If anybody is to help them, they want help today and not as a result of a Committee which will meet. They needed help last week, not today. I can see the Deputy Leader of the Opposition not knowing what is in the Emergency Budget, has come down with this in order that if the old age pensioners benefit, then he will claim - and this is good politics - that as a result of this he has got a little for the old age pensioners. I am not quarrelling with that political manoeuvre; that is what is done all the time. The Opposition hears that the Government is going to do something and you get a Parliamentary Question asking whether the Government is aware and so on. That is good political tactics, but this is debated today purely because he is in the dark as to what alleviation would be given to anybody and therefore this is his way. 5. 35 p. m.

As I say, it is debated today purely because he is in the dark as to what alleviation will be given to anybody. These are good political tactics in case something results from this resolution. I cannot support it on the grounds that an all party committee is not the answer. This is Government's responsibility. If Government does not give them a farthing then Government must stand condemned or praised. This is nothing to share with you. If we do not give them then public or the old age pensioners must condemn the Government, This responsibility is not to be shared with the Opposition, not because I think that you are not as sensitive and as caring, but the Government must take the blame. If they give them something, not that we want the praise, but the financing of Government projects, the payment of old age pensioners, the increase of old age pensions is the responsibility of the ruling Government, not a responsibility which you share or you set up a committee to do. Why not set up an all party committee to increase the civil servants' salaries or to give a cost of living allowance to the NUPW or to give an increase to statutory boards? The responsibility is the Government's, and we must take the political blame for any mistakes which we make and we must not, however much respect we have for the Opposition, involve them in an exercise in which they can be embarrassed and which constitutionally is not their responsibility.

The increase of old age pensions or benefits is a matter by which the Government must stand or fall. The duty of the Opposition is to urge, as they have every right to do, on the Government the necessity and the plight of the people and ask the Government to do something about it. I think the Hon. Deputy Leader of the Opposition has satisfied that need, he has raised the matter and it is now our responsibility to respond or not to respond, but I cannot vote for this resolution which is calling for an all party committee to go into prolonged investigations because this is not the way matters of this nature are dealt with.

Let me say finally that we on this side share the anxiety, the concern, the care, the love for these people who we know with their very limited resources must be experiencing considerable difficulty in this period of inflation and increased cost of living. We know what is stated in the first two paragraphs

of the resolution, so I do not want them to go with the run away feeling that we are not as concerned, and therefore I cannot support the resolution, especially to refer this matter to an all party committee.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the arguments adduced by the Minister, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, who has just sat down, although wrong are among the more sensible which I have heard in this House and I would congratulate him on a speech that was at least logical although I may disagree with his conclusions, for I feel that he was using logic and oratorical talent to prevent the Opposition, as he has freely admitted, from being able to claim any share however remote, bearing in mind that we are not the Government and it is not our money to give away, in an increase for old age pensioners. Why I say his argument is wrong, and why I regret that he should have brought so formidable a body of logic to bear upon a dilatory motion such as we have before us, is that he is speaking as if this is the first time that the hon. member for St. James has urged \$15 per week or in any event a raise for old age pensioners. All hon. members will know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has made this cause his own from the beginning of this

Parliament. Some hon. members on the other side will have memories of making speeches against old age pensioners getting \$15. I hope they will not be repeating the speech made by the hon. member for St. Philip South upon an earlier occasion, but I seem to remember his arguments going in that direction.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member will give way, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I entered this House of Assembly in the year 1961, and if you check the records the first resolution which was brought to this House of Assembly by the hon. member, myself, was dealing with old age pensioners and therefore the hon. member for St. James has followed in my footsteps. In 1961 as soon as I entered the House of Assembly the first resolution I brought, which can be seen at any time in this House, was dealing with old age pensioners. Consequently I would like, Sir, you to remind the hon. member for St. Thomas that at no time did I say anything against the increase in the amount for old age pensioners.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Your point has been taken.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well, the debates are there and the previous speeches of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and the hon. member for St. Philip South can be read by those who can understand them inwardly digest and comprehend them. The hon. member has gone down in favour of an increase for old

age pensioners, but that is not the spirit of earlier debate. Hon. members will remember when I urged on the Prime Minister that since it is going to be a diminishing problem that some sacrifice could have been made two years ago to pay old age pensioners \$15 a week, that it would become a diminishing financial problem to Government since the National Insurance pension will eventually take it over, and hon. members can recall that the Prime Minister and I agreed on the basic premise that it would become a diminishing financial problem but he disagreed with raising it, so we have been pushing for an increase for old age pensioners for the whole life of this Parliament. The Minister of Communications, a man in his rime plays many parts, and he has taken every conceivable side that there is to take on this question, even today to appear to come out in favour of the pensioners. Any argument that could be used for, against or to sit on the fence of total irrelevancy has been mobilised by the Minister of Communications on this subject of old age pensions during the last few years. I at least am glad to see the wheel come full circle, because I believe he always in his heart knew that the pension should be increased.

One thing I will counsel him. Do not anticipate the Prime Minister or do not attempt to put the Prime Minister in a spot, because if one suggests that if the old age pension is not raised then the Government will have to answer to the people, if one suggests that I do not believe, knowing the temper of the Prime Minister that we have, that it will go down well, and I think there is nothing more certain of sealing the fate of the old age pensioners to another year of hardship than for the Minister of Communications to be seen or in any way to be giving the impression that he is telling the Prime Minister he must raise the old age pension or he will answer to the people. That is the effect of what he suggested. He said the Government has the responsibility and if it does not discharge the responsibility, knowing the hardship these people are suffering, we will have to answer to the people. I hope the Prime Minister will have a full and complete report of this debate so that he can show us for once he is a man - that is unnecessarily tendentious - so that he can show us for once that the much repeated statement that if you want the Prime Minister not to do something say he is going to do it is not true. You know, that is one of the great things, Sir, why if the Prime Minister is not minded to do something and you say he is not minded to do it that that will stop it from being done. Above all, the Minister of Communications should know this, because the Prime Minister in reference to him came in here and said how he would handle a man who asked to make him Chief Justice. I only hope he has not condemned the old age pensioners to an economic limbo corresponding to the legal and professional limbo in which he now finds himself. 5. 45 p. m.

But, Sir, I still admire his speech because he showed us that with all the years of lending his voice to the opponents of the hon. member for St. James, his heart is still in the right place. So I welcome what he has said.

I do not know how the Government feels that they cannot support this. If they feel that there is some other means of dealing with it, we on this side would be happy to deal with it in any other manner. I myself have always held and adhered to the belief, hallowed by long tradition in this Parliament, that a Resolution of the House of Assembly calling on the Government to do something is in no way binding.

It never creates a charge on the Revenue.

We are not voting money by a Resolution. We are expressing a plus hope. Resolutions have been passed in this House and have not been given effect to by the Government as yet, or perhaps not in this Parliament, such as a Resolution relating to the Marriage Act and so on; and a Resolution calling on the Government to increase the Old Age Pension cannot by itself increase the old age pension. Only an amendment to the 1937 Pension Act can do that.

If the Government Wants a form of words which will embody the spirit of the Resolution which, after all, is that the most deprived section of our community requires financial assistance, if the Government wants a form of words and a form of words which will recognise the Government special responsibility, we will adhere to it. If the Minister of Communications and Works wants to introduce an amendment saying "that this House bearing in mind the special need or bearing in mind and all of that looks forward to the Government increasing the pension" or something like that, all of that we will support. All that we want is money for the pensioners, not to score political point.

That is why I deplore postponement at this stage. That is why I will also on behalf of the Opposition strongly, totally, entirely and absolutely refute that there is or was any belief that the pension was to be increased at the time when this Resolution was to be introduced. This Resolution was written up even before the hon. member for St. Michael North West made his speech. I do not say that it was brought in here before, but it was written up before it was under consideration. The hon. member for St. Michael North West made a speech outside the walls of this House, which he subsequently explained to this House, relating to old age pensions.

The hon. Member for St. James can tell you that this Resolution was under consideration between he and I before any emergency budget or before there was any talk about pensions. This is something that has been going on for years. Indeed, if there? is some rumour that the pensions are to be increased, I would respectfully suggest that the Hon. Minister for Communications has given it more currency today, and given it more force and weight. He has given it legs and set it walking about now. It is walking and whispering in my ears now where it; was only...

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

On a point of elucidation. None of these slurs about giving any rumours about anything. I dealt with the Resolution on the simple ground that it is the responsibility of the Government, whenever the Government feels like measuring up to that responsibility. I am not saying anything about Cabinet Government at all at this moment.

Mr. ADAMS:

Well, the Minister has shorn his speech of all irrelevancy and false logic and has elucidated in one sentence that it is up to the Government to give the pension when it wants to. In other words, if old age pensioners have been starving until now, it is because the Government has not given them the pensions. Well,, good. I do not quarrel with that. I do not believe that the Minister and I have any disagreement on this point; but we are in favour of dealing with the Resolution now. If everybody is in favour of the principle, we should be able to hammer out a form of words which will embody the principle, and I confidently hope, that having heard my speech, such well wishers as the Hon. Minister of Health and the Hon. Leader of the House will give consideration to revising the words so that we can have a Resolution that we can all pass, and the Government would be seen to be voting for it, and not just giving the credit to the Opposition. I cannot vote, for the dilatory motion, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG:

Speaking on the motion for the postponement of further consideration, Sir, and hearing the Minister of Communications and Works this evening saddens me greatly. Sometimes I wonder if I should respect him or disrespect him. I have known him for a number of years, and I believe that he is fooling me. He is a socialist today and a capitalist tomorrow. He supports the Government today and he opposes it tomorrow.

You know why it saddens me, Sir? Because he happens to be in the fortunate position to have gone to the Inns. He should have gone to the Island Inn, not to Grays Inn. That is why you see that people like Eric Sealy and that group are going to put blood and thunder and sweat before us before this year is out. You look around and see.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will realise that the only contribution which the Minister could get up in here and make this evening is to tell this House, or ask this House or suggest to this House that the Resolution was drawn up by some lawyer who advised me. That is a reflection on you, you know.

Mr, DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No reflection on me.

Mr. CRAIG:

Because you did not go to school as long as some of them, by some accident of the society, you are to

be relegated to having no kind of knowledge at all; that you cannot sit down and draw up a simple Resolution. But, all that you need is to be able to appreciate the needs of the people. Yes, that will touch me. It will touch me deep down inside because I know how a lot of you feel. All of you for some reason I do not understand - I wonder what sort of God there can be sometimes to allow some of you to go to school so long and yet serve no useful purpose.

The only thing that you can say this evening is that somebody assisted me in drawing up the Resolution. Even if somebody assisted me, is that a crime? It is not a crime. What I know is that I am sitting in here with all of you, and I will be here for a long time too.

I can appreciate the needs of these poor people and their problems. What is the hon. member's argument? That he cannot support it because it is going to be a drawn out process in going to a committee. If you do not want it to be a drawn out process, agree to it this evening. Let the Committee sit tomorrow and report back next Tuesday, and we can get it moving. But no; they want to postpone it, talking about when a budget comes down. What do I know about a budget? What do I care about a budget? Have you got anyone to present a budget that will help the people of this country? You have been presenting false budgets for a long time. You have been bluffing your way through this country for a long time; but you can only bluff that long and no longer. I am a poker player. Sometimes when you are bluffing, the other man is toughing, and I am one of the people who will sit down on the ropes and jab out your eyes like Clay.

Listen to what they are saying this evening. They 'cannot agree to a Resolution of this nature to meet the needs of the poor pensioners in this country because if it goes to a committee it is going to die. Do you know who will kill it? The members of Government who are going to sit on the same Committee, because they do not want the credit to be given to the Opposition.

It is not credit that I am looking for. I am sympathetic towards the people because they are around me day after day. Some like the Minister of Communications and Works will not feel the pinch because he is carrying away three thousand and his brothers are carrying away eighteen thousand so everybody can pull back. He has not got to go to the supermarket with \$8 a week so he will not feel the need. 5. 55 p. m.

The hon. member has not got to go to the Supermarket with \$8. 00 a week, so he cannot see the need or feel the pinch. (ASIDES). You should not be in here if you are a lawyer; you should go outside and make your living and leave in here for me who can understand the needs of the people. From the time I came in here, as the Leader of the House has said, this has been my pet subject, but only for the sake of

saying something you got up and started to attack me. (ASIDES) I don't have a salary; I am a labourer; I do not live by the taxpayers. I have always been able to defend myself by working. (Asides) You had better put your salary at their disposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member said he cannot support this Resolution, and that is all the speech he can make to have it postponed. When it is postponed it can die because if the Government refuse to form a quorum you can never discuss it; so let them postpone it, then there is a Budget and it goes off the Order Paper. Who is going to suffer? Since the beginning of this Session I have asked for an increase for old age pensioners. I had to battle with the Speaker because he told me I could not bring a Resolution with any specific figure because it would impose a charge on the Treasury. I had asked for \$15 a week and he said I could not put down an amount, and the Minister of Communications and Works and the member for St. Philip North got up in here and made similar speeches in defence of the Government not being able to pay old age pensions. I recall the Minister of Communications and Works saying in here that the Government was not in a position to spend one red cent on old age pensioners.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

There should be a correction. The member for St. Philip North is the Speaker.

Mr. CRAIG:

The hon. member for St. Philip South.

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to refute the statement made by the hon. member for St. James, because he has made a reckless misstatement. I have never yet in this House opposed an increase for old age pensioners. I have always from the time I entered this House done my utmost to suggest to Government increases and improvements for paying them even by cheque at their homes and therefore when the hon. member for St. James makes such a statement he is trying to assess me along the wrong direction, and I would like to refute his statement because it can do more harm than good to me.

Mr. CRAIG:

I am glad it will do you a lot of harm. Mr. Deputy Speaker, the member for St. Philip South said he did not oppose it. I am saying that he subscribed to it. The Government voted against an increase to old age pensioners in here and the hon. member was in his seat and voted against it.

Mr. WEEKES:

Mr. Deputy Speaker

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

On what have you risen?

Mr. WEEKES:

On a point of order. Since this Government first got into power it has increased old age pensions three or four times. When we first entered the House old age pensioners were receiving \$2. 20 per week, and at present the Ministry of Communications and Works allows old age pensioners to travel on buses free of charge.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member made a speech just now. Is he making another speech?

Mr. WEEKES:

I want to say that Barbados is paying the highest amount in the CARICOM area, that is, \$8. 00 a week.

Mr. CRAIG:

If you show him CARICOM on a piece of paper he would not understand what it is. He does not know the abbreviation. (Mr. WEEKES rose.) I am not giving way. I am going to challenge the hon. member inside or outside that he voted with the Government against old age pension increases in this Session.

Mr. WEEKES:

I would like the hon. member for St. James to go and learn the rudiments of English and his syntax.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in a village you always find a village lawyer; in every village you find a village priest, and in a village you find a village clown. I believe that in some Parliaments you find the same thing, a Parliamentary clown.

Now, Sir, I could not believe that this debate this evening would have been so fiery and would have brought out so much steam from members on both sides of the House. When I introduced the original Resolution, the first thing I drew to Your Honour's attention was that it would be a very short speech made by me and I believed that members on both sides would agree to the Resolution, but to hear that the Government cannot support it because a Budget is coming down, what am I to do with a Budget? (Asides) Yes, correct the double-breasted idiot.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I will ask the hon. member for St. James to refrain from such behaviour. When you say that, you are referring to the Chair, and I will ask you to please withdraw that remark.

Mr. CRAIG:

I withdraw the remark. Do you know why I am going to withdraw the remark? I know the aims of the Government as far as I am concerned. I don't want you to send me out, because if you have to send me out I may pull you out with me, and I would not like to do that. I did not refer to any hon. member on that side as a double-breasted idiot.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

You were addressing the Chair.

Mr. CRAIG:

And, Sir, you know I have never seen you in a double-breasted jacket, and I would never call you an idiot. But you will observe the person who jumped lip. Well, you know, the string.

I feel rather sad this evening, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to hear that members on the other side who go about arguing that they are socialists and are interested in the needs of this country should decide to vote against a Resolution of this nature. Now I can do no more. There are three of us in here, and as usual might is on the other side. It is only a matter of time. I have stated my case and tried my best and I can do no more⁵ but I sincerely hope that the Leader of the House would speak to his colleagues and encourage them not to postpone this Resolution for any further consideration. 6. 05 p. m.

To set up a committee and get a committee working, you could do it this evening, the Clerk can

summon the members to a meeting on Friday morning or Friday afternoon and by next Tuesday it could report. That is not killing anything, the Government members can kill it because if they do not turn up to form a quorum it will die and they will show quite clearly they do not want to support it. The only way, as the Minister of Communications and Works quite rightly said, to get around the whole problem of bringing a resolution of this nature, since I could not bring two resolutions of the same nature in one session, I had to find a way out. The only way out was to ask for a raise for pensioners of all categories. I am appealing now, do not postpone it, support the resolution, set up a committee, let us get cracking on it, and even if the budget comes down which would relieve them I am prepared to withdraw the resolution. I am not looking for any honour or glory, I am an outstanding life insurance underwriter. I have been first in everything so far. To the polls first in 1966, to the polls first in 1971 and in my job as a life insurance underwriter I was recognised in Barbados as one of the most outstanding underwriters in this country. I am asking just to assist the people. I am 45 years old and I can die at any time. I have had a lot of fun, I know both sides of the fence, I know what it is to smoke a Trumpeter and I know what it is to smoke a du Maurier. My simple request is that you support the resolution, gentlemen.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the motion now before the House is one that further consideration of this resolution moved by the member for St. James be postponed. The various reasons were given by the Leader of the House for seeking the postponement and I think that we are seeing the whole effectiveness of Parliament being called into consideration. We are told that if this resolution is sent to an all party committee it will lag there and that the all party committee will not be effective. If this is so, this is a serious indictment on those of us who sit in Parliament and who make up that all party committee, because we are admitting before hand that an all party committee has no usefulness in these matters, that to send something to an all party committee is tantamount to killing that matter. This is a serious indictment on the whole effective process of Parliament as to whether Parliament is really operating in a manner in the interest of the people.

If the Government feels that to send something to a Select Committee means you are going to kill it, it means you are only wasting time under the present parliamentary process and that the whole procedure under which we now operate needs to be changed and to be changed as soon as possible. I will never subscribe to the belief which I have heard so often advocated by Government that to send something to a Select Committee is an indirect way of killing it. I believe that as parliamentarians we owe the people of this country a great responsibility and a duty, and if anything is sent to a Select Committee it is part of our duty for which we are paid to attend those Select Committees. It is not only coming here on Tuesday or on budget day or on any other day, but if it is the wish of this Parliament that something goes to a Select Committee it is the duty of the members to attend the committee meetings and discuss these matters.

This resolution does not only call for an increase in pensions. If that were so I would say that the budget is coming and perhaps there must be some sort of relief contained in the budget for pensioners of

all categories in this country. It does not take an economic genius to realise that, but this resolution goes a bit further. It calls for a Select Committee to make comprehensive recommendations for the improvement of conditions of all pensioners. Not only the increase in pensions but other aspects relating to pensioners need to be investigated and to see whether they can make recommendations to improve the lot of the pensioners. Not only in terms of money, but other considerations have to be taken into consideration. The only time this House sends anything to Select Committees is when it has to do with members' salaries. Nobody objects, the Government does not object, because the way they do it is that they send recommendations for members' salaries to Select Committees and various things first, and when that report comes back then they go and fix the Ministers' salaries based upon the members' salaries. When it suits them to use politics and a lot of political tricks, the rules and Standing Orders which obviously are outmoded and not suited for the operation of Parliament, they use them.

It may be that in the United Kingdom it probably works well to say that you cannot bring a resolution which is a charge on the Treasury. It may be a good idea, but when you hide behind such parliamentary rules members are forced to adopt certain other methods to have certain matters of importance discussed in Parliament in an effort to achieve some measure of agreement to remove from certain things the rancour of politics and so they ask that certain things be sent to a Select Committee. A matter like this should not really cause all the emotion which has been generated here this afternoon, I would have thought that the Leader of the House, having this resolution in his hand, could have avoided all this emotion by saying to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in whose name the substantive motion stands, that they agree with the preamble and give him as Leader of this House and the Deputy Prime Minister of this country the undertaking that he will raise this matter as soon as possible in an effort that people who would benefit from this resolution could benefit as soon as possible. 6. 15 p. m.

If that was done, we would not have had the rancour which we had today. There is a simple way of dealing with these motions. In the same way as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central recognised the need of the pensioners, the Hon. Leader of the House could have given an undertaking

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of explanation. Because I failed to give that undertaking, it does not necessarily mean that the matter will not be raised in Cabinet in the normal way about increases in pensions generally. This matter will be drawn to the attention of the Cabinet in the normal way.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

Obviously the member who brought this Resolution feels very deeply about it, and from listening to the member for St. Michael South Central, the Cabinet feels deeply about it also. Everybody feels that the Old Age Pensioners are finding great difficulty in surviving on \$8. 00 a week. We do not want to hear that in the ordinary course of events the Cabinet will be considering this, so that there will be no

need for the member to bring this Resolution. We feel that there is priority for dealing with this Resolution, and that is the reason why it was brought in. We need to give priority to it. We do not want to hear from the Hon. Leader of the House that in the ordinary course of things the Cabinet will deal with it. In the ordinary course of things everything put on the Order Paper by the Opposition will be dealt with by the Cabinet; but we want an undertaking that the Cabinet will consider this matter with the greatest haste so that the plight of these people will be alleviated as soon as possible.

I think, Sir, that we have lost sight in here of our objectivity. We see things in terms of the DLP or the BLP. Until we see things in the terms of the people of this country we cannot improve. I saw the attitude of the members of the Government side when we were discussing agriculture which is a very serious matter to this country at the moment and every thing was made a laughing stock and a joke. We had ministers abdicating their responsibility and shifting it to another minister.

The time is going to come when the people will not look at anyone minister, but at the entire Cabinet and not even the entire Government. The Government is solely responsible for the advancement of the country, but when everything goes bad, it is Parliament, which includes the Opposition, who is responsible for it. When everything is going good, it is the Government who is responsible for it, but when everything is going bad it is the whole of Parliament which is responsible.

We have to become serious on matters like these because time is running out.

The question that further consideration of the Resolution be postponed was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows: -

Ayes: Mr. LOWE, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. WEEKES and Hon. F. G. SMITH- 9.

Notes: Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. HINDS and Mr. MOTTLEY - 4.

REVERSION TO GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now revert to Government Business.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

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

LEAVE TO DEAL WITH SUGAR LEVIES RESOLUTION

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have asked for permission to deal with the Sugar Levy Resolution, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has agreed to proceed with this matter. I beg to move that the Sugar Industry (Rehabilitation, Price Stabilisation and Labour Welfare) Resolution be the next order of the day.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Did I hear the Leader of the House say that I agreed to do something?

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of elucidation. Except for the Resolution under Private Members' Business which we dealt with at an earlier stage, Government Business could have been dealt with earlier, and done with. I agreed as a compromise to deal with that Resolution on the understanding that we could then come back to Government Business. 6. 25 p. m.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not want any tug-of-war in here. I never went into any agreement with the Leader of the House. I asked the Leader of the House if we could do Private Members' Business on our

return, and he said he had Government Business to do, he was going to do it and then allow us to do this matter and then whatever Government Business was left over would be dealt with afterwards. I never said "yes" I agree or "no" I disagree with the Leader of the House. What is this at all? As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would be happy if that part of the debate could be struck from the records, because I am saying that I disagreed with the hon. member, and he is saying that I agreed with him, and it would look as if one of us is mixed up. I never went into any agreement with the Leader of the House. As a matter of fact, I would have discussed it with my colleagues first.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I will not carry this on, but the fact is that the hon. member approached me and these were the agreements.

I beg to move that the Resolution to deal with the Sugar Levy be the next Order of the day. It has been duly circulated.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Has it been seconded, Sir? Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER Yes.

Mr. ADAMS:

I am glad of the exchange that has taken place between the Leader of the House and the member for St. James, because I have often been the sufferer, I have come in here and I have heard two comparatively well meaning persons such as the hon. member for Christ Church East and the hon. member for St. Michael South West say "yes, you agreed to do this" or you agreed to do that, and upon this occasion it is carried on although it is patent there was no agreement with the hon. member for St. James, and I have asked that to avoid misunderstanding where it is sought to deal with a Resolution in all its stages that communication should be in writing, because even if people do not want to tell a lie on you, who gain nothing from telling a lie on you, who are not persons in whom malice rises to such a pitch that they prefer to tell lies than tell the truth, mistakes can happen even in those circumstances, and I have every confidence that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not agreed to anything relating to a sugar levy and I have further confidence I have not got any copy circulated to me. I know nothing about it. It is the duty of whoever is doing the circulating to see that a copy is at every member's place. I have not been circulated; it does not matter whether I was here or not. Circulate means circulate, not that those people who were here were shown a piece of paper. I want a copy. I can certainly tell you for sure

that I have not received any letter referring to it. The House meets every two weeks, you have two weeks to prepare things, and yet there is always urgency.

Sir, I am standing up waiting to see a copy. If hon. members have been circulated and I was not here, I am here now.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

If the hon. member would give way.....

Mr. ADAMS:

No, Sir. I am not giving way. I want to say there is no way that we are going to agree to do this matter, because this introduces distinctions of principle which I am unaware have before existed. I am speaking on the motion, Sir. It is an order referring to the Caribbean Community Act, it refers to the sugar levy of \$40 a ton, and with all these, is it really intended that a whole and new and drastic alteration in the means by which we are going to tax the sugar industry of this Island be dealt with at 6 o'clock in the evening without notice to hon. members? To my mind this is essentially a budgetary measure.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, the hon. member has only come in here about an hour or two ago. This was tabled since 12 o'clock. If you were doing other business outside, do not come in now at 6 o'clock and find fault. If you were here you would have had a chance to read it. This was circulated at 12 o'clock and I got permission to deal with it. After all this representation for poor people, this is the money we pay them for their canes, and when you postpone this or try to vote against it, what are you doing? Mr. Deputy Speaker, I made a motion that this Resolution be dealt with in all its stages.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am speaking on the motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House said that the hon. member for St. Thomas only came in an hour or two ago and did not get a copy of the Resolution. The first time I am seeing a copy is now that I am sitting in the seat of the hon. member for Christ Church West. I have not received a copy, and I do not like the idea of people coming in here and somebody pushing things in their hands and they

are expected to digest them in this way. This is a wrong principle

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Permission had been sought by the Leader of the House to deal with this Resolution when the House sat at 12 o'clock, and he has now moved that this Resolution be dealt with. He asked permission early in the day and I gathered that consultation could have taken place. I am not aware if it took place or not, but he said it would be dealt with in all its stages before the sitting ended, and there was no objection. Those who have come to the House late might now have heard of it, but I can say that the Leader of the House did seek permission early to deal with this in all its stages.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

On a point of order, the Hon. Leader of the House cannot ask for permission early in the day. He can intimate to the House that he would ask for permission later; so he now has to seek permission, since permission could not have been given early in the day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I did not say that permission was given.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

May I remind you, with all due respect, that you are there to protect the right of the minority in this House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That is what I am trying to do, because you as an hon. member did not come in early enough to know what took place and you are speaking on something you did not hear.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I rose and said I did not receive a copy and I was here before 1 o'clock. I have just seen a copy for the first time.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

That may be true. I have no doubt that you did not receive a copy, but I can vouch that permission was sought.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

This dishonest way of doing things in here is not satisfactory.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order, copies were circulated by either the Clerk or the Marshal early.

Mr. MOTTLEY:

I did not receive any.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bridgetown has complained of not having received a copy. Mr, Clerk, please make sure that the hon. member gets a copy.

Mr. CRAIG:

Sir, I recall the Minister of Communications and Works and the Speaker of the House....

Mr. ADAMS:

It is hard to say that what you do in an organisation where the majority takes power to itself to suspend the rules and to work outside the rules when it suits it. In many ways I have said before in here that I regret that we have snatched at the imperialist concept of making Parliament utterly immune to outside review in a way that is known only, I believe, in the United Kingdom and its emotional satellites so that we can come in here on a matter which the Rules lay down is obviously one that requires a mature consideration of members can yet be sought to be dealt with at 6 o'clock when there is not very much more time to debate it, when neither the interests of the Government, the people, the sugar industry, the revenue, none can really, if Parliament is to exist and have a meaning, be properly satisfied by dealing with this matter. 6. 35 p. m.

This is a major revenue measure. There is no doubt about it, we are to have a budget in a couple of days. We heard that we cannot talk about old age pensions because it might be in the budget, but we can talk about this in all its stages which should be in the budget. We hear that the Government is aiming to raise \$21.2 million revenue for the Crown by means of this Order. In other words, this is a major revenue measure, this is not any little piddling order you can afford to pass because it has always been

the same. Perhaps it is not as much as \$2.4 million, maybe it is only \$-2% million, Sir, I do not know what the sugar production is this year and what proportion is staying in Barbados or in the Common Market, but that is the Order we are talking about, and hon. members are going to follow like sheep, this is nothing that can be dealt with just like that, merely because they have a majority? What is the point of having rules? What is the point of saying that notice must be given? What is the point of soliciting debate in here if matters such as this are going to be dealt with like this? Why bother to give us notice of the resolution for \$557, 000, or even that for \$7 million? You must come in the House, ask the permission of the Speaker or put them on the table and use your majority to suspend the Standing Orders.

I wonder if hon. members are serious when they call this a Parliament. If this is to be committee Government, let it be committee Government and the committee could decide or switch over to the American system and elect a Governor for four years and let him decide what he is going to do, and at the end of the time put himself forward for election again. But this is supposed to be a debating Assembly. Do hon. members really believe they can do justice to this sugar industry levy when the whole sugar business needs to be talked about? The fact that although the world has a record sugar production yet it also has a record price? All these things need to be canvassed in discussing a matter such as this. I do not believe that I see on the Government benches at this moment anybody with great respect to all the hon. members sitting down there, who can satisfy the needs of the Opposition and the public of Barbados with information about the Government's sugar policy, about the trend of the world sugar market and about the future financing of the sugar industry now that it is getting that money? There are a whole series of matters to be dealt with under this, whether the Government is prepared to make monies available to the sugar industry to improve its reaping machinery, to improve its system of reaping. What steps the Government is going to take to achieve a sugar production of 150, 000 tons, whether in the light of the contribution that sugar is now able to make to the revenue, whether even as a matter of wages what the Government is going to do, what the Union is going to be able to tell us about the future share of the workers in the profits of sugar. This is a major matter although it may come in the guise of an Order requiring passage through the House. More than that, it could come in the budget and be handled subsequent to the budget, and the Leader of the House is sitting down saying we are wasting his time.

I will say something to the Leader of the House. When he was in a Party which had to fight for the right of people like all of us in here to come in here and be members of Parliament and rule over this island, if they had handled him and others with whom he was in consort at the time - Sir Grantley Adams and W. A. Crawford and others - if they had handled the then pioneers as the Democratic Labour Party Government now wishes to handle the Opposition, none of us would be in here now. Sir, the Standing Orders say that notice should not be dispensed with in the case of a motion or in respect of any proceedings for which notice is required except with the consent of the Speaker. I gather that the Leader of the House is moving a motion in which he is asking for the House to deal with a resolution in all its stages. It is my respectful submission that that motion is out of order because it is the Speaker's consent that is necessary to found a situation where no notice is going to be given. In my respectful submission this motion is contrary to Standing Order 29. That is point number one.

The rules say that notice shall be given of any motion to move with the exception of the following, and the following go from 1 to 20, and none of these motions that do not have to be given by notice include a sugar industry production and rehabilitation levy. In all the circumstances I ask Your Honour to rule that the motion is out of order, and I further ask Your Honour not to give consent for any motion such as this to be made without notice in the manner suggested by the Leader of the House.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I do not want to delay this, Sir, because you have a substantive motion before you. If the Leader of the Opposition was taking his parliamentary duties seriously he would have been in here earlier on and would have had a copy of the resolution dealing with the sugar reserve and would have been in a position to have studied it and got whatever consultation he wanted and so on, but of course he came late and now he is unaware of the fact that consent has already been given to deal with this in all its stages by the Speaker. Now that the Deputy Leader got embarrassed with his fancy resolution he has changed and said he never gave consent. I understand all those manoeuvres but I do not want to waste time with him, whether he told me or not. It is a compromise arrangement which we agreed on, because normally I would have gone straight through with Government Business, but I stopped at a certain stage to accommodate him.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I cannot sit here all the time and hear the Leader of the House say that I agreed with him. I could call certain persons who overheard the conversation between the two of us, but it is unfair. If I were in a rum shop I would know what to call him but I am not in a rum shop. I would not agree to something like this unless I had discussed it with my colleagues. I tried my very best to ask the Leader of the House to let us do Private Members' Business and when he asked me why I told him it was not beyond his members to leave Parliament after they got through Government Business. He said he was going to do Government Business and then allow me to do the resolution and continue with what other business he had to do.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I agreed to do the two money resolutions and stop there. I kept my word and then allowed him to deal with Private Members' Business. He wanted to deal with Private Members' Business immediately after lunch.

Mr. CRAIG:

All of that is true, but I never agreed with the Leader of the House to come in here and do any

resolution. As a matter of fact, I did not even look at the resolution, and it is unfair, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I believe you will deal with them for coming in here and pushing things down bur throats. The people outside are always asking what is the Opposition doing, but I believe the people should be in here and they would be able to see that we can do nothing.

6. 45 p. m.

We have received a Resolution of this nature. None of us could get together and do any research or get any information. We have to come and guess because they have the numbers. Because they have the numbers you hear the Minister of Housing saying we are going to do it under all conditions. How can we do this when we have not had a chance to look at it?

As the Leader of the Opposition said, this deals with people in Sugar and it is an important Resolution. All we can say is "no" when you put it to the vote, or appeal to the Government to postpone it. Then you hear people on platforms or in newspaper columns saying that the Opposition is inept. That we do nothing. I hope that they are here this evening to see the problems that we are confronted with.

This Resolution was only laid today. We had to deal with an important Resolution and I could only just peep at this one. It is not fair. They have 18 seats. Let us assume, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they have the numbers. We have a responsibility to Parliament and to the people of Barbados; and the first thing you will hear is that the members of the Opposition serve no useful purpose; that they do not work. The Minister of Communications should get up and say something on this.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

On a point of order. I am speaking in connection with the Leader of the Opposition who was not in his place earlier, and who is not aware of what went on. I asked for permission to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. I brought down copies of this Resolution and I presumed that all members got them. I presume that everything was done except getting permission to deal with the Resolution. We have a motion before us and because of these techniques that are being used...

Mr. HINDS:

On a point of order, Sir. If you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were to act fairly in this matter, you may have to pay dearly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I intend to act fairly regardless.

Mr. HINDS:

I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that I was one of the members who was here early enough to receive a copy of this Resolution when it was circulated; but when the Leader of the House thought that copies had been circulated, they had not been circulated in truth and in fact. He was taken by surprise and he gave them to the Clerk of Parliament afterwards. (ASIDE That was something else). But the point is this this Resolution was circulated to hon. members at a time when they were engaged in other matters which were then before the House. No hon. member has been given any time to study this.

Members on that side need not study anything whatsoever. Their function is to say "aye" or "no" as the case might be. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have to hear from the minority in this House and see that justice cannot be seen to have been done on this particular occasion if the Chair bows to the weight of the Leader of the House and his numbers. It will not be convenient to discharge the right of the minority in this Honourable House at all times or for all time as is now sought to be done by the Leader of the House and his numbers.

What you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, must take before your mind for consideration is that the most that the Leader of the House could have done during the course of the day was to intimate to the Speaker that he would seek permission to deal with this Resolution in all its stages later in the day; because at the time that he was speaking hon members did not have it in their possession.

So if the Leader of the House now wants to suggest that the Speaker gave him permission, we on this side are submitting that he is saying that the Speaker gave him something which he did not have for himself to give.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May I interrupt to say that I, as Speaker at the time, substantiate that the Leader of the House did at the time intimate that he would ask permission to deal with the Sugar Levy Resolution in all its stages today; but I was of the opinion that he had spoken with the Opposition. Now is the time that he has raised the question. If you agreed to that or not I cannot say.

Now I have been told that the Leader of the Opposition was not present, and the Deputy Leader said

that they have not consulted with the Leader of the House. I know that this is a ticklish question, and I am ruling that no further discussion on this will take place today in the House. Discussion will have to take place at another sitting of the House. 6. 55 p. m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

The only thing I would say is that one has to be extremely careful in dealing with certain members of the Opposition.

Mr. MOTTLEY; I object to that because it is imputing improper motives to members of the Opposition,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I am standing. I expect the Leader of the House to clarify or withdraw that remark.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I withdraw the remark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Leader of the House has withdrawn the remark.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Order stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works, and is to move the second reading of a Bill to amend the Department of Highways and Transport Act, 1945.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill, after what has just passed, should be non-controversial. I do not think it can be said that they did not have notice of this, but I share the Opposition's concern that this late bringing down of an important piece of legislation is not satisfactory to the House. (Asides) I did not have to get up and say that; I have said it now. What is the difference between five minutes before and now? Does it make any difference? I agree that there are occasions when it has to be done, and as I say, I think the House deserves the treatment of having an important piece of legislation brought to them early for serious study.

Be that as it may, this has been brought down in good time. It is non-controversial. From the time I took up the Ministry of Communications I have been concerned with dangerous corners, the growing of crops within an area which blocks the visibility of motorists at junctions and so on. I wrote to plantation owners and asked them not to plant canes too near the corner; some complied and some have not i complied, and therefore the time has come when legislation would have to be enacted by giving the Ministry power to prevent and to stop the growing of crops which block the visibility around dangerous junctions and corners until such time as the Ministry is financially able to create that visibility by widening junctions and by highway improvement. Section 22A of the Bill will read:

"No owner or occupier of land adjoining a highway shall cultivate or allow to grow on such land any plant so as to prevent users of the highway from having an un-obstructed view for a distance of at least 40 yards along such highway or along any other highway adjacent thereto, '5

I think hon. members of the Opposition will agree this is a very good piece of legislation to meet the circumstances as existing at the moment. This is not the solution for highway improvement, but it is a temporary expedient to see if we can save the lives of motorists and pedestrians in the use of the highways.

Now another point that has exercised the Ministry is the inability by law of the Ministry to enter on private property for the purpose of cleaning drains and suck wells. As a matter of fact, when we were doing a certain drain in Goodland, a man came out with a collins and threatened to kill the members of M. C. W. because technically we had not got the authority by any law to enter to improve the drainage or to do certain necessary works on private property. So you will see that Section 23 reads:

"Where the Chief Technical Director is satisfied that in the public interest any works on private lands are necessary he may serve or cause to be served on the owner or occupier of such premises a notice in writing requiring him to execute such works. "

You will notice that every attempt is made in this legislation to give the owner complete consideration. The notice must specify the period and the notice must say what is to be done etc. You will also notice my concern for poor people which the hon. member for St. James does not seem to understand, in that,

where the Chief Technical Director who is acting under the Minister is satisfied on the advice of the Chief Welfare Officer that an owner or occupier is physically or financially unable to execute works under subsection (3), he may cause such works to be done without expense to the owner or the occupier.

We have just got a nice piece of tree trimming equipment in the Ministry and this will enable us to help poor people to cut down rotten trees on their premises which technically is their responsibility. If a man has a rotten tree on his premises and even if it overhangs the road, it is technically not the Ministry's responsibility, it is his responsibility, but this amendment will enable me, if I find that some old pensioner has a rotten coconut tree, to send my tree trimming equipment and cut it down for him at no expense to him, provided I am satisfied. It is surprising that some people charge them \$760. Some people had some dead coconut trees in Belleville and they were charged \$760 and \$600 to cut down those coconut trees - poor old age pensioners. We did not have any equipment and therefore we could not oblige them, but now we are in a position to accommodate needy cases.

I think you will see, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we give the person the right of appeal if he thinks we are unnecessarily interfering with his right; we have given the Judge certain grounds on which he can allow or dismiss the appeal, and then you will notice that we are claiming the right to enter on premises to see whether the work is being done, whether there is a breach of the condition, and Section 23B(1) clearly sets out the method by which we can make sure that the work is done to the satisfaction of the Technical Staff of the Ministry.

So this Bill has a two-fold purpose: to enable the Ministry temporarily at least to improve visibility around dangerous corners and junctions, and secondly to improve the drainage by being able to enter on private property and clean wells or clean gullies, or anything which might cause unnecessary problems, even out-fall drains on private property in or near to the hon. member for St. Peter, and to enable us to do things which are long overdue. The lack of this piece of legislation has hampered the Ministry in many ways. The owners give permission, then they change their minds, the son says not to do this and the brother don't do that, and this has certainly hampered the Ministry in many areas from bringing alleviation to people who are being flooded out, and this will assist us in this improvement.

I think the Bill as it stands does not take away any rights from anybody, it gives them ample right to go to court, it gives the Judge ample right to reject on certain grounds the Ministry's claim as well as the claim of the person who is affected.

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. ADAMS:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I hope that I do not puncture the satisfaction of the hon. member if I find one or two minor criticisms to make of the Bill and perhaps one or two comments to make on perhaps what might have been in the Bill.

First of all, the Opposition much as we might like to agree with the principle and much while as lawyers we appreciate the new proposed Section 23(1), yet we will be failing in our duty if we did not point out that the language is dangerously wide and bordering on the unconstitutional. The language reads thus, Sir:

"Where the Chief Technical Director is satisfied that in the public interest any works on private lands are necessary, he may serve or cause to be served on the owner or occupier of such premises a notice in writing requiring him to execute such works. " 7. 05 p. m I have carefully studied the Department of Highways and Transport Act itself and this Act does not either as the Highways Act of 1900 did recite that it is an Act intended to consolidate and amend the laws relating to highways, nor does it say that it is passed for the purpose of improvement to highways, and therefore in other words there is nothing in the preamble or the words of enactment which would in the ordinary course of statutory interpretation limit the application of this "any works on private lands are necessary". I just ask the Minister to look at that. I know that the lawyers will have a field day with it unless the Chief Technical Director is sensible enough to tell people that they must build a wall or they must not plant a hedge, they must have a wall or they must take down a wall and put a hedge because cars are always driving off the road and hitting the walls. All these things are possible in my view in the language which is used here. Indeed under the language which is used here I imagine that with a strong dose of unscrupulousness you can look at a vacant parcel of land and tell a man to build a block of apartments on it because poor people need houses. That is carrying it to extremes, but the language is extreme language. "If he is satisfied that in the public interest any works on private lands are necessary he may serve or cause to be served on the owner or occupier of such premises a notice in writing requiring him to execute such works. " That to me is an extremely wide power to be giving the Chief Technical Director of the Department of Highways and Transport and it would require the eloquence of another Adams in the House. I can imagine how my late father would have paraded in Opposition if he saw a phrase such as this, but the general spirit of the Bill, although it might technically be an infringement on people's liberty, yet it may be a useful stop gap in which the Government can afford to fringe highways with proper hard shoulders and a spacious highway.

I regret that while the Minister was having the Department of Highways and Transport Act amended

he did not see fit to consolidate and amend all the laws relating to highways. It has been a matter of amusement to persons who study these laws to find that there are many sections in the Department of Highways and Transport Act which are identical with sections to be found in the Highways Act of 1900, except that in the Highways Act of 1900 it refers to the Commissioners of Roads then and subsequently to whoever it is discharging the duties of the Commissioner for Local Government has been amended, while the Department of Highways Act is Chief Technical Director. In other words, there are two sets of laws in Barbados dealing with the same subject in the same way in the same Words. If the Minister wants assistance he can look at the section dealing with encroaching. He will find that the 1900-5 Act says in section 26 "If any person shall encroach upon any highway by Means of any building, enclosure, hedge, fence, or in any manner, such person shall incur a penalty not exceeding the sum of £2. " He will find that that is reproduced in section 17 of the Act we are now amending. In other words, the two sections are the same.

He will find that in 1900 it was an offence to place timber, stone, trash, manure, soil, ashes, rubbish or any matter whatsoever upon any highway. The Minister of Health will be glad to hear of that, and he will find that that same section is reproduced in section 18 of the Act of 1945-12, so you can go either way if you care to. The penalties are indeed, I think, the same, you can just take your choice. Until recently if you played on a musical instrument called the pump or on any loud instrument you could be fined five shillings. Even now if you hang clothes to dry on any wall, hedge, fence or paling adjoining any highway or spread the same on the ground within ten yards of any highway you can be fined five shillings for doing that. I do not think it looks good to see clothes hanging over pailings on the road, but I think that it is more a danger to the people whose clothes they are than an offence to the public. Nonetheless, all these quaint, little, ancient anomalies need bringing up to date. For example, as a matter of some moment, to people who have houses in towns. the expression "town" is still used although there are no longer any towns in Barbados since the repeal of the Bridgetown, Speightstown and Hometown Act, in towns the right to erect scaffolding to repair your building is preserved but the Act says at present you must have the concurrence of the Director of Highways and Transport but there is no penalty for putting up scaffolding along the highway to repair your place without the concurrence of the Director. In other words, although you are supposed to ask the Director, if he says no you can still go ahead and put it up. There are all these little anomalies which I submit could have been dealt with in one comprehensive Act at the same time as we are asked to deal with this, and so I would ask the Minister of Communications and Works to do two things. I am not insensible to the fact that he is a lawyer, so I ask him before he amends one Act relating to highways to read all the others because he may have been put in a better position to assess the advice that he is getting from his technical officers and from the Crown Law Officers. It is many years we have not had a field day in here on the Crown Law Officers, but this is an example of what we mean when we say they often do not know what they are doing. Two Acts, the Highways Act and the Department of Highways Act, and you are amending one without dealing in to with the whole mass of highway law in Barbados in the light of modern experience and the legislative examples available to us in many other circles.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I really am amused and very thrilled to see the thoroughness and the knowledge

of the Leader of the Opposition of both these highway Acts When the Leader of the Opposition was legal adviser to Mr. Riley who prosecuted me, had his knowledge of the Highways Act been as thorough as he displayed this afternoon he probably would have known that he would have had a chance of a more successful prosecution under the High ways Act than under the Public Order Act. I do not know what has driven him now to the Highways Act because he could never have won under the Public Order Act, but he might have had a chance under the Highways Act.

Mr. ADAMS:

On a point of order, Sir, if the hon. member will give way, is he admitting that he has either thrown a stone across the highway for other missile likely to cause injury to a passenger, or is he admitting that he used offensive language?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

All I am saying is that had his research been as thorough as it is today he might have been able to advise his client more properly but I am grateful to him for his suggestions and I will bear in mind what the hon. member has said.

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed. Clause 3 was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 3 stand part.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN:

I beg to second that.

Mr. CRAIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the Minister's attention that in Holetown there is one of the biggest drainage problems there. I have been promised over and over by the former Minister of Communications and Works that something would be done. He went to the site, the Leader of the House at that time was Minister of Health, and they went together with a Mr. Harding from the Ministry of Health to look at the problem which we have right there in Holetown. 7. 15p. m.

If there is no rain in Holetown it is strange how the whole of Holetown can be flooded out; and the problem you are having there is a problem of drainage, right on Trents land. I am told by old timers living there that you never had this problem until the wall by Discovery Bay was put up. The people at Discovery Bay, I am told, brought in their engineer and they did their part. They put down some very large drains, and the Government was supposed to do their part.

I do not go down now. I would be going down every month just to let somebody see me wading through water, going to see the people. I cannot help them. That is really for the Attorney General. He has to go through the water now. I can only call the Fire Service or the people at the American naval facility in St. Lucy to go and pump the water off.

I know that the problem has been so bad there, that a girl was hospitalised for about two months, and she also lost a baby about three months old. I said then that the Minister of Communications and Works and the Prime Minister should have been charged with manslaughter.

I am appealing to this Minister to put this on his list - not one or two gutters where you have water overflowing the streets - but to make this Holetown drainage a priority. I would like to go with him I do not want any camera man. I am not going into Grazettes looking at garbage dumps or any nonsense with any Minister. Any morning that you are available I can put on my short pants and you put on yours and go and give it a little peep; and I would like you to give this Committee the assurance now that you will make that a No. 1 priority.

I have been asking about it from 1966. I am not asking for a camera man. It is not necessary. The "Advocate" and the "Nation" -the "Beacon" is not around and the "Democrat" will not be around for a long time. Just you and I and maybe your Technical Adviser, to see what we can do there. No credit for

me. Just to help the people in Holetown.

I am making that simple request and I hope that the Minister will stand up and go on record that he will make it a priority now that his Technical Adviser has the power. I am appealing to him to make an appointment to go down with me, any morning or afternoon or evening. I have seen people in St. James with pecks and hoes digging away some of the earth and the water will go into the sea; so I believe that all you need to do is to drain the water into the sea as the old timers say it used to come across the land and empty itself into the sea. It is not like the Coast Guard - \$2 million. Just a couple of hundred dollars would do the trick. I am asking the Minister please to look into this matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH:

It would be preferable to go when the rain is falling or when there has been rain. You will appreciate my position, Sir, because I am torn between the request from him., the gentleman from St. Peter for another part of St. James, the hon. member for Christ Church West and the hon. member for the City for Emmerton. You can see my problem.

All of them, except the member for St. Thomas, who has very little problems, because his water flows down on us in town; but the others have drainage problems which is a problem in Barbados. I will set up a site visit and see it. I must say in fairness to my colleague, the hon. Minister of Education, that he has raised this question some time ago. He passes through not as a representative, but as a concerned resident.

The question that Clause 4 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 5 was called.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Hon. P. G. MORGAN the question that Clause 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. F. G. SMITH seconded by Hon. P. G. MORGAN Mr.

CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the jit Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. F. G. SMITH seconded by Hon. P. G. MORGAN the Bill was read a third time and passed.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this completes Government Business for today. Before suspending until Thursday at 4. 45 p. m. I will recall that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Planning has secured permission from the Speaker to deal with the Supplementary Budget on Thursday at 5 p. m. The necessary arrangements for the broadcasting of the speech on the Supplementary Budget will be made in the normal way and the various equipment will be installed. The time that it is expected that the Leader of the Opposition will reply is the 26th November at 5 o'clock in the afternoon and the same arrangements will be made. I propose to deal with the Sugar Levy Resolution after the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has made his Supplementary Budget proposals on Thursday.

I now beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until Thursday, the 21st November at 4. 45 p. m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr; Speaker, as Your Honour will recall, the object of this sitting is mainly to provide an opportunity for the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning to present his Supplementary Budget. It was my intention to deal with the Resolution in connection with the sugar levy under which the price of cane is fixed every year and which has to be dealt with before the end of November in order to ensure that sugar growers can receive their final payments on the sale of their sugar crop. Certain amendments were necessary in connection with the Order dealing with the sugar levy. I am not in a position to proceed with that immediately, but I will see that hon. members get their copies of the amended Order over the week-end, and it will be proceeded with next Tuesday when the House sits at 12 o'clock.

We do not intend to deal with any other matters except the Supplementary budget which the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance will be here to deliver at the stipulated time of 5 o'clock as indicated by him earlier on. For that reason I am glad to see so many members in their seats, and it may be well that we called the House fifteen minutes prior to the delivery of the Budgetary Proposals. In other words, having suspended the sitting until 4. 45 p. m still serves a useful purpose by enabling hon. members to be in their seats and be ready to hear the Budgetary Proposals and Financial Statement when delivered by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in another few minutes.

Hon. G. G. FERGUSSON:

I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly. 7. 25 p. m.

On Resumption:

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 5 o'clock.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE:

I beg to second that.

Mr, SPEAKER:

When this Sitting was suspended, we were on Government Business.

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

On Resumption:

**SUPPLEMENTARY FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS MADE BY
THE RT. HONOURABLE ERROL W. BARROW, PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF
FINANCE AND PLANNING ON 21ST NOVEMBER, 1974**

Mr. Speaker, on the 5th day of April this year, I presented to this House the financial statement and my budgetary proposals for the fiscal year 1974-75. These proposals were presented unusually early; but as I stated to Honourable Members at that time, the situation with which the measures sought to deal was an unusual one. That budget was presented against a background of international exchange rate fluctuations; world-wide inflation and universal shortages of supplies of food and raw materials. The single factor which tended to dominate all others at that time was the unprecedented and massive increase in the prices of petroleum products.

Developments in the international economy over the past six months clearly reveal that crucial as are the problems of adjustment facing the oil-consuming countries, there are other equally complex and fundamental forces at work which require quick and effective solutions if the present threat to the well-being of all countries, large and small, developed and developing, is to be averted. I refer in particular to the combination of high and rising rates of inflation with the decline in the level of economic activity, known in the language of our times as the phenomenon of 'Slumflation' which, if it becomes chronic, will pose the most serious threat to employment and living standards of the western world since the Great Depression of the 1930s.

Few of the non-oil exporting countries in the world have escaped the effects of 'slumflation' and everywhere the picture is the same - inflation, rising unemployment and falling real living standards. More alarming for the immediate outlook, is the recent admission by the President of the United States that the American economy has moved into recession and, West Germany apart, the picture is the same in Western Europe and Japan.

Very few countries in this increasingly inter-dependent world, especially small open economies such as ours, can hope to insulate themselves from these developments. It must be frankly recognised that the prospects for an early resumption of growth in Barbados depend to a large extent on the success or failure of the international community, in particular the major economic powers, in overcoming the very severe problems we all face. However, this is not to imply that we should sit placidly on the sidelines and do nothing. To the contrary inter-dependence requires that we should do our part in introducing corrective and remedial action. Indeed, as successive budgets have demonstrated, Government has used

the tools at its disposal to attempt to stabilise the economy and promote growth and development.

At the time of the framing of the budgetary proposals in April, inflation and disequilibrium in the balance of payments seemed to be the most pressing problems requiring immediate remedial action. The available evidence suggested that 1973 was a year of modest but positive growth in real terms due largely to a buoyant export performance and continued growth in tourist receipts. Yet, the rate of growth was little more than recovery from the slippage experienced in 1972. In addition, the overall deficit in the balance of payment for calendar year 1973 was estimated at that time to be approximately 3 times that for 1972 and 26 times that for 1971. The growing pace of price increases assumed proportions formerly associated only with Latin American economies.

The fiscal year 1973-74 was also significant because of the reversal of the historical trend of surplus on Central Government Current Account. To this phenomenon must be added the rapid growth in the level of capital expenditure (up 113% over the period 1970/71 - 1973/74) which together with the current account deficit resulted in a considerable overall public sector deficit.

In sum, the level of economic activity and incomes in 1973 was maintained by substantial deficit spending by Government and by an increase in the net foreign liabilities of the commercial banks. The 1974 Budgetary Proposals sought to correct, in particular, the new emergence of deficit spending on current account by the Central Government as well as overall deficit in the balance of payments. It sought to do both in ways that would not further aggravate the pace of already rapid price increases.

As I shall demonstrate later in the course of my remarks, the overall economic picture has changed in certain important respects since April of this year.

The latest available information suggests that the brief recovery in the level of economic activity experienced in 1973 has given way in 1974 to a repetition of the slippage experienced in 1972. The information suggests, too, that while the balance of payments shows encouraging signs of recovery in 1974 rather than further deterioration as anticipated, the slow down in economic activity requires additional measures to strengthen the Government's budgetary position and to stimulate growth.

In addition, the pace of inflation continues to quicken significantly, and it is now clear that an attempt must be made to bring the rate of price increases at least in line with our main trading partners if Government's entire programme for recovery, growth and fiscal soundness is not to be threatened by the

social pressures brought on by declining living standards and the unhealthy consequence of a wage/price spiral of major proportions. A shift in the emphasis of Government's budgetary policy would therefore seem justified at this time to take more fully into account the realities of the current economic situation.

Economic Performance Government, The level of Government activity for the six months period April - September 1974 shows a mixed picture. On the one hand, both current revenue and expenditure are up 18% over the corresponding period in the fiscal year 1973-1974. On the other hand, capital expenditure shows a slight decline in nominal terms for 1974 compared with the 1973 level (\$13.9 million and \$14.4 million respectively). In other words, when allowance is made for some element of price increase, Government capital expenditure has declined in real terms by more than 20%.

The overall picture on Government Account for 1974/75 is that if nothing is done this fiscal year will be one of continued deficit in the current account (estimated at \$22.0 million compared with \$14.5 million in 1973-74) that capital expenditure will show an estimated \$5.0 million (13%) increase over the 1973/74 level to reach \$35.0 million, and that the overall deficit in Government Account would be in the region of \$57.0 million.

Export Sector. A crucial determinant of the level of economic activity in Barbados is of course the performance of exports mainly Sugar, Tourism and Manufacturing. Here the picture is encouraging. Indeed, it is largely, if not entirely, due to the buoyancy of the export sector that the 1974 picture still contains elements of reassurance. Though sugar production for 1974 declined in real terms (total production fell 7,750 tons from the 1973 level), receipts from sugar exports show an estimated 55% increase over receipts for 1973.

The criticism that the Government has done nothing to increase export prices is flatly contradicted by the receipts of \$58 million from sugar sales as a direct result of my intervention in export sales strategy. After consultation earlier this year with my colleagues the Prime Ministers of Guyana and Jamaica we decided that the sale of sugar was too vital to our economies to be left for disposal by a group of private interests. In consultation with the Ministry of Trade and the Director of the Barbados Sugar Producers Federation our sugar sales and prices continue to be regulated on my instructions in order to maximise our export earnings without doing too great violence to the requirement of a long term strategy of guarantees.

As far as our Tourism strategy is concerned, Barbados was unique in 1974 among all the countries in the area in that our industry continued to grow both in real and in nominal terms. Arrivals for 1974 so far have increased by an estimated 6% while gross receipts have increased by an estimated 12.4%.

Exports of manufactured goods also show a substantial increase of some 46% over the 1973 level more than maintaining the high rate of increase registered in 1973.

Overall domestic exports for 1974 are expected to reach an estimated value of \$125. 1 million, reflecting an increase of 51% over 1973 and 96% over 1972 levels.

Balance of Payments

The Balance of Payments picture, though not bright, gives considerably less cause for concern than the forecast made at the time of the preparation of the 1974 Budgetary Proposals suggested was necessary. As noted above, our export performance comfortably exceeded the forecast, exceeding the previous year's increase of 42%. The value of Imports on the other hand show an increase of 27. 5% for the first 6 months of the year - the lowest rate of increase, in spite of inflation, recorded for many years. In addition to a better than expected picture on the current account of the balance of payments, estimated capital inflows are expected to be maintained at or slightly exceed 1973 levels. The Overall Deficit in the balance of payments for 1974 is accordingly estimated at \$3. 4 million as compared with an actual deficit of \$17. 1 million for 1973 and a projected deficit (at the time of the framing of the Budgetary Proposals in April this year) of \$30 million or more for 1974,

Corresponding with a slightly improved or better-than-forecast picture in the balance of payments is the slightly improved picture for Reserves. Indeed, for every month from July of this year when total International Reserves reached \$51. 6 million, the reserve picture represented an improvement over the corresponding months for 1973. The estimated Reserves at 31st October 1974 were \$31. 0 million. The 31st December, 1974 level is estimated at \$29. 0 million compared with a level of \$26. 4 million for 31st December, 1973.

Sectoral Performance

There are no sectoral estimates of Gross Domestic Product available for 1974 so far, but analysis of the latest foreign trade data and of commercial bank lending indicates that while the level of output in the manufacturing sector has probably increased there has been no real growth in distribution or construction, and investment has declined.

Inflation

Some idea of the pace of inflation can be obtained by looking at comparative rates of price increase in the recent past as measured by the Retail Price Index. The December 1972 to December 1973 movement in the Index was 26%. The October 1973 to October 1974 movement & the Index was by contrast 40%. The January to October 1973 movement in the Index was 16. 3%, whereas the movement in the Index for the corresponding period in 1974 was 25. 4%. There is little doubt, then, that the pace of inflation has continued to quicken quite significantly.

Even more than in the past, food items account for by far the greater proportion of the overall price increase. And even here, the greatest contribution is made by a handful of traditional items (of which rice is a simple but outstanding example) which are all imported.

Summary

It would appear that the policies of tight credit and import and foreign exchange restrictions pursued in the last 6 months or more have successfully transferred resources from the domestic economy to the balance of payments. In addition, buoyant exports have also contributed to an easing of the pressure on international reserves. The improvement in the external sector has however been achieved largely at the expense of reduced employment opportunities and the overall level of economic activity.

As is well known, the situation is not without its complexities and paradoxes. The down-turn in economic activity has not been accompanied by a slackening in the pace of inflation. On the contrary, inflationary trends in the economy have now reached proportions that could cancel the gains from all other policies.

Further, the growth in the size of the overall public sector deficit has been due more to rising levels of current expenditure and sluggish revenues than to acceleration in the level of spending on capital works. The result is that the fiscal position is at once inflationary (price) and deflationary (output and employment). A reversal of present budgetary trends would indeed seem a necessary condition to recovery in growth of output and a decline in current price trends.

In the circumstances, no single policy expedient could succeed in bringing about the desired changes. The benefits of sharply increased Government revenues could be wiped out either by increased wage claims or other non-productive expenditures. Also, policies to generate employment and boost investment would prove highly inflationary if too tight restrictions were placed on imports. In any event, import restrictions and increased unemployment in the distribution sector go hand in hand.

It is evident, then that what is required is a package of policies designed to reduce the current high level of inflation while at the same time raising the level of investment as; 4 necessary pre-condition to the resumption of economic growth.

Fiscal Policy

As noted earlier, the data available so far indicate that the public sector will record a larger overall deficit in the fiscal year 1974/75 than in 1973/74. The emergence of current account deficits of increasing magnitude in the last two years has been caused principally by the rapid increase in the rate of Government current expenditure. Contrary to the views expressed by uninformed commentators, this has not been due to waste and extravagance, but has to a large extent been the result of increases in wages and salaries, in welfare and pension payments to the aged and indigent, and to the spiralling cost of materials and equipment which Government has to purchase. Strenuous efforts have been made to restrain the rate of increase of current expenditure, by, for example, a freeze on staff recruitment, the postponement of new programmes and curtailment of some existing programmes. As a result of these measures the rate of increase in current expenditure so far this fiscal year has been kept to around 18%, which is well below the current rate of inflation.

It must be emphasised that any further efforts to curtail current expenditure would be at the cost of the provision of vital social services in education, health, welfare, environmental sanitation, etc, which could have very serious implications for the health and well-being of this nation and in particular for those vulnerable sections of the population most seriously affected by the ravages of inflation. One major objective, therefore, of the budget measures which I am about to announce is to reduce Government's current account deficit without at the same time having to curtail vital public services or resort to inflationary borrowing.

Of great importance also, is the need to strengthen Government's financial position so that the rate of spending on capital account can be increased.

This is necessary because the uncertainties of these times exaggerate the normal fluctuations which occur in private spending. These fluctuations in spending contribute to variations in production and employment.

The classical remedy for a reduction of private investment is for Governments to step in and fill the vacuum with an emergency works programme. Such programmes have no lasting effect and would not be relevant to the current situation.

The Government has a portfolio of projects which we deem essential for the strengthening and enhancement of the productive capacity of the economy. Foreign financial resources for the implementation of these projects have either already been granted by lending institutions or else the projects are currently being appraised by these agencies. The implementation of these projects will directly provide the infrastructure which is a pre-requisite and condition for development and growth and will directly stimulate employment with consequential beneficial effects for the productive and distributive sectors. Obviously these projects cannot all be started at the same time and will have to be phased in over a period of time. The projects which have been, or are being negotiated with the international or bilateral lending agencies with projected levels of assistance are:

Agriculture (\$21 million)

- (a) Sugar Industry Rehabilitation and Rationalization (World Bank Loan).
- (b) Rural Land Settlement Scheme at Spring Hall (Caribbean Development Bank Loan)
- (c) Agricultural Credit Scheme for small farmers (Caribbean Development Bank Loan)
- (d) Development of Deep Sea Fishing and Shore based facilities (Inter-American Development Bank Loan)
- (e) Improvement of physical facilities for the marketing of agricultural produce.

Industry (\$3. 3 million)

(a) Development of Industrial Estates (Inter-American Development Bank Loan) Communication (\$38 million)

(a) Deep Water Harbour Extension (Inter-American Development Bank Loan)

(b) Seawell Airport Development (Canadian International Development Agencies) Education (\$12. 6 million)

(a) Extension of facilities of Barbados Community College (Inter-American Development Bank Loan)

(b) Building and equipment for Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic (Inter-American Development Bank Loan)

(c) Student Education Revolving Loan Fund (Inter-American Development Bank Loan) Other Social Infrastructure (\$19. 4 million)

(a) Development of Sewage Disposal System for Bridgetown.

(b) Water Resources Development.

(c) Mortgage Financing Scheme.

In addition, Government has only this week received the feasibility study on the establishment of the cement plant and the early implementation of this project is being accorded the highest priority. The estimated cost of the plant is \$24 million.

Supplementary Budget Proposals

The total foreign capital approved by the International sources for these projects is \$1153 million. However, without the provision of adequate local counterpart funds these concessionary foreign capital flows cannot be activated. Government's fiscal position has therefore to be strengthened through the raising of additional taxes. The specific tax measures which I propose now follow.

(1) Road Tax on Motor Spirits

An increase of 300% in the price of crude oil in late 1973 has resulted in a significant increase in the balance of payments burden for petroleum by-products. The increased import bill for all kinds of fuel imported into Barbados is of the magnitude of \$41 million. That is to say, we are paying out to other countries \$41 million more on this account than we did during a corresponding twelve month period last year. There has so far, however, been no commensurate increase to the consumer of fuels made from petroleum with the result that users of motor spirits in particular have not felt the need to adjust consumption levels to the realities of the new price structure. Correspondingly, there has been only a 4 cents increase per gallon in Government revenue on motor spirits. In effect, Government's share in the retail price per gallon of motor spirits has fallen approximately from 40% to 25%. In the circumstances, a substantial increase in road tax on motor spirits would seem justified, on the grounds that it would be hest on the consumers of fuel, would substantially increase revenue and would bring prices of this commodity in line with or below prices obtaining elsewhere in the Caribbean (Trinidad and Tobago excepted) and in line with the non-producing petroleum developing world. I propose to increase the road tax on gasoline from 41 cents per gallon to 81 cents per gallon which will bring the retail price of motor spirits to \$2. 00 per gallon and yield an estimated additional \$5. 3 million in revenue per annum.

I should like to stress that no increase in the tax on diesel fuel is proposed because of the effect this would have on public transport, or on kerosene because of its importance in the weekly budget of so many people in the lower income brackets.

(2) Sales Tax

I propose to introduce a 5% sales tax on commodities effective 1st December 1974 which will fall on all retail sales exceeding \$1 including credit sales and hire purchase transactions, and I shall accordingly lay today the Sales Tax Act, 1974 which will give legal authority for the collection of this tax. The levy on retail sales will be paid by the purchaser, and the obligation is laid on retailers to collect the sales tax from customers and pay it over to Government on a monthly basis. Full details of the operation of this tax will be given by the Commissioner of Inland Revenue in the course of the next few days.

I have agreed, as a measure of relief to consumers, that a number of commodities essential to the welfare of the community and to the economic development of the country should not be subject to the sales tax. Having regard to the spiralling cost of imported food items, and the impact the sales tax would have on the cost of food items to people in low income categories I have decided that food and beverages, alcoholic and non-alcoholic, excepting similar items sold in restaurants and hotels which are subject to Hotels/Restaurants Sales Tax under the Hotels and Restaurant (Sales Tax) Act, 1974, will be exempted from the payment of the retail sales tax. Similarly, stationery, and newsprint will be exempted.

Again, bearing in mind our dependence on imported food items and our drive in the agricultural diversification programme to grow and provide more food, fertilizers and pesticides will be exempted from payment of the tax.

Machinery and capital equipment for industrial development and maintenance, as well as building materials for the construction industry will also be exempted.

The sales tax will not be applicable to the retail price of gasoline and diesel which are largely used in our public transport system, and to kerosene and gas used for domestic and industrial purposes. I have also decided to exempt motor vehicles and motor vehicles spares from the sales tax because in line with the policy laid down in recent budgets the restriction of Bank credit and the increase in duties have resulted in the desired drop in the number of units sold, so that it is considered that further tax measures are not required at this stage.

Categories of goods exempted from the retail sales tax are as follows:

Food, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages (not sold in restaurants)

Fertilizers and pesticides

Machinery and capital equipment

Building materials

Transport equipment and spares including motor vehicles, buses, trucks

Goods sold in Bond

Export sales

Gasolene

Diesel

Kerosene

Gas - Domestic and Industrial

Stationery

Newsprint

The detailed list of exempted goods with BTN Classification is contained in the Order which will be made under the Sales Tax Act, This list will be available very shortly. I estimate the yield from this tax measure to be in the region of \$8 million.

(3) Corporation Tax

The history of income tax in Barbados dates back to the passing of the Income Tax Act, 1921 in our legislature in the days of our colonial ties with Britain.

In 1922 a Committee appointed in the United Kingdom by the British Government to consider and report on the question relating to the Income Tax laws in the Colonies, prepared a model Income Tax Ordinance for the general use of Colonial Governments. Needless to say, several of these

recommendations were adopted by Barbados.

Among them was a particular recommendation on the deduction of tax from dividends of companies. It suggested that -

(1) Companies should be entitled to deduct from the dividends paid to their shareholders, tax at the rate paid or payable by the company on the income out of which the dividends were paid;

(2) Such companies should, upon payment of a dividend, whether tax was deducted from such dividend or the dividend was paid free of tax, furnish to each shareholder, a certificate setting out the amount of the dividend to which such shareholder was entitled and the amount of tax which the company had deducted, or which was applicable thereto.

Our tax legislation up to this day contains such a provision. It conforms with the principle of taxation of dividends at source, which has been accepted in the United Kingdom as an effective method of tax collection, originating from the days of the Addington Income Tax Act, 1803.

It should be noted that the gross amount of a share holder's dividend fell to be included by him in his statement of income according to the model ordinance. The tax suffered by the shareholder indirectly, that is, through the company, had to be taken into account in arriving at the total amount of tax payable by him upon his income, and repayment of "tax made where necessary.

United Kingdom tax legislation, relating to corporate taxation demonstrated that the company was being taxed on behalf of its shareholders. From the point of view of the legal concept of incorporation as established in company law, that a company has an identity or personality of its own, separate and distinct from its members, this approach is a negation thereof - the veil of incorporation is torn aside.

In the past, several countries including new independent British Commonwealth nations employed the method of taxation to which reference has just been made. But now, most western countries, the United Kingdom included, have moved away from it, and are now treating the company and its shareholders as persons possessing separate identities. Some of our independent sister nations in the Caribbean have followed suit, and are now levying a tax on companies, called a "corporation tax". Basically it operates

on the principle that the company pays tax on its profits and then pays dividends to its shareholders who pay tax on the dividends as well as on other personal income, if any, at the appropriate rate. No set off in respect of tax paid by the company arises. This system of corporation tax is known as the classical system - the tax on the company and the tax on the shareholder are completely separate. Some countries make modifications, but in essence retain the fundamentals.

Corporation tax is easier to administer than withholding tax and it provides a good source of extra revenue yield, without having recourse to the raising of tax rates of individuals. It has also the advantage of encouraging retention of profits in Companies for business expansion.

It is with such views in mind as well as the idea of bringing our tax system here in Barbados into line with reality and the prevailing world practice, that a change is now to be effected.

I accordingly propose that with effect from income year 1974 all companies in Barbados will be subject to Corporation Tax. The necessary legislation will be prepared and presented to Parliament very soon. The rate of corporation tax for companies other than Life Insurance Companies and Building Societies will remain at 40%, and for Life Insurance Companies and Building Societies will be at 20%. Inter-company dividends will not be taxed twice; neither will there be any change in the liability of tax exempt industries.

I estimate the increased yield from the introduction of the Corporation Tax to be approximately \$2. 0 million per annum. I should like to emphasise that this change in the structure of the company tax in no way effects rates of personal income tax which remain unchanged.

Payment of Tax by Instalments

The withholding of tax from employees' emoluments by their employers commonly known as the "Pay as You Earn System" was instituted in Barbados in 1957.

It has been very successful in facilitating collection and in diminishing the burden which would normally fall upon persons whose only source of income is from employment.

I consider it is now opportune to require all professional persons, self-employed persons, and all persons carrying on business, as well as persons who are in receipt of income from sources other than from dividends, annuities, or interest payments, to pay their income tax from year of income 1975 on the instalment method, so that at the date of filing their returns, their net liability would not be substantial. I wish to let it be plainly understood that the instalment system of payment will be applicable to all companies and all self-employed persons.

With regard to self-employed persons, they will be required to pay their full tax on 1974 income on or before 30th April, 1975. With respect to their 1975 income the following rules will apply:

Payment of an instalment equivalent to one quarter of tax paid on 1974 income on or before 15th June 1975.

A second instalment equivalent to one quarter of tax paid on 1974 income on or before 15th September 1975

A third instalment equivalent to one quarter of tax paid on 1974 income on or before 15th December 1975.

On the delivery of their income tax returns to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue in 1976, any outstanding tax after credit of the total tax paid by instalments, must be paid on or before 30th April 1976. In the year 1976, and every subsequent year thereafter, all self-employed persons will be required to pay one quarter of tax paid as indicated on the returns for the preceding year on 15th June, 15th September, and 15th December. Any remainder of tax owing as shown in submission of annual income tax returns must be paid to the Commissioner on or before 30th April in the following year.

Companies

Companies will be required to pay tax on income arising in 1974 as follows:

75% of tax paid in 1974 (1973 income) on 15th February 1975, on account of their tax liability for income year 1974 (Tax credits for tax deducted from dividends must be excluded).

The remainder of tax shown as owing in their annual return for income year 1974 must be paid on 30th April, 1975 to the Commissioner. All companies must file returns on 15th March from 1975 onwards.

On 1st October, 1975, all companies will be required to pay 50% of tax paid in respect of income year 1974, as a payment on account towards their liability to tax for income year 1975.

On 15th March, 1976, all companies will be required to deliver a return to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, and pay any tax outstanding thereon relating to income year 1975, on the said 15th March; and wherever I say the date, we will receive the money before the date as well. So I do not wish everybody rushing in to the Income Tax Office with their cheques on the 15th March, we will take it on the 15th January or the 3rd January.

For income year 1976 and for every subsequent income year all companies will have to pay:

50% of tax paid for the previous income year on account of tax payable for the current income year, on 15th October in each year.

The remainder of the tax due as revealed by the, Annual Return of Income for the income year in question on filing with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, is to be paid on 15th March or before in succeeding years.

Trade Tax

To facilitate the calculations of both the tax administrators and those making up tax returns, I propose changing the rate of trade tax from 19. 5% to 20%,

Estate and Succession Duties

The basic rates of Estate and Succession Duties were fixed as long ago as 1941. In the light of the tremendous increase which has taken place since 1941, in the general level of prices, it is considered that there is justification for an upward revision of these rates. I do not propose to read out the long list of

amendments, but basically the scale of Estate Duties has been increased by 2% and Succession Duties by approximately 1%. I have also eliminated Succession Duties on Estates below \$2, 400, A schedule of these changes is attached to my Statement which I will table with the Clerk of the House.

Management Fees

The Barbados income tax law provides for a withholding tax of 15% to be levied on management fees paid to non-resident companies. This withholding tax ensures that the Treasury receives a share of income paid to non-residents for services provided in Barbados. The tax is payable by the non-resident who receives credit for the tax paid where a Double Taxation Agreement exists between Barbados and the country of his residence. I consider that there is scope for an increase in the withholding tax and accordingly propose that the rate be increased from 15% to 20%.

So much for the taxation component of the package of remedies which I propose to apply.

I now turn to Monetary Policy.

The Central Bank has been pursuing a policy aimed at limiting the imports of consumer goods, both for balance of payments reasons and in order to redirect resources into more productive activities, To achieve this objective, the Bank has, through moral suasion, succeeded in getting the commercial banks to restrict consumer credit and has initiated a scheme for the financing of export credits in the fields of industry and tourism. The Central Bank has also provided re-discounting facilities for banks lending to the agricultural sector.

With a marked reduction in the volume of consumer finance and with most of the commercial banks repaying their overseas borrowings, considerable liquidity has developed in the banking system. It is the Government's view that in the present circumstances there is need to provide every possible stimulus to expansion of the productive capacity of the economy, I consider that there is therefore scope for a reduction in the very high rates of interest at which some of the commercial banks are lending money. At this particular time I do not consider it necessary or, given the current rate of inflation and the need to encourage savings, feasible to reduce the maximum deposit rate in order to achieve this reduction in high lending rates. I shall be asking the Central Bank to continue its policy of diverting resources into the productive sectors and to use its persuasive authority to secure an early reduction in the very high rates of interest being charged on some loans, I shall be keeping the situation under close review and I

shall if necessary, issue directives to the Central Bank to ensure that we achieve the desired results.

I now turn to that component of the package which can be labelled Prices and Incomes Policy.

The main short run problem which faces the economy is the need to reduce the current high rate of inflation. The rate of inflation in Barbados exceeds that of some of our major trading partners, and unless the economy can be stabilised, the inevitable result will be declining standards of living for many and reduced competitiveness in the export sectors, leading to a further reduction in growth and more unemployment. Given the economic structure of the country, with imports running at the level of 80% of Gross Domestic Product, the major stimulus to the rate of domestic price inflation comes from rising import prices, especially for food and fuel. However, investigations reveal that the prices of domestically produced goods are rising at virtually the same rate as that of the overall retail price index. This is partially due to the fact that there is a high import content in locally produced goods, but it is also caused by certain domestically generated forces which are susceptible to our influence.

As a community, we can do little to control the prices of imported goods and services. These are a fact of life with which we as a small trading nation have to live, although Government has pursued and intends to continue pursuing a vigorous and comprehensive price control programme aimed at ensuring that consequential increases in domestic prices are kept to an absolute minimum. However, the factors which tend to intensify the rate of price increases can, to a certain extent, be influenced by our own actions. The first is the size of the public sector deficit. This has already been discussed earlier in my statement and the proposals in this budget are partially designed to reduce the size of the overall deficit. The second factor is the inter-action between the movement of incomes and prices.

We must all recognise that since total output of the economy is not increasing, as long as prices continue to rise unabated, real living standards for the community as a whole must fall and will only recover to the extent that there are gains in productivity. Various groups in the community, of course, be they workers rentiers or employers may succeed for a time in maintaining or even increasing their share of the national 'cake', by raising their incomes whether in the form of wages and salaries, profits, interest charges or rents. However, to the extent that these groups succeed, others must suffer a commensurate reduction in real living standards. Often these are the most vulnerable sections of the community such as those living on fixed incomes, the unemployed and the non-unionised workers, The inevitable end result of a chronic wage/price spiral in the context of no real growth of output must be increased unemployment.

In such a situation, it seems essential that a socially just sharing of the burden must be worked out.

This means that those hardest hit by inflation should be helped first, for example, old age pensioners, and that each should be prepared to share in the sacrifice according to his means. This will require restraint among categories of wage and salary earners as well as the owners of capital, the recipient of dividends and rents, etc. It is important that we be all clear about the situation confronting us as a country. Either by mutual agreement we try to share the sacrifices imposed by the temporary decline in living standards that we are experiencing, or else this sharing will be imposed on us haphazardly and harshly by the insidious force of inflation. It is a known fact that a persistent and high level of inflation results in inequitable distribution of income and creates social tension in a community.

As the largest single employer of labour in the country deriving our income mainly from the citizens and taxpayers, the Government has a special responsibility in leading the way in matters of fair wages and employment practices. So too must the Government give a positive lead, however appealing other policies may appear to be, when the situation demands restraint in prices, incomes and wages.

The Civil Service is unfortunately in a very special position in this community. No other group of workers in the country has recourse to the Privy Council if a matter of discipline goes against them.

The only similar recourse open to the society at large is to a person condemned for a capital offence. Civil servants can get paid leave passages, sick leave with pay for one year and even more, interest free loans to buy motor vehicles and are eligible for loans under the Public Officers Housing Loan organisation at a rate of interest below the "going" rate. At present they enjoy superannuation arrangements which together with the benefits they can derive in terms of pensions from the National Insurance Scheme will allow them total retiring benefits which in some cases will be equal to four-thirds of the final emoluments which they earn whilst in active service. Most civil servants are granted annual increments as a matter of course. Such an increment is usually about 5% of normal salary; so that with the additional 5% as an inflationary increment in the existing salary agreement, most civil servants can expect an automatic rise in pay of about 10% per annum and all get at least a 5% increase.

If Government yielded to the demands of the National Union of Public Workers the taxpayers would be saddled with an additional bill of \$1 million per month or \$12 million per year, consequently aggravating the already burgeoning inflation.

The alternative would be to institute a drastic retrenchment of the work force on the Government pay roll which would include the monthly paid public officers who consider themselves immune from the slings and arrows of the outrageous unemployment.

During the years 1972 and 1973 Government was called upon to provide \$8. 7 million to meet interim payments from 1st April, 1972 and \$13. 75 million for a full salaries revision from 1st April, 1973 as a result of a three year agreement with all the Unions representing public servants. On the occasion of the salaries revision I stated that in a purely economic sense I did not consider that the country could afford the additional level of expenditure on salaries and wages and that increases in remuneration should normally relate to productivity. The Government has for some time been concerned that sufficient return in productivity is not being derived from the great expenditure on salaries and wages and on its part has made positive attempts to improve the administrative machinery by the intensification of training programmes. To date, I have seen no significant improvement in productivity or work attitudes in the Public Service, but the cost of the administration has continued to rise and is now responsible for more than 50% of the total public expenditure.

The three-year agreement which is due to expire on 31st March, 1976, provides for annual increases during the period 1st April, 1973 to 31st March, 1976, of approximately 5% on the previous year's salaries/wages. This 5% was voluntarily offered by Government and accepted by the National Union of Public Workers in an attempt to cushion the shock of the anticipated rise in the cost-of-living. The agreement has about 17 months to run and during that period all public employees will benefit from the 5% increase due on 1st April, 1975, which will cost an additional \$4 million.

Against this background I cannot call upon the rest of the taxpayers to pander to the demands of an organisation which represents one-third only of Public Sector Employees. Self discipline, like charity, begins at home. There is going to be a policy on prices and incomes and wages, and we are launching this policy with the public service. The Government's position has been outlined to the representatives of the National Union of Public Workers in Whitley Council and they have been advised that the Government cannot meet the Union's request at this stage, and if I were still at the Bar, I would say "or at all".

And now for the gift wrapped components of the package.

No one is more conscious than I that persons on fixed incomes are hardest hit in periods of inflation such as we are experiencing. Among those are old age pensioners.

There are sixteen thousand four hundred of them and they receive a weekly pension of eight dollars. This costs the treasury \$6. 8 million per annum. I propose to increase the weekly pension to \$10. 00

from 1st December, 1974.

The pensions will be reviewed as is customary at the next salaries revision if not before. The additional cost of this increase will be \$1. 7 million per annum.

Mortgage Financing

I have recently obtained approval for a sum of \$2 million to be made available through the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Ltd. for financing middle income and low income housing to be built under the programme of the National Housing Corporation. This will be additional to the \$2. 4 million already approved by the Caribbean Development Bank for financing the purchase of houses at Wildey and Eden Lodge through the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company Ltd. The agreement for this loan is ready for signature and I expect to sign it in the next day or so.

Finally the children.

For a long time I have been concerned over the high costs of school text books which parents have to meet at the beginning of every year and sometimes out of season. The time has come when we should try to ease this burden so that our system of education will be really one which affords equal opportunity for learning.

Accordingly, I propose as a measure of assistance to family budgets, that the Government should purchase and provide all text books in all schools subject to a nominal maintenance charge from 1975. We already do so in the primary schools; we will now extend this facility to the hard-pressed students in the secondary schools both private approved and public since the students are all offspring of Barbados taxpayers.

Emoluments of Public Officers and Pensioners

In 1961 this Government instituted a system of advancing two weeks pay to all categories of Public

employees during the month of December. This advance was repayable over a period of three months in equal instalments.

In December 1973 advances were made only to those monthly paid employees whose salaries were \$600 per month or less and to unestablished staff and casual employees.

I propose to make a special concession this year and next year only pending the outcome of the next salaries revision exercise. Advances will be made during the month of December to all monthly paid employees who are in receipt of gross salaries of \$700 per month or less and to all members of the unestablished staff and to casual workers who are paid weekly, calculated on the same basis as the advances were made last year.

All Government pensioners in receipt of gross pensions of \$450 per month or less will for the first time also qualify for advances.

The concession which I am recommending in deference to the difficulties which the middle income and lower income salary and wage earners may have encountered as a result of unexpected outlays is complete dispensation from repayment of the advances. In the words of international finance these advances will be of a non-refundable non-reimbursable nature in each of the two years and will not have to be repaid.

Import Restriction

I am satisfied that many items imported into this country are neither necessary or useful for the health or development of our economy. In my April Budget I dealt with a list of items which I considered were in competition with locally manufactured articles. Some were embargoed and some were placed under licence. Although, there are many remaining frivolous items which we could do without, we are discouraged from imposing restrictions for balance of payments reasons following a recent resolution of the

International Monetary Fund and the Rome Communique of 1974 on the same issue. It is generally felt that such embargoes would trigger off a world wide retaliatory round of embargoes which would lead

inevitably to a recession in world trade.

Much as I would prefer, for psychological reasons, to discourage imports of many unnecessary items, we will have to be satisfied for the time being with a restricted negative list until we can justify further restriction on the ground of protection of local substitute industries.

We can however help to combat inflation as individuals by refusing to expend our incomes on frivolous objects, by growing more food for ourselves and by deciding to spend on certain items where prices have risen - like on gasoline - no more than we had spent before.

Drive less, give lifts to other people, pool your transportation, grow more food, spend less on imported goods, keep your money for expenditure on essentials.

The Government's strategy during the coming year will be based on - (i) a tight control of expenditure

(ii) increased emphasis on agricultural production, including waiver of duty on fertilizers

(iii) capital investment in productive rather than merely welfare enterprises (iv) implementation of a Prices and Incomes policy and (v) import substitution by incentives to local enterprises.

I also intend very shortly to establish a National Productivity Council which will be broadly representative of Government, Employers, Scientists and Workers, in order to canvass the widest possible experience in keeping the economy moving forward.

Summary of Fiscal Proposals

The fiscal proposals contained in the budget with estimated yields for a full financial year are as follows:

(1) Increased Road Tax on gasoline to take place immediately.... \$ 5. 3 million

(2) 5% Sales Tax from 1st December, 1974 -..8. 0 "

(3) Taxation (introduction of Corporation Tax, increase in Estate and Succession Duties, Management Fees and Trade Tax).. 2. 4 Total.. \$15. 7 million

The estimated yield of the new taxes for the rest of the financial year is \$4. 4 million. However, since companies will be required to pay 75% of tax paid in 1974 by February 15, 1975 (which amounts to approximately \$12 million) the actual revenue received during the current financial year 1974/75 will be substantially higher.

Subsidies and Payments

The additional cost for a full financial year of the subsidy for school books, the increase in old age pensions and the payment to civil servants earning less than \$700 and government pensioners receiving less than \$450 per month is as follows:

(1) Subsidy for school books.. \$1 million

(2) Old Age Pensioners.... 1. 7

(3) Payment to Civil Servants and Government

Pensioners.... 2. 7 "

Total.. \$5. 4 million

Expenditure on school books will not arise before fiscal year 1975/76 and the additional cost of old age pensions for the period 1st December 1974 to 31st March 1975 is estimated to be \$560, 000. The additional expenditure to be incurred for the remainder of the financial year 1974/75 is therefore estimated to be \$3. 3 million.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the measures which I prescribe for our economic ailments such as they are. You will agree that strong though they might be considered by some, yet taking everything into consideration they are far from unpalatable, and indeed to some extent, carry a pleasant flavour.

What we can be assured of is, that the economic health of our nation will continue to be monitored and prescribed for by those persons who know what we are doing and why we are doing what we are doing, and what is even more important, know where we are going even when the going is uphill.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on the proceeds of the sale of goods by retail and for connected purposes.

I also beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882, No. 2.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to provide for the imposition of a tax on the proceeds of the sale of goods by retail and for connected purposes be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Petroleum Act, 1882, No. 2 be now read a first time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA:

Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting and I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 26th November, at 12 o'clock 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. 6. 15 p. m.