

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 28th January, 1975.

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

PRESENT

His Honour N. G. A. MAXWELL, LL.B., (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, (Minister without Portfolio); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, (Deputy Speaker); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Communications and Works); Hon. P. G. MORGAN, C.B.E., (Minister of Tourism, Information and Public Relations); Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND; Hon. P. M. GREAVES, B.A., (Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance); 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 of this House for Tuesday, 14th January, 1975, are before you for confirmation. If there are no corrections or alterations, the Minutes will be confirmed.

There being no corrections or alterations, these Minutes are duly confirmed.

Mr. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay Message No. 1/1975 regarding the Prorogation of Parliament. The Message reads as follows:—

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

His Excellency the Governor-General has the honour to inform the Honourable The House of Assembly that, on the advice of the Prime Minister, he will prorogue Parliament on Wednesday, 5th February 1975 under the provisions of section 61(1) of the Constitution.

The next session of Parliament will be held at the Public Buildings, Bridgetown, commencing at 10.00 a.m. on Wednesday, 19th February 1975.

A. WINSTON SCOTT
Governor-General.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE BARBADOS

28th January 1975.”

DOCUMENTS LAID

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:—

Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation for the year 1973.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to make a Statement on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning at a later

stage of today's sitting regarding the payment of advances of salaries and wages to certain Government employees at Christmas 1974.

It is really an amendment to the 220 days which were considered too long and too drastic and this has been reduced to 215 days.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections, leave will be granted. There being no objection, leave is hereby granted.

Mr. MOTTLEY and Mr. SPRINGER entered the Chamber and took their seats.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,143,455 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. 25, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Also, on behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$120,800 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974–75 Annexed Estimates as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974–75, No. 27 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$7,638 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. 26, which form the schedule to the Resolution.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

A Bill to amend the Druggists Act 1894.

A Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act 1974.

I am also seeking permission to deal with these Bill in all their stages during this Sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: Permission is being sought to deal with those two Bills of which notice has just been given in all their stages today. If there are no objections, leave will be granted.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, notice of these Bills has not been sent to us. How do you get permission to deal with Bills in all their stages? How can the House give permission to deal with the Bills in all their stages?

Mr. SPEAKER: If the House so approves and if there is no objection.

Mr. ADAMS: If the Hon. Minister would give us five minutes' explanation privately, we might be in a better position to answer him on this.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: If Your Honour so permits, I am prepared to give an explanation to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would be prepared to give you permission to ask for leave at a later stage in this sitting subject to your discussing it with the Leader of the Opposition privately.

Mr. HINDS and Mr. WALCOTT entered the Chamber and took their seats.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Druggists Act, 1894, was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. G. G. FERGUSON, a Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act, 1974, was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Oral Replies to the following Parliamentary Questions asked by the hon. member for St. Peter are ready: Nos. 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279 and 280.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20,

42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting on the usual undertaking that if the Opposition sees fit to deal with any of their matters which they consider urgent and necessary, we will provide the necessary opportunity.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

12.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is now the order of the day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No. 6 on the Order Paper, standing in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church North Central, be the first order of the day.

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

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

BILL CITED AS THE HOTEL PROPRIETORS ACT, 1975

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which is somewhat overdue, seeks to clarify and improve the present commonlaw provision which imposes strict liability upon the common inn keeper for loss of the guests' property whilst upon inn premises, in particular by modifying that liability in certain cases by imposing a statutory financial limit. In many respects this Bill is based on principles which originally derived from the Inn Keeper's Liability Act of 1863 and which have been followed in a number of commonlaw jurisdictions. In the Caribbean area the Act of 1863 has been adopted in whole or in part in such countries as the Bahamas, Bermuda and Jamaica. The Bill also deals with certain

other features of the law relating to hotel proprietors, as for example, the duty to receive the guests without discrimination, and the proprietor's lien upon the property of his guests. These Acts, together with the Hotel Proprietors Act, 1956 of Great Britain have been the subject of study for a number of years by several legal authorities including the Law Revision Commission whose work has resulted in the Bill now before this Honourable House.

The first part of the Bill is, of course, the customary interpretations, and the second part, I am told, deals with the point that nothing which presently obtains in common law regarding this matter of rights and responsibilities should be left out of future cases simply because it was not included in this particular item of legislation and therefore it seeks to apply the common law as it now is to any other items which are not included in this particular Bill.

Part 3 details the duties of proprietors in relation to reception of guests and specifically requires that a common tariff not only be printed but posted publicly where people may see it, and it makes it an offence if anyone charges in excess of the published common tariff. It also makes it illegal and an offence to refuse or neglect any visitor who is willing to pay that tariff and who is in a fit state to be received, and/or to fail to provide the guests with any of the facilities of the hotel. The availability at another hotel or alternate accommodation is not sufficient reasonable grounds. Reasonable grounds might be for example, that the hotel is already full.

Paragraph 6 fixes the common tariff and establishes that anyone who is involved in discriminatory treatment is committing an offence and the same thing with the provision of any of the facilities of the hotel.

Part 4 deals with the duties of proprietors in relation to the property brought in by guests, and, ordinary guests' baggage is a common thing; and it requires an innkeeper or hotelier to keep in safe custody any property tendered to him or to any of his employees by a guest for safe custody, and it makes provision for the exclusion of certain noxious and/or dangerous or other type of goods which may be reasonably refused; or having regard to the size and standing of the hotel, to be cumbersome or of excessive value.

The proprietor on the other hand might require the guest to state the value of the goods and to declare them at the time of making a deposit, so that there should be no misunderstandings — let us call them — at a later

date when the goods are asked for again. It makes provision however that the proprietor or his agents or servants are responsible in certain cases if losses are incurred under certain conditions, and the Bill also details cases where the proprietor is not liable under certain circumstances. This particular section also limits the liability of a proprietor in the case of goods lost which were his responsibility; however it also details the limitation of the liability of the proprietor, where it shall not apply in certain instances.

Part 5 details the proprietor's lien in power of sale over goods which are left in his possession by guests of the hotel in the case that the guest is in default of payment, and it details the terms and conditions under which the proprietor may offer these goods for sale in order to recoup the money which the guest defaulted to pay.

This Bill, as I say, is a very simple and straightforward one which is applicable in most developed countries, certainly in countries which deal in tourism, and it has been in the making for some time, and I hope it will pass today.

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

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two points of detail to which I would like to refer; I do not intend to discuss the principles of the Bill which I believe can be accepted by all of us. However, there are one or two points of detail which I would draw to the attention of the Minister so that he can perhaps deal with them in Committee.

Sir, \$250 is a very small fine, for example, for refusing a man in your hotel because he is black; and that is a maximum fine fixed under this; or, looking at somebody and saying 'don't mind the room should be \$30, for you it is \$100.' The sum of \$250 is indeed a very small fine to punish such conduct; and I would also draw to the attention of the Minister that liability is limited to \$1,000 in respect of any one guest. In other words, in respect of an action which any one guest can bring, but you put it into the High Court where the least you normally bring a case for is \$1,000. A thousand dollars is the limit of magisterial jurisdiction in Barbados but in this you have a maximum of \$1,000 as the damage and yet you put into the court that does not deal with anything less than \$1,000. I would very seriously urge on the Minister to rethink that aspect of it.

I would also suggest that in these days of expensive cameras and so on, that a man might not care to leave in safe custody but he might wish to travel with and take pictures during the day, with his camera, and it is a very hard thing to tell a man that he must put his camera equipment worth \$2,500 into safe custody or else if the hotel loses it he can only get back \$1,000 for it. It is a very hard thing indeed, and I would suggest to the Minister that in these days of inflation — these amounts might have been fixed when the Bill was first drafted years ago and no longer bear relationship to reality, and I would even go so far as to concede a Clause that would allow the Minister of Tourism from time to time to fix and publish the amounts under Section 11 — the limits and liability in respect of one article or in respect of one guest.
12.30 p.m.

These are mere matters of detail, but I thought that raising them at this time would give the Minister a chance to have some thoughts about them before we reach the particular clause in Committee.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the comments of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and I certainly would not want to point out any aspects of law to a learned gentleman such as he.

Perhaps I am wrong, but I would have thought that Part III, Section 5, would have given a person the right to take action before the Supreme Court if he felt that he had been discriminated against, above and beyond the \$250.00.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of explanation. The Minister does not want to take an issue on law, but he still made a legal point. If he reads the case of Constantine against Imperial Hotels where Sir Learie Constantine was refused accommodation on grounds of colour, he will discover that awards in such cases are nominal only.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, again I am not going to tangle with the hon. and learned Leader of the Opposition; but I do assure him that the case of Constantine v Imperial Hotels is detailed in this file and has been amply considered by the legal authorities who drew up this Bill. I appreciate the point about determining the extent of the fine and perhaps this could be reconsidered at a later date; but I would be reluctant to hold up this Bill today for that purpose.

Particularly on the question of losing an item such as a camera, I do not really see that if a person is not prepared to put it within the protection of the hotel, how the hotel can be responsible for it. On the other hand I would think that most of us having a camera valued at \$2,500 would have it insured any way.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister has replied.

Mr. ADAMS: This is a point of explanation. He has obviously misunderstood me. He has misunderstood either my speech or the Bill that he has just introduced. He has just introduced a Bill to make hotels responsible for valuable cameras up to \$1,000 whether they are in safe custody or not. So how can he get up and ask how can the hotel be held responsible if you do not put it in safe custody?

This is what the Bill is all about. I would very much hope that nothing that I have said reveals that I do not understand. It is a lack of understanding of what is before the House.

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

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

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

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

Part I was called.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I have a little amendment to make. It is more in the nature of a typographical error and it deals with the question of discrimination. In the fifth line it reads "place or origin". It should be "place of origin".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, if Part I is the one that includes the definition, I would like to ask the Minister about the word "guest". It says: "Guests means a visitor received into a hotel for the purpose of partaking of the facilities provided therein and includes a visitor who engages sleeping accommodation or on whose behalf such accommodation is engaged, but does not include a person who makes the hotel his place of residence, lodging or boarding."

I would like to know on what grounds are you going to exclude a Barbadian who goes to a hotel where, say, a seminar is being held, and where that hotel is taking in people? I would like to know if this definition, when you say includes visitors to the hotel, includes visitors to the island. The section says that it does not include a person who makes the hotel his place of residence, lodging or boarding. What is going to happen?

I am only asking this because — Mr. Chairman, I saw the Leader of the Opposition nodding; but the lawyers in the courts have given some judgments that they themselves have been surprised about, and that brings to my mind an Act that was passed in 1906. It took nearly 60 years until a High Court Judge in the UK found that the Act which all the lawyers thought was a cast iron Act dealing with the question of disputes, they found a new definition in the Rootes and Bernard case. I do not want people to say yes, it is quite clear and then find out that a visitor is something different.

I raised this because if the definition is meant to exclude persons resident in Barbados or who are lodgers and any other persons not coming from outside Barbados, I think that it should be made clear.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that this is one I asked about myself. I am told that there is a difference in law between a guest and the other people described as boarders in that they would come under the Common Law; and of course a person attending a seminar would be a guest just like anybody else. The other people who make the hotel a place of residence, lodging or boarding are in some mysterious way quite different under Common Law.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael West was apparently making a point slightly other than the one I thought that he was making and that is why I was nodding. I am satisfied that "visitor" means visitor to a hotel. If I was going to question the definition, however, I would question the exclusion.

There are one or two small hotels in Barbados where people do live and where people who come to the island on courses or whatever do go and stay. Some are boarding houses and some are hotels, but are cheap enough to accommodate these people. I think that it is marginal whether you could not have found some way of protecting the hotels, but at the same

time protecting those people which does not impose the full liability upon the hotel; because a man who is living in a hotel for six months deserves protection just as much as a man who is living there for six nights.

12.40 p.m.

If you encourage boarding houses to think that they have to take no precaution to protect lodgers' suitcases and goods and so on — boys come here from Cable and Wireless on courses and all sorts of things, and people who come here from a university and perhaps stay in something that amounts to a university and stay in something that amounts to a boarding house — I would not like to encourage these boarding houses to think that they are not going to be liable if they are careless with their lodgers' goods, because to prove default in a hotel has been a very difficult thing for 200 years, and that is why Inkeepers Liability Acts came to be passed. You cannot prove that the hotel is careless about locking up the front door at night, quite often, you cannot prove that it is careless about who it employs and so on, and therefore it is very hard to prove default when you suffer loss from a hotel. So there it is, Sir, I understand what the hon. member means.

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

Part II was called and passed.

Part III was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Part III stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, some of us will wish to speak on different sections, and Part III contains a number of sections. Am I right in saying that the rules, however interpreted, say that you can speak for 15 minutes on each section? Not on each motion, Sir, on each section. I will be glad to see the rules, Sir. The Minister perhaps is going to move it section by section. There may be some of the sections we may wish to vote against. That is what I am worried about, Sir.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In a case like this, Sir, I think we have to be reasonable. I think we will go along with that.

Mr. ADAMS: How are we going to vote against individual sections?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In a case like this I am willing to accommodate the hon. member. I beg to move that clause 4 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the figure of \$250 in the last line of clause 4 be deleted and a figure of \$1,000 be substituted.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second that.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you put clause 4 to the vote, Sir, it would seem very excessive to increase from \$250 to \$1,000. An amendment like this was not considered by Cabinet, and I do not know whether we can accept \$1,000 just like that, because it is a substantial increase. That is all I want to say, it is now left for the Minister to advise and so on. I consider this \$1,000 as being punitive or excessive, but if you want to put on such a big penalty you can increase it to \$1,000.

Mr. ADAMS: In the light of what the Minister said, would he like to suggest a lower figure? After all, the court is going to decide whether or not it is excessive. You are dealing with people who charge U.S. \$100 per day, and a fine of \$250 is nothing to such an institution. That is the whole point. If you want to say \$500 for this, but \$1,000 for the next.

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

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 5 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that the figure of \$250 be deleted and "\$1,000" also substituted. Although I consider that offences under this section are considerably more than offences under the previous section, I give the Government and the Minister full credit for analysing the Act according to the information available to them. I would have otherwise expected to see a much greater fine imposed on a hotel for discrimination other than merely for not displaying its operation at the correct place. Notwithstanding the pages of analysis that may be found in the file about the case of Constantine and Imperial Hotels, the fact still is that

the damages awarded therein are nominal, and I do not see how a man can get any damages other than perhaps the increased cost of alternative accommodation, or the discomfort of having to sleep in the road if he has to sleep, which is not very great. Punitive damages are being eliminated by the courts in these days now, and I myself can hardly imagine how I would argue a case to get \$250 damages for a man who was refused at a hotel because of his colour, not in the light of the authorities. Therefore I think that you have either to fix a very big penalty or put something into the Act which would allow the Civil Courts to give larger damages.

The second course is not one I would recommend, it is always difficult. Therefore, I think, express your disgust at the conduct of any hotel discriminating against anybody on any grounds. We are all talking about colour, but there might be other grounds, so express it by a big penalty. Two hundred and fifty dollars is nothing, absolutely nothing to the sort of hotel that would seek to discriminate. This would be a charter for discrimination and paying the \$250 for it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with the Leader of the Opposition on this section. I have studied in England and I have had a lot of friends in England who, the moment they went to a place and the people saw their faces they could not get a room. This is a serious section in 1975 and \$250 to me is negligible. I support the increase for a penalty for anybody who fails under this section. When you are charging U.S. \$100 per day, plus 5% tax, plus what have you, certainly the penalty should be increased.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to know if the Hon. Minister was seconding the motion.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I beg to second it, Sir.

The question that clause 5 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 6 was called and passed.

Clause 7 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister will give the reason why the fiat of the Director of Public Prosecutions is required in the two Clauses we have just done.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I think, as a former Attorney-General, I can answer this. Under the Constitution of Barbados the Director of Public Prosecutions is entitled to institute, stop, etc. If the facts are sent to him, it is only a tidy form because you find it in several pieces of legislation. One assumes hearing the Opposition argue that the Director of Public Prosecutions is a man of integrity and honour, that he would not hesitate to do his job. We do not want cases brought where the facts would not justify them. You have to place in the hands of a responsible citizen, whose integrity is not in doubt, the right to consent. I cannot see any Director of Public Prosecutions, who is conscious of his responsibility under the Constitution, where the facts presented to him justify a prosecution, refusing to grant his fiat or to support it. You do not want anybody, *prima facie*, thinking that he has a case, and then you get publicity to damage tourism and to damage the community. After all we are a small community and we have to be conscious of the fact that, rightly or wrongly, any adverse publicity in a field like this can do irreparable harm to Barbados. If some crank were to bring a case, which he would be entitled to do — I am not saying it is not genuine or it is genuine, but if some Tom, Dick, or Harry can bring a case, if he is not restricted, the publicity given to a frivolous case can do a hotel untold harm, and it might turn out that the hotel is completely innocent or it may be guilty.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Opposition to accept placing this power in the hands of a responsible person. In the hotel industry as well as the tourist industry you will get a lot of cranks, hippies, and God knows what coming into the country; they go to a hotel, something goes wrong, they bring a case, the International Press takes it up, or they may have a friend like Cummings in the *New York Times*, and you can realise the harm that can be done to the country in circumstances like this. This is not an attempt to deprive any guest of his rights, or to discriminate against any person to bring a prosecution, but tourism is such a sensitive area, it is such a public-relations-and-high-pressure advertising area that, if you do not put the question of prosecution in the hands of a person of independence, a lot of harm can be done. That is all I am asking.

In the tourist industry you will find a lot of cranks, hippies, and people who can easily say

that they were discriminated against. I am asking the Opposition to accept this on that basis alone, and not on any question of legal rights, or any question of depriving people of their right to go to court, but tourism on which our economy depends can be so easily hurt by some crackpot feeling that he has a right that we should be very careful in dealing with this matter. He brings a case, it makes good news to some country which is competing for the tourist dollar, harm is done, the case goes to court, it proves to be frivolous, but the harm will already have been done.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking the Opposition to accept this Clause as a sort of safety-gap, depending on the integrity, honesty and honour of a Director of Public Prosecutions to bring a case, or to instruct the bringing of a case, in cases where such action is justified. This is the only reason I am justifying it because I have been abroad and I know how easily my country can be hurt by adverse publicity; therefore, I am asking the Opposition to put this safeguard in the hands of a person who ought to be concerned with the interest of his country but who possesses the integrity, the honour, and the independence to bring a case in circumstances which are justified.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want the Hon. Minister to overdo the point he has made. I am not speaking now any more than as a black man. I am diametrically opposed to this concept that you are doing your country harm if you have to stand up to certain issues, whether it be the tourist industry, the sugar industry, or anything at all. I do not share those sentiments that you do your country any harm if you have to stand up for things that you consider are right. Now, I speak as a black man who has lived in Barbados all of my life. I am not going to say that you should take it out of the Director of Prosecutions' hands, or it should not be in his hands. I have lived to see in Barbados where the Director of Public Prosecutions prosecuted people. He has the right to prosecute. Last year there was a trade dispute in the hotel industry, but the only people who were prosecuted were the black people who were struggling for their rights. Do not believe that this question of discrimination is only going into a hotel without thinking of those people who operate the hotels. There are too many people in Barbados sitting back on the words used by the Hon. Minister. The Press and the media can build up this idea that you are doing Barbados harm because you have to speak out. If I am doing Barbados harm by what I am saying now, I know that we have people in the hotel industry who discriminate against other people based on colour. I am not going to mince words about that. Too many of

them have the idea that Ministers would make the kind of speech that the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works has made. As long as a speech like that comes from such quarters some of the people in the hotel industry believe that they can get away with a lot of the things they do, and they believe that they cannot be prosecuted easily.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael West cannot get away with that. I am speaking as a lawyer although he may object to lawyers and he does not like them. He cannot be any stronger in favour of the workers than I am. What I am trying to explain is that, even although you have discrimination, which I consider as heinous as he does, I am asking that this safeguard be left in the hands of the Director of Public Prosecutions to stop crackpots who come into Barbados, not black or white necessarily, but this is the type of charge that can do my country harm. He does not love this country more than I do. He does not love the workers more than I do, and I want to get the record straight. When he talks of the type of speech I am making, my speech is rational, and it is based on my interest in my country. I want him to get that quite clear. I am not going to sit here and hear him accuse me of making speeches to please hotel owners.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was born in Barbados. I am not one of those people who claim that I love Barbados more than anybody else. I do not claim that I have to do anything in Barbados more than anybody else. I have always been a Barbadian and a black one. All I am saying is that the people who own the hotels — I am not afraid to say so because there is nobody who owns a hotel, or no Minister, who can come to me and ask why I made the speech I have just made. I am not speaking as a worker now. I am not speaking about loving any worker. I do not love anybody more than anybody loves anybody else. I repeat that the people who run the hotels like to hear a speech such as the one made by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works. It makes them feel that they merely have to do some of the things they ought to do and some of the Ministers will get up and say to anybody who speaks out: "You will do the country harm. What will happen to the country if you do this?" If the hon. member takes exception to what I have said, he can take exception and I do not care. (*Asides.*) I do not care whether you take exception to anything I say. It will not be the first time, and I hope it is not going to be the last time.

1 p.m.

There are too many people in Barbados who like to hear these statements made, because I have proof that there is discrimination in the hotels, and I am not accusing any single person for it. It is not discrimination on the basis of anything other than colour. We have some crackpots running some of the hotels and we have some dishonest people running some of the hotels, but you cannot prosecute a man merely because he is a crackpot running a hotel. The hon. member says that he speaks as a lawyer. It was a lawyer who prosecuted a man once here for murder, and that was one of the biggest jokes in this country, because the man was one of the biggest imbeciles and idiots prosecuted for murder in the Law Courts, and it was the laughing stock of the world; so you get good prosecutions and you get some bad ones. All I am saying is that some of the people who run these establishments like to hear the kind of statements that the hon. member made because it appears to them as if it is a cover for some of the things they are doing, and they will get support in the generalisations that are being made and will continue in their ways.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make that brief point. There are some hotels which discriminate against their guests. I remember returning home from a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference and the hon. member for St. George was present in Miami when we were informed by some guests who had been at one of our hotels here that they had been asked to find other accommodation because they had invited some black Barbadians to their hotel for a drink. That is the kind of thing I think the Minister of Tourism should be investigating and trying to stamp out wherever possible. I do not know what the Hon. Minister of Communications who speaks as a lawyer at all times would have to say on a matter of this score, but I believe that because we happened to be at Miami at the time we were able to prevent the aggrieved persons from giving the information to the newspapers because we said we would have reported the matter to the authorities and have it investigated, but on coming home we heard that it is the type of thing that is becoming the general practice here where if people come to this country and are staying at a hotel and meet our local people and invite them for any sort of entertainment, they are kindly asked to find accommodation elsewhere. I would like the Minister to tell us how right or how wrong he thinks this is and if he feels an end should not be put to it, because it can certainly to my mind do more harm to the Minister's nation and everything else than good, and we should urge upon the Minister to take these matters that are complained of very

seriously and see what can be done to maintain the industry's image as at present and do not let it fall any more.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that I should seek to move an amendment to Section 7 by deleting the full-stop and inserting a comma and adding the words "or by anyone who upon an information sworn before a Magistrate alleges himself to be the person aggrieved by the breach of the said action". I beg to move that amendment.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to second that amendment and the reason why I second and support that amendment rather than vote against the clause simpliciter is because of the very eloquent, rational and national speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. From the determination of his defence I can see this is a matter on which he feels strongly, but I do not think that the logic has really been thought out in dept, although I dare say that the advisers of the Minister of Tourism have thought that this is the be all and end all of the matter, and I am going to have to be a little time, Sir. As I take it, the amendment gives a protection, because it says that a man must go before a Police Magistrate and swear to the information and there are other things which are attached to that. If the magistrate is dissatisfied he is not going to issue a summons against the hotel. There is a power at common law that a magistrate does not have to issue a summons. The Minister from the abundance of his legal experience will remember the numerous cases in which madmen have sought to summon the Archbishop of Canterbury to face a charge of indecent assault, and the magistrates have refused to issue the summons. It is not necessary although it is widely believed in Barbados that as long as you make a complaint that the court must send it out. That is point one dealing with the hippies. And why I will support this amendment which calls for appearance before a magistrate is that in this manner you bring the complaint before a judicial officer so he can see what sort of person is seeking to make the complaint. I think that is the merit of the amendment.

Now the general merits of allowing three prosecutions are well-known and they exist in Barbados. It would be madness for us to say that you can bring a private prosecution for murder and bear in mind, Sir, that if I care to make myself a fool and expose myself to the penalties for malicious prosecution, I can tomorrow go and write and sign an information saying that you, Sir, have murdered the Minister of Tourism and a summons will be issued, and the practice of the

court is that you will have to be committed to Glendairy Prison until the evidence is given which will allow the magistrate to dismiss the summons. It is a fact. A private person can bring a prosecution for murder and make it as frivolous as he likes and unless some sharp-witted clerk decides to take it before the magistrate and the magistrate enquires into it, it will go out. In Barbados you do not need the permission of the Director of Public Prosecutions to bring a prosecution for murder and this infinitely more trivial offence, for which the maximum fine we have now fixed at \$1,000 on the grounds of national policy, we are saying needs the Director of Public Prosecutions' fiat. I think this is really an absurdity. What the Minister says about stopping frivolous prosecutions entirely ignores the fact that the Director of Public Prosecutions has the power to stop any prosecution he wants. Once he is satisfied that a prosecution is frivolous he stops it; there is more to it. If I prosecute you for murder, all you would have to do in my reckoning is to ring the Director of Public Prosecutions and say I have been prosecuted for murdering Mr. Brown and I have Mr. Brown with me to say he is still alive, it is a joke, and the Director of Public Prosecutions will stop it; and he can stop a prosecution brought against a hotel if he finds it is frivolous. The hotel can make representations to him, can give a statement to the police and if he finds it is frivolous, he can stop it, and it is my belief that the fair name of Barbados will suffer just as much, indeed perhaps more if a man alleges he has been discriminated against, he goes to the Police and makes a statement and the Director of Public Prosecutions informs him that he does not intend to take any action or will not give his consent to the action being brought, and he goes to New York and says so.

1.10 p.m.

If you bring an action against a hotel and it is publicized, that hotel may get an unfairly bad name, but if you seek to bring an action against a hotel for discriminating against you and you write to the responsible officer of Government and he refuses to allow you to bring your action, then the whole Government will receive the bad publicity, if any. If there is bad publicity to be obtained from a frivolous prosecution of a hotel, bringing in the Government will only extend the area of bad publicity to embrace the Government itself. This is a matter of commonsense; not a matter of legal argument.

If you can say that you went to Barbados and you tried to get in a hotel and they would not let you in but they let in white guests, and when you applied to the Government the

Government refused its consent to allow you to prosecute the hotel, the Government will appear to be the guilty party condoning discrimination; not just one hotel that might be run by a rough-neck, red-neck from somewhere in Alabama — with respect to all the decent citizens from Alabama who happen to be on our shores, of course, I mean no discrimination against any part of the union of the United States of America or the Great Dominion of Canada or anywhere else. I am just selecting examples.

It was an attractive argument, no doubt, which was put up to the Minister before he accepted what the hotels said, because this is the hotel's representation, Sir. The Minister would know that better than anybody else. This is what the hotels said: 'You have to protect us from any idiot coming in and saying that he was discriminated against.' Now it was attractive all right; let a responsible officer deal with it; but I am suggesting to allow the responsible officer to be a judicial officer; put the man at peril of making a false statement; put the complaint at some peril of having to go and swear an information. I do not believe they will just go and write the information. They will have to consult a lawyer, and lawyers are also responsible people. We are all the officers of the courts these days and if we lend our support to any foolish charges that do not bear analysis we can all be disciplined by the Bar Council. We would probably have to go to a lawyer and then go before a magistrate, swear an information and then perhaps a summons will issue. Those extra steps may deter the wild boys who are going to make these allegations, and in my submission — in my argument — the hotels will get just as much if not more protection from such a provision than they are getting now, and the Government will not involve itself in any of the bad publicity.

We heard poor Mr. Richard Cummings' name mentioned. Do you think that if Mr. Richard Cummings had a complaint about discrimination and it was legally possible (*Aside*) — I know nothing about the gentleman; nobody in here knows him, least of all the person who falsely and maliciously published of him that he wanted a woman to come down here and live with him, and so on. Nobody in here, in my opinion, knows him. (*Aside*). Well, the hon. member for the City knows him, apparently; but, his name has been mentioned today as somebody who has given Barbados bad publicity.

Do you think that if he or his like felt that they were discriminated against by a hotel and the Government did nothing about it, that they

would fail to give the Government worse publicity than they would have given the hotel? And now you are putting the Government in a position where it is responsible; you are now putting the blanket of the Government over the discriminatory practices of all hotels. You are setting yourself up as the judge of when there is a prima facie case of a hotel discriminating against a man and you are taking on some of the responsibilities.

A hotel manager would know in his heart what he has done, but because he has the ear of the person who has the DPP's ears, say, because the local police inspector and he get on well, the inspector gets a drink when he goes in and so on and he knows he would not do anything like that, and so on — all of that goes on, you know, Sir. The Police sergeants have their own judgment of hoteliers but they do not know the hotelier is one man with them and another man when the sergeant has gone through the door and the hotelier has turned back inside to his wife or to his friends. They do not necessarily know that. Not all of them have the judgment to realize it and they might start out with a prejudice in favour of the manager, but the manager knows what he has done and he is laughing perhaps because the Government is protecting him against his own discriminatory instincts. All these are things that we have to consider, Sir, and I would urge upon the Government, particularly urge not to make as trivial an offence as this a DPP offence. The only ones I know the DPP is obliged to give his fiat before he can prosecute relate to members of Parliament, and various offences which can be committed against members of Parliament, and I dare say it relates to perjury and I believe official secrets; and, by the way, incest. Now listen to the list: official secrets — not even treason itself, but official secrets — interference with members of Parliament, perjury, incest, and bad behaviour by a hotel manager or a hotel servant, and so on. These are the offences which the DPP and the DPP alone can prosecute. I say, leave in his powers so that if consent is obtained you do not have the trouble of swearing before the magistrate. I am not against leaving that in so that he can consent in an obvious case and save you the trouble; but in case he does not wish to consent or takes too long to consent, or cannot decide about the case before you leave Barbados — that is another point, Sir. A person may be leaving Barbados in three weeks and his case has gone through the eddoes because nobody is going to kill himself about that. They hardly even — well, I would not like to be unkind. They do bring back victims of sexual assault; but they are the only ones who are ever brought back to Barbados to pursue cases.

If a tourist gets knock down by a motor car there is no possibility of his being able to bring an action, and I do not believe you are going to bring back people for actions like these

Let the DPP have a discretionary power but also let there be other machinery which would allow prosecutions to be brought by the persons aggrieved. The amendment as moved by the hon. member for St. Peter limits it to the person aggrieved. That would stop the Bajan Consumer League from bringing a case about somebody they heard about; that would stop busybodies from getting in. If you and I, Sir, go to a hotel and I am discriminated against, this amendment would not allow you to bring the case. Normally, that could be done, Sir. If you see somebody beat me you can bring the case against the person, but this would limit that — limit it to the person aggrieved; limit it to a sworn information. Sworn informations are not unknown to the law either, Sir. In affiliation cases sworn informations are required where, you say that a man is the father of your child and the child is more than a year old; if a child is more than one year old you have to swear before the magistrate before you can actually bring the case. Have a sworn information on the matter such as this and allow individuals to pursue their own remedies if the Government does not feel fit to pursue them. Do not put a further financial burden on the Government of considering these matters, because, that is another thing to consider. The DPP might have to take on an extra Crown Counsel in his office to consider complaints of this sort, or have to reassign duties, which would take away time from the no doubt busy schedules of the present staff of the Legal Affairs Department.

In my submission it was too casually included in this Bill, and I would urge on members of the House that if they like the idea and they are a little doubtful about it, remit it to a Select Committee which would report quickly, which could get advice from Crown Counsel — or this afternoon get advice from Crown Counsel if you like the idea, on a suitable form of words, because I do not pretend to be, and I am not paid to be a legal draftsman, Sir, but I would urge the principle of what I am suggesting on members of the other side.

1.20 p.m.

I would urge consideration of what I am suggesting on members of the other side.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am speaking on the amendment. I spoke before the Opposition made this amendment and I was accused of being

illogical. The Opposition turns around and accepts my argument for the maintenance of this particular provision and then adds a further amendment. Therefore I think that the Leader of the Opposition is illogical with me. He accepted my argument and then he goes further in attempting to give an aggrieved person the right to bring an action. How can he in one breath accuse me of being illogical and then get up and support the Bill as it stands with an additional amendment?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of explanation. He has got the wrong member. I did not say that he was illogical. I said that I was convinced by his arguments, but I did not think that he was entirely logical to limit them only to that. The person who said illogical was not me. I do not think that I used the word.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry if I misunderstood, but I do not understand the Opposition's point of view. They are accepting my arguments for the maintenance of these provisions and I was accepting theirs for an addition to the particular provision.

The idea is good, but there is the question of drafting. When the hon. member for St. Peter drafts something I do not think that he will pretend even to be a lawyer like me. While we agree with the idea of the amendment, I do not think that he will claim that it is word perfect. If he would consult with the two colleagues on his right I think that we could get something in proper form.

I think that the Leader of the Opposition has clearly thrown weight on the Government. He knows that under the Constitution of Barbados the Director of Public Prosecutions is an independent person. He spent hours in here during the Constitution Debate to maintain that position. How can he turn around and suggest that if the Director of Public Prosecutions who is an independent person safeguarded by the Constitution, on any grounds refuses his fiat that the Government will be involved? You mean that Barbados will be involved.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, if the Minister would give way. I do not know how he has misunderstood my speech. I said if we are going to get publicity, the person would go away and say that he wrote to the Government and the Government refused. I am not saying that the Government will be involved. I am saying that the publicity is going to embarrass the Government, because an American is not going to think of the Director of Public Prosecutions, he is going to think about

the Government. When it is written in the New York Times, it is going to be that the local DPP refused to prosecute. They are not going to mind the Constitution of Barbados. They are going to mind that it was a Government figure which would not prosecute a hotel for alleged discrimination.

I am saying what others will say. I am adopting the argument that is necessary to protect Barbados to some extent, but do not create a situation in which the Government may become involved by your act of protection, or may appear to become involved.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, since he is using "Government" in the term as representative of the island of Barbados I would accept his explanation; but the amendment contains a very good idea. When I spoke, my idea was not to champion the cause of hotels. I was purely motivated by a desire to prevent people who feel or dream that they have had some grouse to frivolously bring a case. I was not giving comfort or consolation to anybody.

I have been in public life long enough, like the hon. member for St. Michael West, for people to know my sincerity and to know where my interest lies; and we will see where our interests lie next year. People know me for what I am. I was trying to give an independent public official the power to be the go between because, as we know, the hotel industry brings all sorts of people into Barbados.

I was at the Hilton one day with my children who were swimming. I am only giving you an example. I was talking to an American and beside him was a purse and a bag. I saw him put his hand down into the bag and take out something and put it in his hip pocket. He had on those torn up jeans. I saw two couples come up the steps by the pool and take up the bag. As soon as they were going to him he said "I saw a lady go into your bag and she took something out." As the couple went down the steps I said, "look into your bag. I saw that man go into it and take something out." So they searched and missed a Bank of America credit card. They asked me if I would go to the front desk. I went. When we went upstairs Security asked if he had gone into the purse. He said "no; I saw a lady go into it." I said: "man you are a liar. I saw you go into the purse." He almost took off his pants and everything at the pool. Naturally he did not have anything on him. When the security guard looked down at a crack by the side of the pool, there was the credit card on the off side of where the bag was.

That is the type of person that you get coming into the area. The hotels are not responsible for this, but you get people coming in and stealing at the hotels. I did it because I felt that some poor chamber-maid or bell boy would have been blamed when the lady missed her card. I am trying to prevent my people from being blamed for the dishonesty of people who come in masquerading.

I am not out to protect any hotels. I want to straighten the record that just as he could steal from a fellow guest he could do something worse to damage Barbados; because he would have gone away and the hotel maids, the chamber maids or the bell boys would have been blamed for stealing the lady's Bank of America credit card when it was done by a guest staying in the same hotel.

I am glad to see that the Opposition appreciates it. I do not want to stop anybody from prosecuting. I am against discrimination. I have been against it throughout my entire life. I am prepared to make any penalty strong enough for the punishment of discrimination in any form.

I do not want to deprive anyone of the right when they are discriminated against, of bringing an action against the hotel.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the amendment to the subsection is very much a matter of law for lawyers who know so much more than the rest of us ordinary people. It is not possible to accept the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition to send it to Select Committee and come back next week because that would mean that there would be no opportunity for the Other Place to consider the Bill and it would have to be gone all over again. I wonder if the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition would accept a suggestion to defer further consideration until later in the day, during which time the legal luminaries could sort out this particular section, and we could go on with the other sections now, or deal with them all later this evening.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The position, Sir, is that drafting cannot be done in this manner very successfully. Although we agree with the particular amendment, it should be inserted in the most elegant manner. I am not quite sure that we have it here in the most elegant manner. It may be that we could proceed with the Bill and postpone further consideration of the section.

I beg to move that further consideration of section 7 be postponed.

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

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

1.30 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Clause 8 stand part.

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

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

Part IV was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that Part IV stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: The only section I am worried about is section 10(3). The Minister did not really, I think perhaps the only aspect of it, understand what he was introducing, because the hotel is never liable without fault for anything that is lost. That is the whole meaning of section 10. "Subject to subsection (2), a proprietor is liable without proof of default, neglect or wilful act by the proprietor, his agent or servant, to make good to a guest any damage....." Therefore it is an extremely simple case. All the guest has to do is to prove that he had a suitcase in his room and when he went back to his room he no longer had a suitcase. The proof of fault is a difficult legal matter. The proof of something without fault is easier. I can see no reason why the High Court alone should have cognisance of such action since damages are limited to the magisterial jurisdiction. It is, I hope, an argument which contains all the logic that is needed to convince hon. members. It is a simple case without difficulties in law since all you have to prove is that you lost the goods. You do not have to prove that they were stolen; that the hotel left the door open; that the fire escape was not drawn up so people could climb up and have access to the bedrooms; that the hotel employees are criminals who are liable to steal. You do not have to prove any of those things, all you have to prove is that you lost the goods, whatever the goods are.

Magistrates deal with more difficult cases than these every day, and the essence of a

magisterial jurisdiction is speed; You can get a case heard quickly. If you are going away from the island you can go and swear affidavits and have the date drawn up, so that indeed people who deal before Magistrates, the really sharp lawyers, the debt collectors dealing in the other direction, can sometimes have a hotel guest, hearing the news that something has happened in the morning, can get him before the court at half past one in the afternoon, and the hotel gets the same speed of access. These are things that are just not possible at all under the High Court procedure, and I would really urge that if you are going to ask the Crown Law Officers, call them in over subsection (3) and they would recommend to delete it altogether. I really would urge this. It is a waste of the High Court's time. There is no other action in the High Court which involves amounts of under \$1,000, this would be the only thing you are asking a Judge to deal with under \$1,000 and it would really be wasting the Judge's time. The case is too simple, and I would urge that section 10, bearing in mind the liability set in section 11 which I do not like anyhow, but that is a matter of policy. If the Government likes those limits, thinking of inflation and everything, then the Government could deal with it.

My suggestion is that the Minister should take power to vary the limits from time to time. That is my suggestion, and I think it well comes within ministerial discretion, but if the Minister does not want that discretion it is up to him, but bearing in mind the limits as embodied in the Act at present, take it away from the High Court. I would suggest with great respect to the Leader of the House that he could refer this section and the next, if the Minister likes the idea of being able to vary the limits from time to time without coming back to Parliament, give section 10 and section 11 in those two regards to the draftsmen. Give the whole Part to the draftsmen and let the draftsmen decide whether it would not be better to approach it from that angle, Sir.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition is perfectly acceptable. I was waiting since he addressed it to the Leader of the House, to hear what the Leader of the House thinks.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in view of the amendments which we are called upon to consider at this stage, it might be wise to postpone further consideration of the Bill. I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition has any other points to raise. If these are all the amendments it might be better at this stage to

postpone further consideration and refer the Bill back to the Attorney General's Department to deal with it on that basis.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with other Items on the Order Paper I would like to ask for leave to lay this statement with regard to advances of salaries and wages.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the will of all members of the House, leave will be granted for the hon. member to read this statement. There being no objections, leave is granted.

STATEMENT TO BE MADE TO HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

In pursuance of the Supplementary Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals made by the Minister of Finance and Planning on 21st November, 1974 that advances of salaries and wages, should be made to certain Government employees. A Resolution Supplementary Estimates 1974-75 No. 15 for the sum of Two Million, Nine Hundred And Ten Thousand Dollars (\$2,910,000.00) was passed by the House of Assembly to be granted from the Consolidated Fund and placed at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974-75 Part I - Current.

The terms and conditions on which these advances should have been made were set out in the Addendum to the Resolution as follows:-
1.40 p.m.

It is proposed to make advances of salaries, wages and pensions to certain employees, to assist them in meeting the additional expenses of the Christmas Season. These advances will be non-refundable and non-reimbursable and will be made to Government employees during the month of December 1974 on the following terms and conditions:-

- (1) all members of the unestablished staff and casual employees who had worked not less than 220 days during the period 1st January 1974 and 30th November, 1974 should receive a payment on or before 15th December, 1974 in addition to the wages normally received by them equivalent to twice

the amount to which they would have been entitled during any average week in the period of eight weeks immediately preceding the date of payment;

- (ii) all monthly paid employees whose salaries did not exceed \$8,400 per annum on the 30th November, 1974 should be paid an amount equivalent to 50% of the monthly salary to which they would have been entitled during that month;
- (iii) all persons in receipt of Government pensions not being old age pensions or National Insurance retirement benefits, where these pensions do not exceed \$450 per month on the 30th November, 1974 should receive payment equivalent to 50% of the pension to which they would have been entitled during that month.

Representations were made to Cabinet that the condition requiring unestablished and casual staff to work for 220 days between the period 1st January to 30th November, 1974 in order to qualify for the advance, had resulted in a substantial number of such workers being disqualified from receiving advances.

Consequently Cabinet reconsidered its decision of 29th November, 1974 and concluded that —

“Unestablished and casual staff who had worked for not less than 150 days during the period 1st January to 30th November, 1974 or who but for illness would have worked for such a time during that period, should be eligible for the advance of wages or salary”.

This note seeks to clarify the variation in the terms of payment from those set out in the Addendum to the Resolution. The House of Assembly is accordingly invited to note the change in the number of days from 220 to 150 for which casual and unestablished staff would be eligible.

Mr. SPEAKER: I also take this opportunity to lay on the Table of this Honourable House Accounts and Statements for the month of February, 1973, as prepared by the Accountant General.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the laying of the accounts by the

Accountant General, has Your Honour taken any steps to see that the law which states that the accounts must be laid not later than one month after the month to which they relate is enforced? These accounts should have been laid since March or since April, 1973. The accounts are, therefore nearly two years late and getting later. Your Honour has a number of duties relating to the proper administration of Parliament, and I am sure that a word from you to the Director of Public Prosecutions, or whatever authority is responsible for punishing persons who do not carry out the duties to Parliament, would be effective.

I believe it is actually a contempt to Parliament on the part of the Accountant General to refuse to carry out those sections of the Financial Administration and Audit Act that relate to the proper keeping of the accounts of Barbados. These are Public Accounts of this country. The law says that they must be laid within a month, and Your Honour has been insulted, in my respectful submission, on your behalf and on behalf of all Parliament, by the Accountant General treating Parliament so casually. He can, obviously, supply the Central Bank with figures because the Central Bank produces up-to-date figures, but he cannot supply them to Parliament.

Your Honour, I do not know which way to turn. We have dealt with this matter in the Public Accounts Committee. I can only appeal to Your Honour to consider whether it is not a breach of the privileges of Parliament that the Accountant General could treat us with contempt by forwarding documents 22 months late in breach of the law.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply to deal with the money Resolutions which are on the Order Paper.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974-75, No. 21

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the first Item is a Resolution to grant the sum of \$43,337

out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1974 - 75 Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1974 - 75, No. 21 which form the Schedule to the Resolution. The Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport will deal with this matter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, as the Addendum to this Resolution states, the sum of \$150,000 is provided under this item and there is a balance of \$10,703 and that is inadequate to meet the cost of two additional units which are urgently required. The two units are required to provide improved accommodation at the Christ Church Boys' School and at the Christ Church Girls' Foundation School.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister is referring to Water Street School.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD indicated accent.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we do not want to oppose any effort on the part of Government to establish accommodation for the school population in this country. What we are worried about is that the Minister seems to be finding it convenient to pay attention to the suffering of the school population in particular areas.

1.50 p.m.

We believe that the Minister will in process of time establish himself as Minister of Education for the nation, if further time permits him to remain in office. We doubt this very much. But there is no denying the fact that there are other parishes and other schools in other areas with a need much greater than that which exists or has been found to exist at the Water Street Boys' School, the Christ Church Boys' School and the Girls' and Boys' Foundation Schools. What we are saying is that we are not trying to deny that these schools all the good that is now being done or attempted to make good for them but we believe that the Minister must realise that his responsibility stretches much further afield, and I am sure he has carried out or caused the necessary investigation to be carried out since he has been Minister of Education and he has found on his files when he went into office the necessity and the weight of the necessity that exists in respect of many other schools, and we

feel sure that what is now being done the Minister cannot deny is being done at the expense of others because as I have tried to point out the need in the northern parishes, not merely because I represent the constituency of St. Peter and I do not make reference to the needs of St. Peter at this particular time at all although the need there is very great. The Minister is aware of all this and we will hear from the Minister undoubtedly that he cannot attend to all at the same time, but surely he has been in office long enough, he has set about establishing institutions where they need not have been established and for purposes for which there was no immediate need, all at the expense of other schools. We are asking the Minister now to give much more serious consideration to his responsibilities to the nation in a matter of this sort.

Mr. Chairman, it is not merely because a favourite might be placed or found to be at the head of this or that institution that one would go all out as we have evidence has been done at some of these schools. Unless you prove yourself to be a favourite or found it convenient to be a favourite of the Minister - let us exclude the Minister this time and say the Ministry - you will find that people have to go on with the heels of their shoes sinking into the floors of the buildings and what not, the children during the rainy season cannot go to the lavatory because it is separated from the main building, and even teachers themselves at some of these schools cannot find it convenient to go from one class room to another during the rainy season or when the rain is falling. These are things that needs the Minister's attention, I do not want to say more on this score because we are going to support it; let us have these prefab buildings, but I am sure the Minister is aware there are many other schools with more serious problems than the ones he is now seeking to try to remedy by bringing in this Resolution. We urge upon the Minister to give active consideration, and my last words to him are "be quick about it". That is our cry.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the hon. member for St. Peter in his efforts to get accommodation for schools in his area, but I would like to point out at these two schools which are in my area I have never got anything done since I was a member of Parliament. If there is one area that is crying out for more space it is the Christ Church area. We have a lot of development in Christ Church. There is Atlantic Shores, Ealing Park, Enterprise, Silver Hill development, Gall Hill Housing area, Fairholme Gardens, Maxwell Gardens; so there is terrific development taking place and the Foundations Schools are completely inadequate

to deal with the child population in this area, because the Girls' Foundation School carrying 300 pupils and the Boys' Foundation School carrying 400, these are just joke schools to the people who have come into this area through the various developments, and you need almost double the amount of schools places you have at present at these two schools. At Water Street Boys' School which is the main school for Christ Church, we find that that school has been expanding; it has over 900 pupils and the Silver Hill Housing area and the Gall Hill Housing area as well as people living in different housing schemes have brought a terrific population to Christ Church; so it is not true to say that these schools do not need more accommodation. I have been trying for the last two or three years to bring these things to the attention of Government — that this area is rapidly expanding and we need to have the facilities there to accommodate the growing population. We are receiving people from all parts of Barbados in the development that is taking place and I would like to compliment the Minister in that he has been able to provide more accommodation at these two schools.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and myself share in common in addition to a very long friendship having been pupils of both the Christ Church Boys' School, the Water Street School and one of the Foundations Schools, and I should certainly I think, be failing in my duty if I did not on behalf of the schools in particular and the population of that area express my satisfaction at seeing some provision being made for increased accommodation. Indeed the hon. member and myself were pupils of that school some considerable time ago. We are both getting to the stage in age that sixteen becomes a happy number and like the female section of our community we are slow to say how old we are, not that we are over the hills by any means; but it is several years since we both attended the Water Street Boys' School, and if I may say so one of my regrets about the development in that area has been that the school facilities have not kept up with what has been happening in the surrounding area, and indeed the old building which has no architectural beauty and not very much convenience far less aesthetic qualities still exists as it did several years ago in that area.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Ministry had plans for establishing playing fields at the Water Street Schools and I should like to know from the Minister whether he has been able to acquire and put into being all of the facilities for playing fields at both the boys' and the girls' schools; but certainly the hon. member too forgot to mention

the expansion that has taken place in the Newton area in particular. There has been a tremendous need for school places at Christ Church, and I hope that the building facilities can be expanded and that there will be much more land area available in that area for expanding the Christ Church Boys' School.

2.00 p.m.

With relation to the Foundations I should like the Minister to tell us how soon he expects to be able to provide a residence at the Foundation for the Headmaster and the Headmistress. Speaking as a citizen of the Foundations and an old boy of the School I am saddened by the fact that vandalism seems to have taken over among a few people, but effectively among a few people and one is finding wanton destruction of school windows and school buildings. I happened sometime last year to be in the vicinity and regretted very much the damage I saw at the Foundation School; and I would have thought that the presence of a Headmaster's residence certainly, and most likely, a Headmistress' if possible, in that vicinity would have led to proper control — not that there is not a security watchman there, but despite this I do not think that we have been able to contain the damage which is being done.

I do not believe the economic circumstances would allow us immediately to provide this, but there has been a lot of talk about it over the last few years, and I hope the Minister could give us some idea as to whether he is going to be able to make some provision, in the life of this Parliament certainly, for the building at the Foundation School.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply quite briefly. As I indicated in my opening remarks in introducing this Resolution, I said that the prefabricated, or, wooden buildings were meant for the Christ Church Boys' School and the Christ Church Girls' Foundation School. The Christ Church Boys School has a roll of 874 pupils and they are accommodated in a total area of some 6,780 square feet. The standards used by my Ministry in designing class rooms for new school buildings is some 12½ square feet per pupil and on this basis a total area of 10,925 square feet as opposed to the existing 6,780 square feet would be required.

On the standard being applied there is no doubt at all that there is need for additional accommodation in that particular school. It is a very tight school both in terms of congestion which create problems for both teachers and students alike, and the noise level within the class

rooms also because of this tight situation makes it imperative, when you take everything into account, that this additional accommodation be provided.

Similarly at the Girls' Foundation School, the fifth forms have been expanding in numbers and indeed some of the forms are being accommodated in the old school building to which the member for Christ Church West referred. Proposals are being developed for an extension to the two Foundation Schools. This measure here is an interim one in order to provide additional accommodation to hold the line until we can get the contract awarded and the work commenced.

This particular Resolution has nothing at all to do with any favourites. I do not have any favourite Headteachers when it comes to the dispensation of Government's work. I am concerned about the needs of the country as they are put to me and as I evaluate them. It has nothing to do with favourites or anything like that, and I deprecate that type of remark coming from the member for St. Peter. I am not his favourite Minister and I do not expect him to pay any compliments. I am not looking for them.

During this current year additional class rooms are being provided for the Alleyne School in St. Andrew, St. Luke's Primary School in St. George, St. Peter's Girls School – that work is already completed – St. Peter's Girls School in St. Peter; the hon. member may know something about it; St. Ann's Primary School in St. Joseph, the Pine Primary and the Farm in St. Michael. And these are provided because there is an established need for the additional facilities at this area.

I would not rely on the member for St. Peter to tell me what are my national duties. I have more experience in this than he has ever had or will ever have, so he need not make that type of point; but where the need is demonstrable as in this particular case or in these two cases we come with what is required in order to meet the requirements of the schools for additional accommodation, and that is what this Resolution is about.

As far as the acquisition of playing fields for the two Christ Church Schools is concerned – the Boys' and the Girls' school – I wish to assure the member for Christ Church West that plans are being developed for the acquisition of land; in fact, the negotiations I understand, should be completed pretty soon and it is hoped that a playing field will be provided for the Christ

Church Boys' School. There is an area already designated for the Christ Church Girls' School.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$43,337 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION FOR ONE HOUR

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended for one hour – until 3.10 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.10 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1974–75 PART I – CURRENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as stated here in this Resolution, the first item is Compensation. Before I go further I would point out that the sum mentioned should have been \$700 and not \$430. I am asking for leave to amend that in order to regularise the situation. It means that the amount that we are asking for in the Resolution would be \$235,587 and not \$235,317 as stated in the Resolution.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As I was saying the first item under Head 15 (1) Cabinet Office, the first Head, is Compensation. We have had to pay

out some. As far as Government hospitality is concerned, owing to the proposed visit of Her Majesty the Queen which is due to take place from February 18th – 20th and other visits we have had quite recently, like Heads of Governments and the member of the US Congress, Mrs. Chisholm, we have had to utilise this vote.

The supplementary that we are asking for on this occasion is to make provision for the proposed visit of Her Majesty the Queen who is Queen of Barbados, and who would be visiting here for the first time since Barbados achieved independence.

Hon. members may wish to ask for a little breakdown, and it may be just as well to give some information at this stage. A reconnaissance party was sent out here to visit and report from the 27th – 29th November, 1974 and the Bill was \$457.31. As far as the commitments for the actual visit are concerned, the amount for supply of finger bowls to Government House is \$807.50. Carpeting of room No. 10, \$1,861; air conditioning of three rooms, \$3,415.50, so \$6,084 is the total; engagement of transportation for the entourage, \$1,560; accommodation and meals etc. at the Holiday Inn for the entourage, \$8,250. On 18/2/75, the night of the day of her arrival, there will be a reception at Government House for 600 guests, and the amount estimated for that is \$5,000. There will be a reception at Culloden Farm on 19/2/75, and the amount is \$16,000. Provision of strip carpeting for (a) the arrival and departure ceremony at Seawell, \$1,000 and (b) Opening of Parliament, \$2,000, making a total of \$3,000 for the carpeting.

In gifts for the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh and other members of the entourage, \$2,000, making a total of \$42,351.31. Incidentals, \$14,235.13, making a total of \$46,586.44, call it \$47,000.

I have given a breakdown of the commitments and expenses which are anticipated as a result of the proposed visit of Her Majesty the Queen of Barbados, and I beg to move that Head 15(1), Cabinet Office, stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the House has been at pains to give us what he called a breakdown of the proposed expenditure in connection with the visit to Barbados by Her Majesty the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh. Mr. Chairman, \$47,000 to people who are

accustomed to money does not look like anything and one would be tempted to say what is \$47,000 that could not be spent to entertain Royalty?

But Mr. Chairman, when we take this \$47,000 and match it against the mass suffering, mass unemployment, and I must say the mass hunger presently experienced by thousands of Her Majesty's subjects in Barbados, one must ask where the necessity arises at this point in time for embarking on such expenditure.

We do not for a single moment suggest that a visit from the Queen would not be welcomed at some time; but we want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is too much concern among our young people that they are neglected in too many ways, that they are being denied so much. We also have our old people and when some of them live to a hundred years all that they receive is a message from the Queen.

3.25 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, all we are asking Government to do is this. Look at the state of affairs as presently exist in this country, look at the economic situation. There are public servants today who go to gasoline stations and credit gasoline and at the end of the month cannot get money to pay for the gasoline. There is no money in the Treasury to pay these people. Nobody is going to deny this. There are persons who render services to the Government, who carry out contracts for the Government, and when they have completed the work they cannot be paid because there is no money to pay them. Our pensioners, the old age pensioners who have been promised \$10 instead of \$8, some of them are still asking when they are going to get the \$10. They are still looking for the extra \$2. Our Provident Fund workers who have given their blood, sweat and tears and everything else, the little \$3.60 they have been getting in the past from the Provident Fund they have to wait months sometimes to get it.

Mr. Chairman, are we right in trying to find \$47,000 at a time such as this to provide entertainment for the Queen? People are crying out for the 5% sales tax imposed upon them. Did you put on this 5% sales tax to raise money to feed the Queen? I am sure Her Majesty would never be party to causing her presence in Barbados to create any suffering or any increased hardship upon the mass of people in this country. We believe that this is in itself an embarrassment to Her Majesty to invite her here at this time to cause the Government to have to spend \$47,000 when mass starvation is in our midst. The situation with respect to malnutrition amongst

our infants has given much cause for concern to above all others, the Hon. Leader of this House. He has had to remark on it on a public occasion. It could not then be unknown to the Hon. Minister of Health. In the light of all this our little children cannot get milk and they are improperly fed despite..... (Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: By whom?) The Minister of Health of the Nation wants to know by whom. I want to say here and now the same people who are going to take \$47,000 to entertain Her Majesty the Queen would be doing greater service to this nation if they bought \$47,000 in fresh cow's milk and distributed it to five year olds, the infants who would benefit from it most. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: How much would they get from it?) It is not a question of how much they will get, it is more a question of how much they are not now getting. That is the point at issue. These Ministers just want to have an opportunity to parade, some of them dressed up like they are going to carnival, in the company of Royalty and are prepared at a time such as this to see \$47,000 spent so that they can have a time with Royalty.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to look at the programme from what the Leader of the House has just said we will see they are going to have a reception at Government House, a \$6,000 reception, but now they are going to outdo themselves at Culloden Farm with \$16,000 worth. In the light of all this would it not be better if you really have to spend money instead of spending \$6,000 at Government House and \$16,000 at Culloden Farm to have a reception at Government House costing \$9,000, or let us have a reception at Culloden Farm and leave out the one at Government House? What is the point? You are going to have a reception here, and then the same thing all over again? Many of the same faces at Government House will be turning up to swell their bellies at Culloden Farm, but the poor people are the ones we are concerned with at this time. We believe that on another occasion when the economic situation is entirely different from what it is today in this country we can do something like this. We are going all about fighting, arguing and asking for help. The oil prices have us strangled, giving some people hernia according to the Hon. Minister, high prices for oil, we want better prices for sugar, we are fighting on every possible front to cut down the high cost here and to bring in more there and from one thing to another, Sir. In other words, the truth about our economic situation seems to be unknown to Ministers of Government. The truth about it is that when facts or figures are put before them they disregard them totally and put their own delineation, but they know.

Mr. Chairman, if I am coming to the end of my time I should wind up. It is only fair that I should do so. I would like to impress upon hon. members on that side of the House to question whether or not it is absolutely necessary to have Her Majesty the Queen visit at this particular time.

3.35 p.m.

Alongside of this, Mr. Chairman, you must consider the suffering of the nation as is advertised widely, and they must tell themselves if they think it is right, in these circumstances, to spend \$47,000 as suggested in this Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is another occasion on which an important occasion like this is taken as an opportunity to make a cheap political point, and the attempt is being made to suggest to the public of Barbados that \$47,000, which is \$.0027 of the Barbados Budget, is an extraordinary expenditure on the visit of Her Majesty the Queen. Barbados became independent in 1966. Nowhere do I find in the manifesto in 1971 of the Barbados Labour Party of which the hon. member is a member, the member for St. Peter, that it is suggested that they would make Barbados a republic.

Her Majesty is the Queen of Barbados. That is one of her titles. In all of the Constitutional amendments they moved a few months ago, when they were running through the country telling people about constitutional changes, not one of them even suggested that Her Majesty the Queen should be removed as the Head of Barbados. Now the Queen is the Head of Barbados. She last visited Barbados in 1966, 8 years ago, and she has expressed a desire, protocol and proper formalities having been gone through, to visit not one of her realms, but to come as a Queen of Barbados for a 2-or-3-day visit. How can anyone be so ungracious? How can anyone take an opportunity in a responsible Parliament to suggest to the people of this country that spending \$.0027 of its Budget to entertain the proper Head of the country of whom the Governor General is a representative will be money badly spent. It is cheap politics to say that it could buy milk for 5-year old children; the economy is bad and the money could stop a gap here and there. If the people of my constituency, or the people of Barbados, want to kick me out because I am going to vote for \$47,000 to entertain the Queen of Barbados, the Head of Barbados as at present established, then they can kick me out willingly now, tomorrow, 1975, 1976, or 1977.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I am not expressing my view on whether I favour a republic, whether I favour monarchy, or whether I favour a president. That is not at issue. The issue is that Her Majesty the Queen under the Constitution is the Head of Barbados not by choice, but by choice of the Opposition who went to London and by choice of this Government. If a referendum were taken in Barbados tomorrow to decide whether Barbados should become a republic or not, 75% of the people of Barbados would opt for the present monarchical system because the present Opposition would go around and say: "If you have a president, the Prime Minister will be a dictator."

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, nobody in the Opposition would wait until we have a republic to say that the Prime Minister is a dictator. We would say that now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have always maintained in this House that we must reach a stage where we must stop pandering to the baser elements of our society and when we must stop making politics of Ministerial salaries, of the visit of the Queen, and of legitimate expenditure to maintain the dignity of this nation. I am surprised at this. The hon. member for St. Peter is ordinarily a rational person who accepts the Constitutional position, who never flouts the authority of Parliament, and yet he can stand in here today and say certain things because he thinks the people will say: "What a foolish visit!" Well you can go to the Garrison when she is here and you will see how many thousands of Barbadians will be there. When she opens the building in Fairchild Street, you will see how many thousands will be there to see Her Majesty the Queen. Now, I want you to be serious. I want you to tell your Party members, after the speech you have made here today, to put in their manifesto that Barbados should become a republic and that the Queen should be removed. I dare you to do that.

Mr. HINDS: To elucidate a point, Sir. What I said in my speech was can we afford this, or should we embark on this expenditure at this particular time. I did not go on to say whether we should have a republic, or a Pope, or a president. Maybe that is turning over in the Minister's mind.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, if Her Majesty the Queen is the Head of a country and she has not visited that country for 8 years, then if that country cannot afford to spend \$47,000 to

entertain Her Majesty it should become a real colonial country again, or it should beg to be taken over by some other country. If a country like Barbados cannot afford to spend \$47,000 to entertain Her Majesty, who is the Queen of Barbados, among her titles, and the Head of this country that would be a sad day, Mr. Chairman. Do you not think it would be a sad day if we had to say to the Secretary to the Prime Minister: "Tell Her Majesty we regret that the invitation which we have extended to her and the expression of her desire to visit Barbados must be postponed because the Barbados Government, at this present time, cannot afford a measly \$47,000 to entertain the Queen."

Mr. Chairman, I am not going into the arrangements. This Government is a grass-root Government. You will get an invitation as a member of the House, and whether or not you come to see who was there is your business. You will see that when the invitations go out every section of the community will be represented from the scavenger right to the top. Since Barbados is a big country with various walks of life: the civil servants, the statutory boards, the Justices of the Peace, and all sorts of people, the Government said, and Her Majesty has expressed the desire that she would like to meet with as many of her people as possible — not subjects; we took them from subjects after independence — who, up to this time, have consented that she should be their Queen. We can change this tomorrow because we have a two-thirds majority, but we know that the people, in spite of their emergence from independence, still feel that that lingering link with their long traditions of Parliamentary Government and those long traditions of Commonwealth association should not be severed at this point. The young may require the severance. When that time comes we will sever, and I will bet that they will not put this severance in their manifesto.

Mr. Chairman, I have always had respect for the member for St. Peter. I could understand him telling me that \$47,000 is thrown away by M.C.W. in a week, or that the money was thrown away on some Government project.
3.45 p.m.

If they have any shred of what is right, if they have any shred of what is the proper thing to do, how can he in the name of all that is honest and fair object to spending .0027 of the budget to entertain Royalty whom we have not seen for over eight years. If you read the debates of this House, look at the budget for Government hospitality; he has not said a word about that. These are people not connected to Barbados;

these are officials coming down and people unconnected. If you look at the Government's total budget you will see that there are several areas in which people are entertained costing much more than one visit which is now taking place after eight years. I am not going to find myself between now and 1976 indulging in this cheap politics. I have aspirations to be a statesman; I have aspirations to lift my people to a higher range of thinking. Votes are all right. Some people will say "man you are wasting money; I could have done with that; they could have given me an increase." If we bought milk with the \$47,000 for five-year olds, they would not get half a gill, they would only get about three drops a piece, so if they are mal-nourished and you give them half a gill for one day you would know what good that would do to a mal-nourished child. Let us endeavour as parliamentarians, since we have their confidence, to elevate them to a stage where they will view vital issues not from a narrow political vote-catching point of view, but from a point of view which can only ensure to the elevation of themselves and to the benefit of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I think now I have spoken the hon. member for St. Peter must be having second thoughts on whether the tone of his speech under the circumstances of this particular case really merited the strictures and the strong condemnation of the Government that it gives, and I would like to finish, Mr. Chairman, by saying that if I know my people, the speech made by the hon. member for St. Peter can do him nothing but harm because the people of this country still have a large reservoir of respect and decency which the spending of this money can only tend to replenish.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, some of us like to tread on and get involved in matters without fully understanding exactly what somebody else has said. The hon. member who has just spoken is famous for this. He believes that he is entitled to twist other people's speeches to suit what he has prepared before hand to talk about, and today is a typical example. It shows, Mr. Chairman, that politics is no longer the sort of business one can debate rationally; there must always be something wrong with somebody if he says something which the other side did not expect to hear coming from him, and that is how the hon. member has behaved today. What I would like the Hon. Minister of Communications to do is to go home and reflect upon what he has said today and then pick up last week's newspapers and see if there is not an M.P. in Britain who is next door to the Queen who wages endless war against the Queen. That does not mean that the man does not

recognise her as Queen; it does not mean that the hon. member for St. Peter does not recognise her as Queen of Barbados, Head of the Commonwealth. He has put forward his views. A politician in Britain who can look out every morning and seek audience with the Queen has just written a book in which he said Britain had no right financing the Queen, that she is a multi-millionaire, but that is the man's opinion. Is it so wrong if the hon. member for St. Peter feels that Barbados cannot afford to entertain the Queen at this time for him to say so? That does not necessarily mean that he or his party would like to see a Republic in Barbados. One has got to be rational about things nowadays. What would he say of a man who sits in Parliament in Britain among his colleagues and criticises the Queen daily? Every time a Bill comes up in Parliament to do with the Queen, he unleashes on the Queen as if she were his next door neighbour, but it does not mean that he wants Britain to be a Republic. This foolish talk about you and your party not having written anything in your manifesto about being a Republic now seems to be the catch phrase. It was not in the manifesto that the Government would come in here and amend the Constitution, but they did it; so what foolishness am I hearing when every time he gets up he says something was not in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. If every thing the D.L.P. had to do was in the manifesto, we would have come to the end long ago. According to the hon. member for St. Michael West you would have to write a Bible and put it outside so that if you come in and say not to vote money for repairing roads, you could turn to chapter 15 page so and so of the Bible and see it written down there; so the Government would have to do the same thing.

In the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party they talked about taking over tenantry roads, and I heard the same Minister of Communications and Works say that despite all the money voted in the Estimates he only got \$60,000 for building roads. So if you had to write everything in your mind in a manifesto, I accept the statement by the hon. member for St. Michael West that you would have to write a Bible and publish it as a manifesto. I am saying now that if the hon. member or any hon. member gets up and expresses his feeling, he is entitled to do that. I heard the Prime Minister in here talk about a Wages and Incomes Policy and I heard the hon. member who represents the Trade Union, a member of his party, get up and say this is tomfoolery; so is he telling me that the whole party is wrong? The hon. member was expressing his feeling so I do not understand what the hon. member is getting on with. We

have to be rational and come back to our senses. He talks about a cheap political speech, but his was a cheap political speech. What he is doing is pandering and hoping that seeing the Queen being utilised as a tool in Barbados the people will say that he and the D.L.P. are all right, they brought the Queen down and showed us. What he is likely to do is to use the Queen as a masquerade to cover down what is happening in Barbados today, the hardship which the people are going through.

The Minister of Communications and Works has a very convenient memory. When they come here and say that something is an increase of so and so and somebody says it is so much percent, he gets up and says you cannot talk about percentage. When a few weeks ago we were discussing the increase in the Provident Fund, he got up and said you do not talk about percentages, you talk about money, but now he refers to .0027 of the budget. When it suits him he gets up and talks about percentages, but when it does not suit him he talks about percentages. He has a convenient memory, but he is a cheap politician because when he gets up and talks about the Queen, he also talks about who will come and see her, the scavengers and such people. So you bring down the Queen like you bring carnival to Barbados from Trinidad and excite the people.

3.55 p.m.

That is what he wants to talk about, and I think that if any member gets up and expresses his opinion on a given point it should be taken in the spirit which it is given. If the member said he wants to have a republic, he wants to have a republic. If he gets his party to accept that view, then that is the party's position; but you do not talk about 'go and write it in your Manifesto.' Why doesn't he write in his Manifesto certain things that he says? Why doesn't he write in his Manifesto that Ministers should declare their interests in this country? Why doesn't he write that in the Manifesto? He helped write the Manifesto. He was a member of the executive at the time when it was written, and I did not see that in the Manifesto but he stood in New York and said so — that he was in favour of politicians declaring their assets, (*Aside*) Right; thank you. But when he is faced with it in here he gets red hot all over his ears and hot all under the collar. Why doesn't he look in his Manifesto to see that? Why did he not write that in the Manifesto? You mean he is such an infradig in the party that his views are not taken into account when they are writing the Manifesto? Those are the things he must talk about when he is talking about the manifesto. He should not play up to the public when it suits him.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this Head. I am not making any apologies to the Queen or anybody else, because I do not feel that at this stage of our economic development we can afford to throw away this sort of money on the visit of the Queen for two days and I am not apologising to anybody for that. That is my view. I am not saying this is the Barbados Labour Party's view; it is my view and I am going to vote according to my conscience.

I remember well as a young man — or as a young boy — when I was at Harrison College, coming to this Chamber; the member for St. Michael West and the member for Christ Church East were then in the House — and I remember when this party brought forward a Resolution for the purchase — and I think the member for St. Michael South Central was also a member of the Opposition then — and the Government of the day brought forward a Resolution for the purchase of a car for the then Governor — it was only \$6,000; but I remember that debate and the length of time that debate took, and what was said in that debate. But today as I listen to the member for St. Michael South Central, at one stage I thought the speech was coming from the member for Christ Church North Central. It was a speech plus the speech he made earlier. One can see why he is always held out to be the great white hope of the Democratic Labour Party. His speech was in the terms of what you would expect of one of the members of the League of Empire loyalists; not the speech of one who was in touch with the economic sufferings of the mass of people in Barbados today.

What do we find? Are we really serious? I wonder if the members on the other side have a conscience, or they just sit down and accept whatever is sent to them. Look at it. Three thousand dollars for carpet alone, and somebody out there does not get \$3,000 a year to live on. School children in this country are still going to school barefooted in the country, and you can take \$3,000 for the Queen to walk on. That is the way we are spending our money, and we feel proud that we can invite the Queen and bring the Queen and spend \$3,000 for carpet for the Queen, and some people do not have the place to put carpet; they do not even have a pigeon coop in this country, and they need it but they don't have it. But you are not concerned about that; you are more concerned about buying \$3,000 worth of carpet for the Queen to walk on.

I go further. That is not all the carpet. They are spending \$1,800 more for carpet for some room at Government House. That is \$5,000 in carpet they are buying. The Government really

cannot be serious. Even if the Queen is coming here, must you buy \$5,000 in carpet for her to walk on? Are you really serious? Spending that on carpet when people are all over Bridgetown and people are in the country suffering? You are spending \$5,000 in carpet for somebody to walk on for three days when people are suffering all over the country.

In addition to that, \$3,000 for an air conditioner. Are you really serious? I have heard about the Government's emergency budget and about cutting Government's expenditure and all that; nobody is saying the Queen must not come here. Nobody is saying you should not have a reception for her, but why must you buy carpet for \$5,000? Why must you spend this on air conditioning? It is a good thing she does not come here too often.

And above all, you are having two receptions two nights — \$21,000; \$5,000 for the one at Government House and \$16,000 for the one at Culloden Farm. Spending \$16,000 in liquor and food for one night?

I would like to know if the members over there realize that there are people who do not even get \$16,000 over five years in Barbados. They do not even work for that in five years in Barbados. Do they have a conscience to sit down and expect people to vote for this? *(Aside)* Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central wants to show he is more loyal; wants to show that he is a member of Her Majesty Loyal Government; he cannot be that loyal. This is no cheap politics. *(Aside)* When you got in here and abused the Government for buying the car for the then Governor, that wasn't cheap politics? When you were in the Opposition, considering the things you said then, that was not cheap politics then?.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. In 1956 when I opposed the car for the Governor he already had a car three years old. It was not a matter of giving him a car. It was, the car he had at that time — according to the excuse given by the then Leader of his party — was that the car was too short and every time he got up his plume would hit the top.....

Mr. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member could not be in his senses.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what have you risen?

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us hear your point of order.
4.05 p.m.

Sir, did they not come in here to change the Consul General's car in New York when it was less than two years old with the excuse that you changed it before it got two years old so that you would get more money for it?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. MOTTLEY: I will deal with the former Leader of the House, because when the Consul General and his house comes before us that will be a different matter altogether — all the air conditioning and curtains that the Government bought.

But, Sir, I was surprised to see that part of this Resolution does not include tickets for the passage of the High Commissioner in London home because I have no doubt that he will be here. He said already in this House — and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central seems to be an excellent example of this — that you say certain things when you are in the Opposition, and when you get into the Government you change your mind about them.

All that I am saying is that this is an extraordinary amount of money to spend for two days for anybody, Queen or no Queen, at a time when we hear that the economy is under so much pressure, that people are suffering, that people are losing jobs, that certain people cannot get work, that certain people cannot get food to eat.

Yet, Sir, we can take up \$47,000 and in the space of two days spend it on a visit by Her Majesty the Queen. There is no way that I will support this Resolution, Sir.

The question that Head 15 (1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the Committee dividing as follows:-

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. F. G. SMITH, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. WALCOTT and Mrs. EASTMOND — (9).

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — (3).

Head 23 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 23, the items are Clothing and Uniform, Equipment and Appliances, Medical Treatment and Radio Equipment. As far as the item, Clothing and Uniform is concerned, for which the sum of \$5,000 is asked, the explanation is that the provision of \$8,000 was under estimated when the Draft Estimates for 1974-75 were being prepared by that department; and the existing provision will be inadequate to meet commitments to the end of the Financial Year.

Under the item Equipment and Appliances for \$5,000 the amount of \$11,500 was included in the estimates to meet the cost of providing equipment, appliances, recharges and maintenance of appliances and equipment. The existing amount has proved to be inadequate.

Under Travelling, the rate was increased. Under Radio Equipment, \$2,000 was provided, but the Chief Fire Officer has reported that it is insufficient for the department to pay a number of outstanding bills amounting to \$1,429.33 in respect of 1973-74 from the amount of \$2,000 provided in the Estimates.

Under Furniture and Equipment, the amount of \$2,775 was provided in the Estimates, but has proved inadequate to meet outstanding bills etc.

I beg to move that Head 23 for these various amounts stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are particularly interested in Item 5, Equipment and Appliances, because there is an amount of \$41,500 already spent and we are now asked for \$5,000 more. We are to wonder if this equipment and appliances must be taken to mean and include the second hand tenders that came here from Canada through HARP and what not, because this is about the best way that we can put it.

As you know, Sir, there is much concern, and this concern has been particularly awakened by a Press Conference which was held quite recently, when the opportunity was taken to strike the defenceless. The Chief Fire Officer could not defend himself and it was given to the

nation and given to the public to understand or to make it believe that because he was not given a free house in which to live or something like that, he was up in arms against somebody.

These things, Mr. Chairman, are not nice. I am sure that the Minister of Communications and Works would not do it because he knows that the Chief Fire Officer cannot defend himself. You find that the nation is given to understand that he held conversations with the Prime Minister, may be a few weeks or a few days ago, talking about this House business; but these are conversations that went on prior to 1970.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt the hon. member but he is speaking on the Head Ministry of Home Affairs, Item 6, Fire Appliances. We do not have that item before us. The item which we are on does not include fire appliances. This is equipment. We are not dealing with Item 23, Fire Appliances to purchase an air field rescue tender. That is what he is speaking on.

4.15 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I may be a little out of line here but I would like to know where the Leader is reading from because I do not see any Head 28 in the copy I have. It usually happens that they have something there which we do not have over here. I would like to appeal to the Leader of the House. I would like him to inform me where he is reading from before he goes on.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would listen, I have just said that this is not before us.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: I am not going to sit down here and let him rattle off something that is not before the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the irony of all this is that the Leader of the House is not slowly becoming senile, definitely not.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member tried to explain that the hon. member is out of order and I read a few points, but that is not included in this Resolution. You are entirely out of order.

Mr. HINDS: Does that not prove my point, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Head 23, Item 5 — Equipment and Appliances. We are dealing with something that the note tells us uses gasolene, lubricants and spare parts. Something like the crash tenders they bought from Canada and brought down here, and we want to know if these spare parts are for these pieces of machinery.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I am telling the hon. member that is not what is before us, that is a new item, Item 6. That is not included, if you want to continue talking that is a matter for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To my mind "appliances" means appliances regardless. The hon. member will proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We do not want to stress very much the lack of good behaviour on the part of others who took the Chief Fire Officer to task and so on, what we are concerning ourselves with is the fact that the poor officer did not have the opportunity to go before television or on radio or anything else to reply and to give the lie direct to much of what has been said against him. What we have before us, and what the Leader of the House does not seem to understand, is a matter relating to Fire Services. The Leader of the House very well knows what there is to try and hide in this whole matter, but nobody is going to deal any painful blows at a time such as this. Like the Leader we anticipate the visit of the Queen. She will return and the blows will fly up but however it cannot be said that Fire Services has been getting good treatment, whether personnel or equipment, and even after the Leader of the House read one or two things on the situation, but one must know, Mr. Chairman, that the gasolene does not put itself in the vehicles, nor do the lubricants or spare parts, and when these vehicles are all serviceable they have to be manned by men. The Leader of the House knows that I queried in here the question of the men working 96 hours per week and a Minister from Government had the shameless boldness to stand on his feet and say that the men were not dissatisfied. In manning these machines, the appliances that use the lubricants and spare parts, they have to put in 96 hours per week, and the Minister of Government tried to make us believe

that that was not so. Since then we have heard of a "go slow" amongst the personnel.

All these things are the things that the Minister would not perhaps like to have brought to light, but he knows the truth, he knows the situation exists. The men are working terribly long hours under sub-human conditions in some cases. He knows all of this, but it would not suit the present Government to give the consideration apparently to Fire Services that it really deserves.

As for these appliances, when we hear of one Fire Officer paying two visits to Canada to determine the usefulness of these tenders and what not, the Leader of the House ought to be in a position to tell this Hon. House as I have told the House already that Mr. Sherman Alleyne who went to Canada on two trips was not recommended by the Chief Fire Officer. When the Chief Fire Officer knew it was when Mr. Alleyne had gone. He had no choice, and people who encourage this kind of behaviour are only setting up the same Sherman Alleyne to be at loggerheads with the Head of the Department. Ministers of Government encourage this type of behaviour and then people go on television to say this about who knew this and who knew that. It is one dirty racket, Mr. Chairman, that is the best way to describe it, and I sincerely hope that every Minister on that side could stand up and hold his head aloft that his hands are clean, not at all involved in the racket with the purchase of these tenders. You learn that they had Rolls Royce engines which have been changed and they have put in Fords. After hearing that a fire appliance does not have to do this lot of mileage as a private car or a motor truck for business, you are told how on mornings like a race horse you have to carry them around the paddock to see that they are in trim that in case of emergency they can be brought into action, but one must understand that if they were bought with Rolls Royce engines that is exactly the type of engine suitable for service here because the Rolls Royce engines have not done any large amount of mileage, so why put in Fords? It is all of this we are very concerned about and this is the thing that is worrying the Leader of the House, he knows that the whole thing has been unpleasant, unhealthy and does not smell good.
4.25 p.m.

We are asking the Leader of the House if he knows of any Minister who was so silly as to get himself involved, or to allow his name to be tarnished by this exercise. He should endeavour to clear the Minister's name because we do not want to have Ministers involved in this unhealthy and unwholesome exercise.

The question that Head 23 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 27(1) Ministry of Education – General Administration – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in moving the several items under Head 27 (1) as listed, the supplement is required because the amount provided is insufficient. If there are any questions, I will attempt to answer them, but it is for the continuation of the service.

I beg to move that Head 27 (1) – General Administration – stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister that members of the public including myself experience considerable difficulty at times in getting effective communication between the various offices at the Ministry of Education. I do not know whether or not the PBX system is working efficiently, but it is certainly not satisfactory. I have tried time and time again to get through to the Department of Education, but there are members of the public who, perhaps, do not have enough time to spend in getting a call through. I should like the Minister to have his officers examine the system with a view to seeing whether there can be an improvement in the communication between the public and the Department.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about a different type of communication. It is communication between officers in the Department itself. If you manage to get through to the Department on the telephone, you will find that some of the officers do not want to speak to you. I have had a startling experience, and I may have to ask pertinent questions in this Chamber in connection with the matter.

Now, arising out of the 1974 Examinations, a number of slips have been sent back to students written in three different handwritings and three different colours of ink. I am told that, when a student enters the Examination Room, he is supposed to write up a slip and hand it in with the papers. The slips I have in my office are written in three different handwritings and different colours of ink and they have recorded the students as having failed. I have written and telephoned the Ministry in connection with this matter, and I was told that I must speak with the

Examination Section. I telephoned the office and a young lady answered the telephone. She called a gentleman and said: "Are you there?" I distinctly heard him say: "No, I am not in." That is the type of communication that bothers me. When you get through to the Ministry certain officers will sit down and tell you that they are not in. I do not want to call names in here.

Now, a student's future existence depends upon these examination slips, which have been under investigation from March last year, and nothing has been done in the matter. I told the young lady that the officer was in the office and I was not going to put down the telephone. He then told me that he had written to London about the matter, and he could do nothing until he received a reply. These students attend secondary schools; they take the examinations and then they get back slips which are not written up by them! A student wants to find out whether he has succeeded or failed in the examination. When you try to deal with the Ministry of Education you will find officers sitting down and refusing to answer the telephone. I have been told by several persons in the teaching profession that this particular officer is very difficult to deal with and he does not talk to people.

The question that Head 27 (1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division

Head 27(2) – Primary, Adult and Special Education – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, again the supplements that are being required here are required because the existing services cannot continue without such supplements. It is necessary to have the supplements, if we are to continue the operation of the services which have already been approved by this Honourable Chamber. If there are any queries about any of the items and I have the information, then I will supply the information.

I beg to move that Head 27 (2) stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, there is something that we want to bring to the attention of the Minister, even apart from the fact that he must agree that these schools are not so widely scattered that they cannot be all linked up by telephone in order to speed up communication between the Ministry of Education and the various schools from time to time. I have made this point on previous occasions, and I am sure

that the Minister can do something about the matter. There are schools where the teachers have to pay for their telephones out of their pockets and I do not think that is right. If the teachers have been good enough during the past to install telephones and pay for them, then the Minister should look into the matter. If anything happens at the various schools it will be necessary to use the same telephone. If the Ministry wants to communicate with a headteacher it will have to use the headteacher's telephone. The teachers who pay for their telephones should be reimbursed.

Mr. Chairman, we are asking the Minister to see to it that all schools are given telephones as soon as possible. (*Asides.*) It is time that telephone lines should be run all over Barbados. It is now 1975. We are spending money on other things, and we should pay the Telephone Company to put down more telephone lines.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is making a point about telephones for schools.
4.35 p.m.

I would like to state that that decision has already been taken that telephones should be extended to all Government schools, and this was actually in process. It is a matter therefore for the Telephone Company to schedule the work when they can implement it. A list of schools has already been given to them and they have started on that particular project of expansion, and they are continuing on it. I believe what is probably causing the member some concern is that you do have one telephone at a school and this telephone may not be at the most convenient part for members of staff as such. It is where it is most convenient for the head who is administrator of the school to look after the telephone, but we provide a telephone service, and in some cases where the staff was provided a telephone we have taken over that particular service except in some cases where the staff said they wanted to retain their service for their own business, we provided an alternative phone.

The question that Head 27(2) Primary, Adult and Special Education — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 27(3) Secondary Schools — was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the same reasons that I had advanced in respect of the previous Head apply, and I therefore beg to move that Head 27(3) Secondary Schools, stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

Head 27(4) Erdiston College — was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, as the note to this particular item states, there has been an increase in the charges for water and electricity. Provision under this item is inadequate and a supplement is therefore required.

I beg to move that Head 27(4) — Erdiston College — stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to see that the Minister is asking for more money for electricity in particular at Erdiston College because it has been reported to me that all the rooms at Erdiston are equipped with 40 watt bulbs in the reading lamps. I do not know if this is economy or if this is spite. They have reduced the bulbs to 40 watt bulbs and the present students are complaining that they cannot use the facilities because of the lights. It seems strange that you reduce the wattage of the bulbs and yet the Minister is asking for more money for electricity. (*Asides*) I bet the Hon. Minister has not got anything less than 60 watt bulbs in his house and where he reads if he reads, because I doubt he reads, I believe he has a 100 watt bulb. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: I read the Advocate.) He speaks to the Advocate. I would say that at least you should have 100 watt bulbs in the reading lamps at the College. You cannot expect people to strain their eyes using 40 watt bulbs. I doubt anybody would say this is so unless it were so. The Hon. Minister does not even read the Advocate. He listens to news and gives news. He cannot read; senility has taken over. Since he has been demoted from Attorney General it seems he has reached the last lap.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member tell me which item he is speaking on?

Mr. BOLDEN: I am speaking on Erdiston College, Mr. Chairman, which is a Teacher's Training College, and if the hon. member cannot read you will have to send him there despite the fact that many students fail courses in reading because the lecturer took off in mid-stream and left the students in mid-air. That is what I am talking about. When we come to Erdiston College in a subsequent debate I will tell him the balance.

The question that Head 27(4) Erdiston college – stand part – was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 27(6) Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the amount provided under this item has proved inadequate. This particular supplement is required for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, Item 4, Office Expenses, and I beg to move that Head 27(6) – Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic – stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I could not attract your attention earlier. There is nothing I have reason to object to in this matter, but I would like to draw to the Minister's attention, not like the wild chorus that was going on, that I think it is necessary for the Minister to look into the rapid explanation of this kind of education in Barbados. I am not critical of this department, but I believe the amount of money that is spent on education has to be examined in the light of exactness in that in spite of the nonsense about employment in Barbados and throughout the world, unskilled and general workers' jobs are going to be memories in the next century. It is just like an illiteracy is going to be a luxury that only millionaires can carry to show how stupid they can be. We will be fooling ourselves to believe we can go on planning for a society where you will find jobs and they will multiply at the rate that your population will multiply at the level where you are having a problem if you do not change your pattern, and I would like to see more technical schools, and this is not based on the fact that more technical schools will mean that every person out of a technical school will find a job, but the person is capable of doing a job anywhere and at any time, but is more employable. To every 100 persons working in any new establishment, one or two unskilled or semi-skilled persons would be about enough.

In Barbados you have shortages of skills. There are people looking for jobs, but there are also people looking for persons to fill vacancies in Barbados and they cannot find them, and I do not believe it should be so. I believe we have enough people in Barbados that could man all of the vacancies we have with very few exceptions. We cannot train an army of geological experts or oil drillers because we do not have enough of them to use, but we can train enough people in the basic skills – artisans, masons, carpenters,

plumbers and the like, and we can do that on a better basis than it was done in the past.

4.45 p.m.

For that reason I am hoping that the Honourable Minister would speed up the programme for expansion because the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic is congested, I understand, and the basis for entering there quite frankly, does not deserve the treatment as if entering the legal profession, as though you really want to keep out people and therefore you put up barriers because you know you cannot absorb as many as want to come in. We should not put up barriers to skills. We should open the knowledge and skills of people so that if a young man or woman want to work in any particular field, the skill is there.

For example, this Island is short of Secretaries. Now let us take office administration. We do not have enough good qualified secretaries available for purpose of office administration. I say that because right through our society is this half-baked mediocre stuff while we would have good secretaries available in Barbados and we should have so many being trained that every office should be able to get good secretaries. We should be producing them as a matter of course, because there is the polytechnic and these other places – not that that is the only area – but this is where we should have a large flow of people available for this kind of training; but there are too many untrained people and that has been my experience in dealing with people from day to day and from time to time.

The quality of secretaries in Barbados considering the amount of money we spend on education is not good enough, because we have allowed some of these so-called secretarial institutions to come up here and fleece the people with charges, and out of ignorance people believe that the higher the charges are the higher the service is, and our people purchase this service or these services, and they think they are purchasing something when they are attending some of these secretarial institutions. I can compare the with what I have in my own office and I know what I am talking about.

They are just half-baking people and sending them out on the community and sometimes giving them a little flare and making them believe that they know what they are doing. I believe the Minister understands; fortunately he has the experience himself since he is a former school master.

It is time that we expand the polytechnic because there is too much mediocrity that we

have to rely on. There is definitely further scope for education. Too many people expect to learn from a text book and not from basic training, and I feel the time has come when we should review this matter and go deep into it. I say that in a broad way; I am not like some employers who believe you get a better society by criticising the society. My idea is that you should make a positive stand to improve the ability of people to serve in the community, and my idea is that the Ministry of education has to do it.

Some people believe that an attitude, or, the ability to serve is something with which you wake up one morning and they do not believe that the attitude towards getting improvement in a society is based on what you hear, what you see and what you read in the Press. For instance, I have to ask the Minister, can we seriously say that the best is being obtained by people in Barbados through the newspapers? It is obvious that the people who control the Press never endeavour to get a person who is properly qualified, because it seems to me they want to start people off with this idea of getting cheap labour. In New York they seek to get a person with some qualification and seniority, but what do they do here? They expect some boy or girl leaving one of these secondary schools with one or two "O" Levels to be a journalist, but you do not get good journalists that way. Therefore you put an estate into the hands of fledglings, and that is where our future life would be.

So I am very concerned, Mr. Chairman, about education at the Polytechnic on the whole. I am concerned that expansion must take place because I am satisfied from the statistics that I have seen, from what I have seen through the Statistical Department, that the population growth in Barbados is such that there has to be a broadening in the field of education in this community. You child, Mr. Chairman, the child of the Leader of the Opposition and the children of all members of the House are privileged in a society like this because they start off with some person asking you what your son or daughter is going to become and what he or she is going to do, and therefore you consider that they must have the ability to be placed in a job.

4.55 p.m.

It is James Browne and Mary Lou in Richmond Gap, or Thomas Gap that nobody knows. They have to struggle, and it is in these areas that you have to build these institutions so that the children will grow up not with an inferiority complex, but with knowledge and understanding of what they have to do in society, and not feel jealous and envious of the other people in the society.

I say this because it is in these areas that the unscrupulous will capitalise on in the next ten years, and in that short time they will be very destructive. It is for that reason that the Minister should not allow the vicious people we have in our society to capitalise on this. We have vicious people in all elements of our society, and you have to be sure that the young are given an opportunity to escape the clutches of such elements; and the best thing that you can do is to give to the areas of your largest population such institutions.

We are making a mistake in believing that our problem is at the secondary or university level. The people who send their children to the secondary level will send them there anyhow, and the ones who are going to the university will go there anyhow; and the impact that they will make on society is going to be small as compared with the mass movement that is taking place; because it is at the mass level that the explosion will take place, while the others will find themselves in a narrow cubicle in society which will accommodate them.

This is an explosion that is taking place in Europe. It took place in the USA and it will take place slower in places like Barbados, but will be more devastating in a small society because we do not have the resilience in other areas of life to resist as other societies can.

I hope that the Minister feels that the Polytechnic is not the only basis for what is going on, but there should be an area that will accommodate not only the young, but the adults. I have to deal with adults and I know that they still want some areas opened up for them. The employers are not going to help them. They think that their only business is to make money. They do not know anything about making future predictions in areas like this. They have not been accustomed to doing it and they cannot start now. They are too old.

It is time that the Minister take a stand and let people see that you will not get a better society by dealing with one section of the society. I hope that the Minister will see that this is the real problem that he has to face. I am sure that he has the resources, if not financial, at least the mental resources to deal with this matter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reply briefly to the points made. I would like to preface my remarks by stating that I am indebted to the hon. member for St. Michael West for his thoughtful observations on the educational system and the

need for further change particularly in respect of technical and vocational education.

I would like to say that I have always found his observations and views on education to be soundly based on the socialist and educational foundations necessary for the development of this country. In dealing with this question of the extension of technical and vocational education, and particularly in respect of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, I would like to assure the hon. member that the directions that he has indicated are in fact the directions in which we propose to go.

We are proposing the establishment of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic on its new site at Delamere Land. It now has an enrolment of about just around 1,500 students, and the proposal is to establish that polytechnic on its new site with an enrolment of about 2,000 students; and the details about the award of the contract for the design and for the construction of that building as well as the sub contractors who will work on that particular project are now being finalised; so I expect that we will certainly get the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic established on its permanent headquarters pretty shortly.

I will also like to say that as far as the training of stenographers and other persons in commercial education is concerned the largest department within the Polytechnic now is indeed in the commercial department. I believe that there are almost 400 students or 300 students in that particular department; so we are concerned and have been concerned about the provision of these necessary schools, or schools which are necessary for adequate training in office work. We are concerned about providing that particular type of school.

As far as admission to the Polytechnic is concerned, I would like to lay this particular ogre once and for all. There are more persons applying for admission than there are places in the Polytechnic. Whenever you have more persons applying for positions or places than there are positions or places available, there must be some criteria to be applied.

In the case of the Polytechnic the criteria for admission are some three or four. You can be 14 years of age, have completed the first phase of secondary education or the Barbados School Leaving Certificate or have a recommendation from your previous headteacher or some other such person.

The criteria for admission are the most liberal that we could ever imagine. All that one has to do is to have completed the first phase of secondary education and be 14 years old. This does not mean that anyone who is 14 years old can just walk into the institution, because it is a question of choosing the persons who, in the opinion of the Polytechnic, are best able to benefit from the courses being offered; and if there were enough places for all of the people who are applying there would be no problem at all. Everybody would get in; but so long as you have fewer places than the persons demanding these places, you will get this problem.

5.05 p.m.

As far as the expansion is concerned, it is the policy of this Government to develop trades training centres or branches of the Polytechnic in the north and south of the Island, in Christ Church and in St. Peter. We are currently working on this particular problem but you will understand the situation where we are working to get the central Polytechnic established and also giving consideration towards the establishment of the northern and southern Polytechnics, but that is the proposal we have. The central one in Bridgetown, one in St. Peter and one in Christ Church. I would like to say that all these proposals are subject to the availability of the necessary resources, both financial to provide the funds necessary for the land, buildings and so on and also human in terms of the staff necessary to teach the necessary courses. This is the trend we are on to expand this type of education, because like the member for St. Michael West we believe that we need more of this type of education. We are not limiting it there because we are also going into the Secondary Schools and expanding the pre-vocational and the pre-technical type of courses in these schools. In the older secondary schools we are either extending the technical departments in those schools or proposing to do so, and we are also in the newer secondary schools we are constructing, providing more technical courses, woodwork, metal work, technical drawing and a variety of handicraft courses as well.

I am speaking of this whole problem and trying to see how we can multiply the number of technical skills in the country, because these are necessary to support and underpin the social and economic progress of this country. I would also like to say that the Cabinet has under consideration the establishment of a national industrial training programme particularly again to take care of the need for expanding the technical skills within the country. I do not wish to say anything more on that at this particular

stage, I think I have dealt with the problems that have been raised during this debate. I again express my appreciation of the comments and observations made by the member for St. Michael West on this particular subject.

The question that Head 27(6) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 27(11) – Government Industrial Schools – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27(11) stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be very long on this, but I believe that this is one department of Government which needs some sort of attention. Sometime ago a scheme was instituted whereby the boys at the school were encouraged to go in for farming, poultry raising, the growing of vegetables and things like this. Some of the produce they kept for themselves, the remainder being sold and the money paid into the Treasury. I do not know the amount of money, I believe it is somewhere between \$10,000 and \$20,000, but having done this they were then confronted with the situation whereby the stock of chickens they had were sold, they wanted more chickens but then they had to go back to the Treasury for money and they were then competing for this money and therefore they could not get the things they wanted. I would like to suggest to the Minister to look at the situation and see whether it can be reviewed whereby some sort of Committee of Trustees could be set up and the residents of the schools either go on with agriculture in the growing of vegetables and the raising of chickens, and that the money they obtain from the sale of these things be not paid into the Treasury but be paid to trustees and that the trustees would then be able to use this money to provide and to refurnish the needs of the schools as they arise from time to time in the case of providing seeds or a new stock of chickens, or for providing also other things like cricket gear. I would like to recommend to the Minister that he takes a close look at this to see whether this can be done.

It may very well be that there is need for more psychiatric treatment for the residents either because they have psychiatric or remedial teaching. I think that for too long we have tended to treat these persons as outcasts of the society, and I think we should examine the whole

scheme to see how best we can implement a scheme for remedial teaching and also for psychiatric care for those persons who may be in need of it.

The question that Head 27(11) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 27(12) – Public Library – was called

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27(12) – Public Library – stand part.

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

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

Head 27(13) – Department of Archives – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this particular supplementary has become necessary as a result of the increased rates of travelling and I therefore beg to move that Head 27(13) stand part.

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

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

Head 27(15) – Community Development – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this supplement is for Item 3 – Office Expenses. I beg to move that Head 27(15) Community Development – stand part.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that not too long ago the Minister in one of his many speeches spoke about the Government embarking upon a scheme of providing a number of community centres throughout the country. I would like to find out from the Minister whether the programme has yet been implemented, how far it has reached and how soon we can expect to see some more community centres.

5.15 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the question of Community Centres, I have been asking since 1970 for the restoration of the Community Centre in St. Joseph. The one in Bathsheba has gone from bad to worse. When I came to Parliament in 1970, although it was said that the building was not fit for public use at the time, it was used as a tailor shop. The Minister said that he knew nothing about that. They have finally closed the doors. It is unfortunate that the Minister has never given any concrete undertaking as to what facilities would be provided for the St. Joseph area. I would like to know whether or not the Minister has reconsidered St. Joseph for a Community Centre. I have asked, on many occasions about the compulsory acquisition of certain areas which I know people will be willing to sell to the Government for the purpose of constructing a Community Centre other than in Bathsheba.

Mr. Chairman, St. Joseph may be looked at as three separate areas: the Bathsheba area where you have to go to the top of Horse Hill, another area along Mayers corner and Lammings, and West St. Joseph would be a central point for the Government to acquire land and put up a proper Community Centre. The Y.W.C.A. asked to be allowed to use the old Almshouse, and they were told that it would cost too much money to rehabilitate one of the rooms there. The old school at Golden Egg has been closed and nothing has been done about it. I believe that a small sum of money can be spent to make the old school at Barracks Road fit for use. You can also do something for the people in the other areas. It is no use saying that we are going to build a new Community Centre and that is the end of things. That is like saying that Jesus Christ is coming and nobody knows when.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister for Communications and Works once made a famous statement as to what he would like to see happen in St. Joseph but I hope the Ministry of Education is not in that same frame of mind. I hope that he will tell us what facilities he intends to give the people in St. Joseph.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the points made, first of all, I do not recall making any speech, as suggested by the member for the City, indicating any vast expansion in the number of Community Centres in this country. What I did say was that, before even considering any wide expansion of such Centres, I want to be satisfied that the existing Centres are serving a useful purpose within the

community because I believe that their use is not now maximised, and we are not getting the full benefits from the use of the existing Centres. I was talking in terms of adequate programming for the existing Centres before considering the question of establishing new Centres.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that we are carrying out a programme of renovation of the Centres and looking into the question of providing some type of programming on a regular basis at the Centres. I would also like to state that, before even thinking of putting down new Centres, we would have to look at the use of the existing public buildings. By this I mean places like schools which may be in certain areas where, probably, a room may be set aside for community activities until such time as a Community Centre for that purpose can be provided.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, with the permission of Parliament and the Minister of Education, when he speaks of looking at Government buildings before providing new Community Centres, I wonder if he will think of liberalising the conditions under which the schools may be used. I can give him the evidence if he so requires. When we last tried to use the St. Elizabeth School we found that the conditions laid down were so severe that nobody in his right senses would use it. I hope he will tell us what are the new plans for using school buildings and what Regulations he will make for using such buildings. I do not want a civil servant to tell me that I must first take out an insurance policy; pay a man for opening and closing the school; I must be responsible for any damage done to the school; I must replace things that are broken and so on. I should like to hear what is his policy in connection with this matter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the question of the conditions for the use of school buildings is a matter for the Ministry in keeping with what legal advice may come to me on this matter. I can assure the hon. member that I will look again at these particular conditions and see whether they can be liberalised in any way. I am not making any promises here, but if buildings are to be used they must be conditions attached to such use. I will certainly try to be as liberal as possible in this particular regard while safeguarding the rights that need to be safeguarded.

As far as St. Joseph particularly is concerned and the Community Centre that was at Bathsheba, a visit was paid there within the last two or three weeks by a team from my Ministry

headed by the Parliamentary Secretary, who has a special responsibility in this particular area, and I am now awaiting the results of that particular visit as well as the recommendations.

I have already informed this House in a reply to a Parliamentary Question that land was being acquired at Blackmans for the establishment of a playing field for West St. Joseph which would also be available for community purposes. The negotiations, I have been advised, are nearing completion, and this is one area where we would provide the necessary facilities. At Lammings an area of land was provided for the development of a playing field which would serve both the school and the community. There is land at the school, and work is being done on it.

Mr. Chairman, there was one other point raised about the school which was replaced by the new Lammings School. Here, again, consideration is being given to the use of that building or the part which belongs to the Government because part of it is a Church School. Consideration is being given to the use of the buildings for community purposes. I should like to give the hon. member the assurance that we are looking into both possibilities as far as facilities down there are concerned. I hope that I have dealt with all the remarks.

The question that Head 27(15) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

5.25 p.m.

Head 27(17) – Sport – was called.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 27(17) Sport, stand part.

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

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

Head 33(1) General Administration – was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are three items under this Head for which some additional funds are to be provided. The notes are fully explanatory and I beg to move that Head 33(1) General Administration, stand part.

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

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

Head 33(2) – Labour – was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, under Head 33(2) it becomes necessary to seek a supplementary provision for items 19 and 22, and again I think the notes are reasonably full.

I beg to move that Head 33(2) – Labour – stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to make some comments on this particular matter, particularly in reference to the Wages Council and its operation. First I would like to say that it is my opinion that the Wages Council needs as it were if I may use modern jargon, to get with it. A lot of decisions that have come out of the Wages Council within recent years have led those of us who keep a close watch on the operations of the Wages Council to believe that the Wages Council does not really reflect in its decisions the kind of situation which exists on the question of wages in this community.

To give you some examples, Mr. Chairman, would indicate the point I am making. It would necessitate me to just go back a couple of years to put the matter in its proper perspective. About three years ago the Wages Council had a differential of wage levels on the basis of a particular rate for male, another rate for female and on the basis of a rate for workers under the age of 18 years. Now we have been able to get the Wages Council to at least become a little modernised in the way it operated in that the differential which previous existed between male and female for doing the same job has been removed even before we moved into 1975 which has been designated as International Women's Year, but we still have a situation existing, Mr. Chairman, which I consider needs some serious thought being given to and indeed it is my opinion that the Wages Council should act in this regard so as to remove the differential which exists at present for workers who are over the age of 18 and those who are under the age of 18 years.

I am sure that you would agree that if a worker is given a job to do, whether the worker is 17½ years or 16 years which is the legal minimum age at which a worker can be employed or thirty-five, as long as he is doing the same job, naturally he should be paid the same rate, and it beats me how you can still in this day and age persist with this differential. This is why I say I

consider that the Wages Council needs to really get with it and get down to making decisions that bear some relationship to what is going on in this present day. This is what I consider a very important point and something which should be looked into as quickly as possible.

The other point I would like to make in regard to the Wages Council relates to the unreal wage levels which come out of the Wages Council, and you would probably be aware, as I know you are a person who is conversant with what is going on in this country from day to day, of the stand which the Barbados Workers' Union had to take on the first decision which the Wages Council made about wage levels, and we stated our position quite clearly on this and indicated that even the present level which has set I think a \$48 a week minimum does not bear relationship with wage levels in the sector we are dealing with, and this is one area we would like to see the Wages Council bear some relationship with what is going on.

Now, having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make another point, and it is a point which I consider is a very serious one and one which would not only involve the Department of Labour, in that the Department of Labour under the law has the right to ensure that any decisions of the Wages Council whether they relate to wages or not are enforced, and unfortunately there is a situation existing in Barbados today and I think it is a situation which has been drawn to the attention of this Chamber on more than one occasion in the past and still the situation exists. It relates to the fact that there are a number of employers who fall into the net of the Wages Council who bluntly refuse to pay the wages which have been laid down by the Wages Council for the category of worker which should be under this net, and I consider that this is a matter which is a very serious one because it is a situation where employers would be openly flouting the law and exploiting the workers. We know there are a number of situations where workers have been threatened and forced to sign paysheets for amounts which they do not really get and this situation can only continue and persist because the Labour Department which is commissioned with the responsibility of overseeing the operation and the observation of obeying the decisions of the Wages Council is not really doing its work or maybe is not equipped to deal with this particular matter. I feel that when a decision of this nature has been made that every effort should be made to ensure that employers abide with the minimum levels which are set down, because unfortunately again there are some employers who tend to think that when

once the Wages Council has set a wage level that this is the wage that should be paid. It is a minimum wage which is a guideline but even in that situation there are a number of employers who bluntly refuse to abide by the decisions of the Wages Council, and I think those of us who are concerned with the exploitation which takes place in this country particularly with the exploitation of workers by the employers would feel extremely hurt to know that employers are allowed to get away with this. I would hope that the Minister would take these comments seriously and try to initiate some kind of action to immediately put this situation right, because it is something which concerns a number of people and I am sure that if employers get the impression that one group of employers can get away with flouting the law, then one never knows where we would be in a matter like this. So I hope the Minister would take these comments and try to initiate some action to get the situation put right.

5.35 p.m.

I hope that the hon. Minister would take note of these things, and would try to do something about them.

The other point to which I would like to refer, Mr. Chairman, is the question of holidays with pay for people who are working in these areas. At this point of time we have a well established five-day working week in Barbados and a holiday with pay Act which makes provision for a qualifying amount of days which have to be put in, and in view of the five-day working week which is almost universal it seems to me that some kind of consideration would have to be given to amending this aspect of the law in order to make it possible for more people to qualify for holidays with pay because as it stands now all those who should qualify are not so qualified.

I just draw these matters to the attention of the Minister with the hope that he will look into these as quickly as possible because these are matters which concern people and their welfare and should be the concern of the Ministry of labour.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, before the Minister replies I would just like to say this. This is something that we in the labour movement are concerned about. Somebody used the word 'labour' and talked about labour is outmoded but I would like to remind them that as much as they would say that labour is outmoded, those who say so are enjoying the benefits and advantages which they would not have enjoyed had it not been for labour. Now we have some people like the hon. member for St. Joseph; he

seems to think he is a priest and is seeking to invoke.....

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would like the hon. member to repeat what he said. Did he say something about a priest?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is completely out of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not like to go too hard on these people and I do not like to have a situation where people are not clear about what you are talking about. However, the hon. member has spoken about a five-day week and I read about some person who said that we cannot afford a five-day week. Mr. Chairman, that person has to be a confounded idiot, because the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party in 1971 contained in italics that they would proceed to have legislation to introduce a five-day week; so the public of Barbados understands that. Now if the party to which I have been elected said that they did not mean that, they would be hypocrites to write that down and put it in the manifesto in italics, because when you have anything written in italics you put it in italics because you want it to be realized with force; so I do not want anyone from the other side to come in here with the stupid idea that a five-day week is something that the Trade Union had put up in their hip pocket.

The banks had a five-day week; some other people had a five-day week, and if you are going to tell me that some workers in this community are entitled to a five-day week but not others, then you are saying that some workers are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect, and not others.

So far as the holidays with pay is concerned, I will point out that has to be a consequential amendment in view of changes which have taken place. This follows; as soon as you have a five-day week and as you change the basic factors — there have been changed factors so far as the working conditions are concerned; the Holidays with Pay Act must be changed accordingly.

Now I introduced the Holidays with Pay Act in 1951 — twenty-four years ago — and I have not lost any of my faculties in these twenty four years. This was introduced twenty-four years ago when many of the people now enjoying the benefits of it were children going to school; so if twenty-four-year-old legislation could stay on the Statute Book that length of time — twenty-four years — without being touched, then what has

happened? If it has been on the Statute Book twenty-four years without being touched, then it must be worthwhile. But you know why it had to be put on the Statute Book twenty-four years ago? Because the wicked employers in Barbados twenty-four years ago refused to give a worker more than seven days. We wanted them to give the workers two weeks holiday with pay and they bluntly refused. I was a member on the Executive Committee at that time, and the late Sir Grantley Adams who was on the Executive Committee said 'well, we are not going to waste any time in negotiating holidays with pay anymore. From now on everybody will pay' and you brought down a Bill in 1951. It was not the best, but at least it had served a useful purpose; and that is how the Trade Union movement had to be again in the forefront. We negotiated.

So you hear in here today of how people are enjoying the fruits of labour; when you hear some people saying the trade union is unreasonable because we are asking for conditions of employment that bear relation with modern time and modern change, we wonder to know what paradise they are living in.

Now the other point that the hon. member for St. Lucy raised was with regard to the wages council — and the Minister of Labour must get cracking with the officials and let them know about these things. We do not worry too much now about the wages council; we know why we had to get the wages council. Things will always go wrong in an area where people are not organised, and, you must put people on these wages councils who understand. A point I would make here is that if the wages council is to perform its function as it should, people must tell us in advance about things, because sometimes the wages council is going to deal with something and you do not know in advance that the wages council is going to be considering it.

Now every hon. member of this House must know that there is no economic or financial logic in making any distinction in a shop in paying a girl or boy different, say under 18. This is what I mean. If you go to buy a shirt, or if you go to buy an item of food, the price of the shirt or the price of the food does not vary based on who is selling the item; and you cannot work out a system whereby you have a price factor or profit and loss factor based on a system that you have two people at 18 years, two at 36 years, two at 40, so that is equal to what? Therefore it is nonsense having a wages structure that is based on differential arrangements.

5.45 p.m.

Therefore, all that he has to show is his strength. There you have a situation where the young man and the young woman are concerned. You are telling a young girl about working for \$40 a week, \$8 less than a young man. The union is now negotiating wages. We do not negotiate for \$8 less as a wage.

The Wages Council is talking about minimum wages. If you tell a man that the union is negotiating for \$50 or \$55 a week, and you come with a minimum wage for the same sector lower than that, what are you doing?

I do not think that members on the opposite side can speak on this because I think that they represent people who are guilty of this. I am coming to see that socialist parties are becoming dominated by such people. I would have to say that when I look back in retrospect when I was secretary of the Barbados Labour Party, with myself and the then president sharing socialist views together, that we could ever have seen the party dominated by, or even accommodating certain areas.

We had very strong views. In later days it might have got watered down. When we come to the question of employers not paying the correct amount of money, this is an age old thing. The hon. member for the City knows it. He is in the heart of this thing. There are places like Baxter's Road, Milk Market and Swan Street. They nearly had a riot in Swan Street already.

This is the kind of exploitation you get where they make people work for this kind of wages, and some of them have the idea that they can salve their consciences by subscribing to a political party. I do not want anyone to give me any money. They give money to a political party with one hand and take it away from the people with the other hand. If you can support a political party you should first support those people who work for you.

This is an age old device. The Conservatives many years ago used to support the Conservative Party on that basis. There is no more Conservative Party, so now they will support any political party. I want to say to the Leader of the Opposition and to any political parties that as a matter of principle you cannot have this kind of practice and get up in the same breath and talk about dishonesty and people's attitude to work or work when you get blatant, open thieving; because any employer giving a person a certain wage and making him sign for something less than he received is a person who should be imprisoned. When you examine some of the

businesses in town you will see what I am saying.

At the same time, I will pay a compliment to the statement of the President of the Chamber of Commerce which he made recently. He said that businesses should be run efficiently and if they are run efficiently, the question of laying off people should not necessarily occur because labour cost is only a small part of expenses. Many businesses operate on the basis that labour cost is the biggest part of operating a business.

The Hon. Minister must carry out these consequential changes in this matter. This was amended in 1955. It is 20 years old, and the trade union movement has moved a long way in 20 years. The trade union in 1975 is a different organisation from what it was in 1955.

There are still a few difficult changes in our organisation. Even in the USA where there are 10 million organised workers and in Great Britain where there are 10 million you have this problem. We have a higher percentage in Barbados. We have pockets where we have people working in shops and stores who have shifted from agriculture, but you get the same type of exploitation in stores today that you got in agriculture 20 or 30 years ago.

The Minister must give attention to this question of the Wages Council. Two people doing the same job should be paid the same money, and the question of age should be dependent on other factors. As it stands now, this question of being 18 years old is illogical. If a person is too young to work in a store and that store only needs one person, it should employ one person. We are not having this method of feather bedding in the union. Do not tell me that you are going to employ two people because one is 18 years and one is 16. Let the 16 year old boy find himself in the Polytechnic, or if you have to employ him, pay him the same rate.
5.55 p.m.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw attention to a very acute situation which is presently existing in the community. Unfortunately there are many people in our community who cannot absorb the level of education which they are required to absorb at an early age, and we are finding that children of age 14 are being asked to leave school at the end of every year which is around the end of June or July. There is no provision under the National Insurance Act for employment of these persons, and as the member for St. Lucy has said, you cannot employ them until they are over 16. It

the member for the City who has been inquiring who the other members are. (*Asides.*) I do not remember the names of the other persons. I remember the ones whom the Government appointed. They get together somewhere in the latter part of the year; they examine the wages of these people; they publish what they consider to be a fair or minimum wage for these categories of workers, and invite comments, representation, or objections to the wages. This is done on each and every occasion. Objections are always invited.

Now, I remember when I first became a Minister that we did have the distinction that the member for St. Lucy spoke of: the males and females were remunerated differently as, indeed were persons under the age of 18. Somewhere along the line it was felt, I presume, by the Council that a discrimination based on sex was anachronistic and made no sense and the distinction was removed so that males and females were then paid the same thing. The point I want to make here is that the Minister does not set a wage for any group of employees. The Minister makes an Order based on a wage that the Council itself has agreed upon, after hearing objections and so on made by the general public, if the general public wants to make an objection. The first set of wages are published and, as I said earlier, objections are invited. When the Council sets this wage, the Minister then makes an Order in identical terms to the one which the Council has set.

I just thought that I would set the record straight with regard to this matter as to how, in fact, a wage is fixed for those persons who are employed in shops, restaurants and in bars. With regard to the amount of money at which these persons should be remunerated, and as regards different levels of remuneration based on age. All of this is done by the Council and not by the Minister. It is done by the Council, and, as I said earlier, objections are invited.

Now, the other question to which I would like to address my mind is the point about employees being forced to sign for more than they, in fact, get. This is an allegation which we have heard from time to time and I have no reason to doubt it. As a matter of fact, I believe it. I would be glad if those who have the information would give that information to the Chief Labour Officer. We have been hearing about this for years now, and the matter has been investigated by the Chief Labour Officer and his staff. The Chief Labour Officer cannot get any of those persons, who have been underpaid, to give any evidence in court that this

is the case. This is the problem. What, in fact, the employers, who engage in this kind of deception, are doing, is committing a criminal offence. For this offence they can be punished by law, but the Chief Labour Officer's hands are tied because he cannot get the evidence. There is no point, Mr. Chairman, in taking the matter to court unless you have the evidence to support a case. The same persons who have been underpaid are the very persons who refuse to give the evidence or the information. They refuse to give the information to the Chief Labour Officer, but they will, perhaps, give the information to any other person. However, the person who will act on their behalf and take the matter to court will not be given the necessary assistance. (*Asides.*) Yes, as the hon. member says, it is a question of security of tenure.

Mr. Chairman, when hon. members come here and talk about this matter they must realise the difficulty in pursuing the matter. We have recently heard of a different kind of operation where the employer pays the worker the full amount and makes the worker bring back a part of it the following Monday. (*Asides.*) That is what I have heard. I do not know that it is the case. I did not hear it in relation to any particular store. I heard that this is a practice, but unless the Chief Labour Officer, or those who can assist the workers in stamping out this malpractice can get the kind of information that will support a conviction of such persons, then quite frankly there is no point in pursuing the matter. These are the problems, Mr. Chairman, that we are up against, and I thought that I should put some of the matters on record as regards the Wages Council and the restrictions under which the Ministry of Labour operates.

The question that Head 33(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 34(1) – Ministry of Information and Public Relations – was called.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, this is another small item concerned with increases in travelling rates and telephone rates requiring an additional sum for the balance of the financial year.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, just before you put the matter to the vote, earlier on in the sitting today, I think, about two hon. members

made reference to the kind of difficulties which they experienced in getting information from various Government Departments and Ministries. Now, it is my understanding that the Ministry of Information and Public Relations have Information Officers who look after, in a general way, the public relations for the various Departments and Ministries in Barbados.

I would like to re-emphasize, Mr. Chairman, the kind of difficulties which are experienced by a number of people in getting information which they require for a number of things. People have all sorts of problems and from time to time a representative or, maybe, a person who has an interest in people might try to get information from Ministries and various Departments on a particular matter in relation to a particular person but, unfortunately, some people seem to be treated with scant respect. I am wondering if this is not an area where, maybe, the Ministry of Information and Public Relations are falling down, or whether it is not a kind of attitude which is developing among certain top officials in some Ministries who do not consider that when certain bits of information are requested the information should be given.

6.15 p.m.

I do not consider the kind of instances I have in mind and the information which is required is information on matters which are of a secret nature or would lead to the overthrow of the Government, but the whole approach is one in which the officials to whom very often letters are addressed tend to treat that in this way, but the whole point is that people in the Ministries and various Departments seem to think that when a question is asked or information is sought that they are not obligated to give the public this kind of information, and I myself have had a tremendous amount of difficulties in getting information out of some Ministries.

I would say as an example that if you take the Ministry of Communications and Works, this is one Ministry from which you get back answers to questions which you ask or on information you seek, but I do not think that this can be said for many of the other Ministries and many of the other departments. I would like to see a situation arrived at where when questions are asked or where information is sought, because quite naturally a representative from a particular constituency would not want to raise every question that comes to his notice on the floor of the House because this would be time consuming, it would be given readily and people would realise that this is part of the system. This is something which should be done which the

public would know and something that the public are entitled to, because in the final analysis this is what Government is there for, to respond to the needs and requests and questions which come from the House.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Ministry of Information is labouring under a very severe handicap and it is this: I think I am right in saying that hardly anybody believes anything that is said by the Ministry of Information. Very grave doubts surround whatever publications they put out, whatever explanations they offer, and I am urging upon the Ministry right now that they should cause a survey to be carried out amongst the population so that the Ministry will be better informed as to its own credit rating among the population, and they will be able to either improve their image or set about in some form to dish out or serve up what they have got to offer the public so that the public will be tempted to believe. The Ministry of Information must understand that there are some matters which they in Government treat as top secret but which is really talked about by Harrison's corner, in Swan Street, by Nelson and all about; but for some reason the Ministry of Information treats us in a manner that when they are driven perhaps through some sections of the press to attempt to give some sort of rebuttal or to explain away something, they do it in a way that makes what is put out by them more suspect because the general public very well knows in truth and in fact the situation is 99.9 percent opposite to what the Government's bulletin has said it really is. That then is the sum total of the manner in which the Government Information personnel operates, and if it is to serve the usefulness for which it was established, they had better set about examining themselves to see in what way they can be of service to the public in general.

We are satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that the Government Information Service, the Ministry of Information I prefer to say, on numerous occasions has based its output on information that was not strictly correct. In other words, we believe they must increase their staff to fill offices if they now operate such, and they must have people discharging that type of work who in themselves carry some credit amongst the population. If they fail to do some of these things and to take cognisance of some of these things, the Ministry of Information will continue to bear the same name, that is, one of mis-information that it now bears. We do not like to see this. We are urging upon the Government to act otherwise and see how best this particular Ministry can improve its image.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, in replying to the two hon. members, I would like to say to the hon. member for St. Lucy that questions that are directed to the Ministries are not responded to by the Ministry of Information. Each of the Ministries handles its own questions and the Government Information Service would only give information on a particular subject if requested by the particular Ministry to do so and indeed if they wanted to give some information which they knew was needed, and if the Ministry said it did not wish that information released, then that is the end of it as far as the Ministry of Information is concerned. Each Ministry has its own business to conduct in that way, and I sympathise with the problems and would be glad to help in whatever way I can, but if the hon. member writes to any particular Ministry apart from the Government and does not get a satisfactory answer, I am afraid it cannot be said to be the fault of the Ministry of Information or the Government Information Service, because they may not know that the question was put.

With regard to the comments of the hon. member for St. Peter I will have to say that if the Government Information Service Releases are not believed, if they are inaccurate in some way, then it should not be difficult to find out in what way they are inaccurate. Still I believe that copies of every release are sent to the Shadow Minister of Information who is the Leader of the Opposition, and I am yet to have one comment that something was inaccurate. I do not think I have had one comment from the Shadow Minister of Information saying that such and such was an inaccurate statement or inaccurate release or even an incomplete release. If there are inaccuracies I would be glad to hear about them because I cannot see everything nor can the Chief Information Officer or anybody else. I again sympathise with the point made that some facts which should be given on Government activity are not given. We have a situation in which the Ministries can get the Information Service's assistance when they request it and if for example the Information Service sees something in the newspaper or hears something on radio or television which they think requires amplification or correction on the part of the particular Ministry, the Information Service will suggest to that Ministry that it would perhaps like it to make a statement on this particular publication or whatever it was, it is either inaccurate or needs amplification or something like that.

6.25 p.m.

Now if the Ministry concerned says 'no, we do not want to comment on it,' I am afraid that as far as the Ministry of Information is

concerned, that is the end of that. We cannot tell them 'you must do this,' or we cannot do it on their behalf. We offer a service; that is all it is — to be able to offer a service to the various Ministries and Government Departments, which, I must say, do not always themselves respond or recognise the need for information; and indeed I have found in many Government Departments that the Civil Service attitude is, that the less you can manage to say about something the less likely you are to make a mistake or get blamed for something. This is where you have to drag information out of people, but it is not a very easy job.

We are trying to do the best we can. I sympathise and I appreciate what the hon. member for St. Peter says in that particular regard, and I hope he understands the problem with which we are faced.

The question that Head 34 (1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 34(2) — Public Relations Department — was called.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, this also concerns the Public Relations Department. Increase in the cost of gasoline and unexpected charges in maintenance of vehicles are mainly responsible for this.

I beg to move that this Head stand part

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

The question that Head 34 (2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$235,587 as amended do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION FOR \$366,774 — No. 23

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next is a Resolution for the sum of \$366,774. The Hon. Minister of Communications and Works will deal with this.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no intention this afternoon of

dilating on the matters set out in these various Heads. Head 1 — Annexed Estimates to the Post Office. The Opposition will have every opportunity at Budget time to discuss the post office; and I am certainly not joining in any argument this afternoon.

I beg to move that Head 1 — Annexed Estimates — Post Office, stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister ought to be in a position to tell us something about the plight of these people who have been looking forward to receiving their mail, and as a result of certain occurrences at several post offices they have not been in receipt of such mail from time to time.

The Minister, I believe, very well knows that the public is aware of the fact that there has been loss of mail from time to time at Seawell Airport, that post offices have been broken, and all of these things have been happening. Let the Minister tell us what he knows about all of this and what steps have been taken at least to allay the fears of the total loss of some of the addressees here and to what extent does he know there are claims amounting to how much in respect of all these; how many people have been suffering as a result; because the Minister very well knows when mail is misplaced by whatever cause or whatever form, that it can occasion a very considerable amount of suffering to business and to private individuals as well. We are not placing him in the position of a policeman, but as a Minister responsible for the post office and its activities, and whatever, he has got to pay for mail being sent overseas and being brought from overseas and what not; he is asking for money for all this.

Well we want to hear from the Minister if the mail as brought from overseas is being received by the persons to whom it is addressed, and if not, why now. The Minister might be able to tell us what has been his own experience and how he has been able to deal with complaints and what not from time to time arising from all this.

As regards postal stores, Mr. Chairman, we note that this is a revote; the amount is \$11,693 — and we still feel that despite the fact that we are told it is to meet payments of stores ordered from the Crown Agents during the last financial year, and that the invoices were not received until April, 1974, we still feel that the Minister

has something more to tell us on that particular item of stores; and we would like to hear what he has got to say. We are not worrying ourselves about the debt that he owes the Government Printery because if the Government Printery did work for the Post Office it is a reflection on the operations of the Printery to find that they do not find it convenient to sent bills when a particular order has been filled; because we know the system is that the Government Printery cannot fulfil all the orders at one printing and make deliveries all in the same day, but if they made a delivery of part of the order and they made four deliveries, let us say, with the last portion of the order that is delivered, the bill ought to accompany the last part of the order. That should be the system. Whether the post office is in a position to pay at a particular time that is an entirely different matter; but nevertheless the accounts department of the post office would have the bill on file so that at the appropriate time they could look into all of this, so that we would not find ourselves in 1975 hearing about paying for the 1972-73 and now for the 1973-74.

This is not a question of sending your printing overseas. This is just our Government Printery and the post office, and this is a very unsatisfactory way of doing bills, because you will find the same thing that is happening with the Crown Agents; you did not receive the Bills from the Crown Agents until April, 1974, but you have not received the bills from the Government printery for 1972-73, 1973-74 until perhaps sometime in 1975. This is a state of affairs which I believe the Minister ought to be glad to have corrected, and we should not find it existing any longer.

6.35 p.m.

As regards Books and Publications Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is time that the Post Office also find itself establishing a library where postmen and other postal staff could engage perhaps in light reading of what is appropriate to their type of work. Some type of library ought to be established where workers could partake in some type of exercise that could be educative, and at the same time allowing them to have a little leisure when they are not actually working, instead of assembling in the yard. They could find time to keep abreast of what is going on. We would urge the Minister to find it possible to have in the vote enough money to provide a library service so the Postal Service could have access to the benefits to be derived therefrom.

We would also like to hear from the Minister something about the mails that never reach the people to whom they are addressed.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, as regards the items, Overseas Mail, Commission to Stamp Vendors, Travelling etc. I wonder if the Minister would say how much of this is attributable to the frequent trips from Seawell in the last few months in connection with the loss of mail at Seawell Airport.

The Minister over a year ago came to Parliament and admitted that several pounds of mail were lost at Seawell. Subsequent to that we had a newspaper report of mail being thrown down the river at Land's End. I do not believe that there has been any publication about the results of any inquiry which it was then said would go into effect.

Quite recently it has been reported to me that again there has been a considerable loss of mail from Seawell Airport. I believe that some time ago I said in this Chamber that the question of mail is so important that the Government should consider the erection of some kind of post office or postal facilities at Seawell Airport; but mail, I understand, is still being thrown into the general luggage pool at Seawell, and I have had complaints about a number of security officers who are operating at Seawell having no identification marks.

I do not know if the Government has yet put them in uniform or given identification forms to them. The regular Customs Officers feel that it is an infringement on their duties and when they question people whom they see working there they say that they are security officers and there is no sign of identification.

There have been complaints about the loss of mail, and whether it is intransit mail or mail destined for local distribution it causes a serious problem. The Government on the one hand will talk about the amount of money sent home to people from overseas — invisible earnings — and then you get a report from somebody saying my relative wrote me a letter and I have not received it up to now.

There is a case which occurred yesterday in the Post Office. I do not want to mention it at this point because I have already reported it to the Postmaster General; but the security of mail in Barbados is still in a state that is causing concern.

The Minister likes to tell you that in Barbados we do not really lose mails, that it is only the odd case; but it is that odd case in a matter of \$20 that will cause hardship to a poor

person in a country district who is depending on that money for sustenance. Or take a case of an old lady of 78 who has applied for pension, but because her husband died and left her two acres of land, but she is too old to work it and the only sustenance she has is her relatives abroad sending her a \$20 bill. Think of the untold hardships to this old lady when the postman comes and he has not got it, and when she writes her relatives she is told that they sent it.

I would like to hear the Minister say what the Government is doing and how they are trying to stop this loss of mail particularly the number of bags lost at Seawell within recent months.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I will not be very long. Out of courtesy to hon. members I will break the promise that I made in introducing this Resolution. I do not believe that anyone would not appreciate the untold harm done to families when mail is lost; but what I do not like is the allegation that when Miss James in America posts a letter to Mrs. James in Barbados who does not get the letter, it is always assumed that somebody local has taken it.

What happened to the postmen in New York? Could they not have taken it? Are their hands broken? How do we know that a letter left the Post Office in New York and reached Barbados? In any organisation we get bad eggs, and I read in the newspapers where one man got 12 years because he had 12 pounds of mail in attic.

I am concerned when I know that a letter has arrived in Barbados and has not reached the addressee in Barbados; but we often blame our postmen in instances even where the Post Office cannot say that the mail arrived in Barbados. I had a letter from a woman in Texas last week asking me to see whether her land tax was paid. It is true that we get cases where your own people are dishonest, but you also get dishonesty from people outside. Postmen in New York seeing a regular remittance coming in will take it up. Write one in Italy, and it never leaves Italy. The postman throws it down in a sewer. As I said, I can see the hardship to persons who do not receive a letter when it had been received in our post office.

6.45 p.m.

At Seawell, as I have said before, the airlines used to treat bags as second class passengers. They are only interested in people paying \$70, \$100 and \$500, so they just threw them away or left them there. We built at Seawell a receptacle, we had the security from the Government to go

in, and it is completely burglar proof as far as we have been advised. We got Establishments to give us officers to take all luggage — we are responsible so we got porters — and we stored it to send it out to the other administrations in the area at the time, so we have out of kindness rather than leave the airline to throw it away assumed responsibility in the interest of safer transmission of mail to other postal administrations. As a matter of fact, it is interesting that all the mail that has been lost at Seawell has not been lost by us. We have never lost a bag of mail at Seawell that had come into the possession of the officer who went up there to collect it. Any mail that was lost had not been handed over to any officer of the postal administration of Barbados. It was either stolen, thrown into the pit or taken away before he signed for it, and we have never lost it once we have got it into our possession. We have taken steps to make sure that we get all mail coming in. We have somebody to go to the ramp, check the invoice and make sure that so many bags received are those which were due in the interest of safer mail.

We had two break-ins at Christmas and the Police are investigating. We had a break-in at Oistin and we had one in the parish represented by the member for St. Peter. He would probably tell you that the person came from the adjoining parish, maybe from St. James. I do not know, but that is an unfortunate incident. The moment that was drawn to our attention we immediately put on a Watchman — not that they would not steal if a Watchman is there — but we took immediate steps to ensure that these Post Offices are secure. We did not lose very much at Oistins. There were one or two registered letters, but the Police have not completed their investigations in either case. This was at Christmas and they had to interview people, but I have not been able to see an official report on the alleged losses at either of these two places.

We cannot have any recreation room. If you go down there and see the conditions under which the Postmen work you would understand. You cannot get the supervision with everybody sitting choc-a-bloc, one on top the other. Until we can get the new Post Office which we are hurrying to start, this year — we have just had consultants down and we had hoped to get it started this year — until we get the new Post Office they cannot function efficiently in this position. I want it while I am still Minister of Communications and Works, I want to lay the foundation stone of that new building, so I promise to get it, and I think everything is going to this end. Probably not later this year, because

we have problems with consultants wanting to put in certain mechanical aids. I think they know that we who live in Barbados appreciate how much a letter from abroad means to the working class man in Barbados, and its loss works untold hardship. You can rest assured that my Ministry will do the best in its power to make sure that the mail gets through.

The question that the resolution for \$366,774 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE

1974-75 No. 24

A resolution for the sum of \$124,310 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, under Head 6 — Legal Affairs, the only Item I need to elaborate on further is the Council on Legal Education. As far as that Item is concerned, Sir, Barbados' contribution is 7.79%, paying \$49,961, and we have brought in line the salaries paid to senior executive officers and the academic staff of the University of the West Indies, so that the salaries and conditions of service have been increased and improved, and this amount is needed in order to pay similar wages and salaries to the academic staff of the Council on Legal Education.

I beg to move that Head 6 stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I rise with some diffidence to raise the subject I am going to raise now, but I think it has to be raised. I am glad to see the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central has not gone too far away. From time immemorial members of the House of Assembly have been supplied with copies of the laws which they make and pass in here. In more recent times, however, a certain attitude and atmosphere of hostility towards the legal profession has prevailed in certain quarters. It is most noticeable among those failed members who could not make a living at the Bar but who yet find themselves in exotic positions today they never expected to attain upon legal prowess alone. I do not mean the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. The hon. Member is around and about. I believe the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central, had he persisted at the Bar in Barbados and got over the lean years, would have achieved the dignity of the silk and the position of a senior member of the Bar, perhaps enjoying a greater

reputation in the community than he now does. I certainly do not mean the hon. Member for St. Michael South Central. Whatever may have been said in the past he had a wide criminal practice and was regarded as a fighting lawyer in his day.

But not to be diverted from the main track, Sir, it seems that people want to cut off their noses, to spite their faces. So as to stop one or two members of the Opposition who happen to be lawyers from getting what they regard a free copy of the laws of Barbados, they want to have a break with tradition and stop all members from getting them. I do not know what kind of people we are. In the days when there were hardly any lawyers in the House of Assembly, in the days when there was much less money in the Treasury, as a matter of course these laws of Barbados were supplied to everybody, but now out of perhaps the same motives that prompt certain people to speak against the award of the silk we see people saying that members of the House are not to get copies of the laws.

All of us know the inconvenience that happens from time to time when we have to amend an Act and no copies can be found in the House. All of us know that we would like the privilege of having our own copy to follow from day to day. The laws of Barbados also are coming out and have come out in a new form. They have come out in a form where they can be kept continuously up to date on a loose leaf basis. I am saying this in advance of any announcement. I will regard it as cheapness, as meanness, as maliciousness, and thank goodness I am not referring to anybody in here, on the part of anyone who tries to stop the members of the House from getting copies of the laws. A man should have a copy of the laws to keep in his home at night so he can read the House of Assembly papers and look up what interests or affects him. I cannot think of anywhere in the world where people are so petty as apparently people are going to have to be in this matter. A set of the laws will cost £100 or whatever it is. 6.55 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is not particularly difficult for any one of us on this side, especially when you realise that it comes off the income tax, to pay £100 for a copy of the laws. I am not speaking for the hon. members for St. Joseph, Christ Church West, the City or myself as a lawyer. I am speaking for the hon. members for St. Michael South, St. Michael North Central, St. Peter, St. Philip South and you, Sir, when I speak on this subject. Do not be led into the paths of petty malice. It is one of the immemorial privileges of this House that the members are

supplied with laws. Allegedly to save less than \$10,000, when you spend that casually on the Presidents of Zambia, and what is the wicked man's name who is not only trying to take away the money of the people in his own country, but when they go overseas to work he is trying to take away their money: Chief Jonathan. They will prefer to spend \$10,000 on Chief Jonathan than to spend \$10,000 in giving members of the House of Assembly, only once the laws of this country! It is only a once-for-all because it will come out in supplements and they will not have to be issuing these laws every year. They will come out in pages at a time and not whole new laws. They do not want to spend that amount of money to give out the laws of Barbados to hon. members.

I very much hope, Sir, that the private members and the non-lawyer members on that side of the House as well as all the members on this side will be able to make their weight felt in this particular matter. In the days of the planters and the merchants, highly economy-minded people who hated to see money spent on any matter whatsoever, they accumulated the laws. We are the sort of people that, in order to hurt each other, we are going to hurt ourselves. The 18 are going to injure themselves so as to stop two or three out of the six from getting something that they regard as a benefit. The 18 are going to drag down themselves so as to stop one or two hon. members on this side from getting this particular thing.

Mr. Chairman, I now have to enter a little piece of special pleading. I, particularly, do not wish to be put in the position to have anybody say that I am begging for the laws because I am contemplating taking a certain course anyhow. Even if I get a set, I am contemplating taking a certain course to make sure that it is at no financial cost to the Government, lest I be accused of begging for something. There was a Select Committee on those same laws, and I cannot believe it is right that they should ask members to give up their time to come and sit on a Select Committee to work out the form of the laws, which should be in and which should not be in and so on, and then they have to go and beg somebody to look at the laws. I cannot believe that the House of Assembly will do this to itself and to its own members. I just do not believe that, after we have spent time and energy throughout the House in a massive exercise which is involved in this, we would let a man who could never establish himself at the Bar and bears a grudge towards all those, friends and enemies alike, who were able so to establish themselves,

to lead you by the nose and dictate to you what should be done.

Always bear in mind that those who are getting these benefits themselves: the letters to put after their names and the books to put up on the shelves, always have to be looked at extremely carefully when they find principle, whether backed by secret malice or not, to deny other people what they are gladly reaching out their hands to take for themselves. I would welcome a statement from the Leader of the House that the laws of Barbados and subsidiary legislation made thereunder will continue to be supplied to hon. members as has been the case since the first collection of laws in the year, I believe, 1641.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I must join the member for St. Thomas on this particular point. I remember some time last year we were amending a very old piece of legislation in this House, and when it came to Parliament there was not even a copy of the law here. I suggested then that, when we are amending legislation of this type, we should be sent a copy of the particular Act to be amended together with the amendments. Even though the previous members of this Parliament were supplied with copies of the Laws of Barbados, it has been noticeable that year after year copies of the laws are bound, but the members of the House are not treated with the courtesy, or the privilege of receiving a copy of the laws. The only Act I have received, since I have been in here in 1970, is the Amendment to the Representation of the People Act which was done in May or June, 1971, and within, probably, a week of its passing the Senate copies were sent home to members because the election came within two weeks of the passing of the law.

Now, one has to look at the attitude of this present-day society. Mr. Chairman, when the plantocracy occupied this Chamber they never made discriminatory recommendations against themselves. Throughout this Parliament, when they say the masses have now taken over, you will find that there is money in the Agricultural Development Bank for agriculture, but one of the Regulations placed on that is that no member of Parliament, no Company of which a member of Parliament or a relative of Parliament is connected, shall benefit from a loan.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Peter raised the issue about the Fire Engine at Seawell and the Press Conference which stated that the Chief Fire Officer talked about a house. When somebody of another ethnic group was holding that post, he was provided with a house. When somebody else was holding the post of

Chief Sports Officer, he was also provided with a house. Is it that we look at each other in such a manner that we must be discriminatory against each other?

I remember returning to Barbados in 1964. When I asked about the Laws of Barbados, I was told that they would be published later in the year. I collected two sets of the Laws of Barbados. How did I get them? Lloyd Smith had a complete set of the Laws of Barbados. Every year they used to issue him with one. All the members who were in Parliament at that time were given the laws. If you look at the matter carefully, you will see how many of the plantocracy and how many of the others were in Parliament at the time. I went to one of the old members of the plantocracy and he had a complete set of the Laws of Barbados bound in a beautiful green colour. Today you are telling me that the 24 members in this House, who have to come here and argue over new legislation, or the amendments of old legislation, must now be deprived by our own people of a copy of the laws which we made and amended! As the hon. member for St. Michael West would say, only a lunatic would think that is feasible and possible. That is how I look at the matter.

Mr. Chairman, if you tell me that I am elected to Parliament, and I must do the people business, then Parliament has to pass laws. If you then tell me that, in order to do the people's business effectively, I must go elsewhere and look for the tools to come in here and do it, then I will have to stop and think whether or not Parliament is a joke shop.

Look at the top of this Table, Mr. Chairman. Look at the Clerk's Table. Look at the other Table, and if the next matter we have to consider deals with the amendment of any legislation passed in this House last week, or last year, there is not one copy available in here to which reference can be made.

7.05 p.m.

If you get your papers on a Monday night or even on a Friday evening to come into Parliament, do you mean to tell me that you must wait until the Government Legal Affairs office opens on Monday to run up there to check an amendment, or wait until the Law Library opens to run and check it? If a Resolution or something comes down and the Leader of the House asks to deal with it in all its stages, are you saying that we must go ahead and talk without seeing what you are amending? Three years ago Parliament sought to amend the Schedule to the Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic

Act and because of the unsatisfactory state of the laws of Barbados and the unavailability of the books in Parliament the wrong Schedule was amended, and when the Budget Speech was made it was found that the wrong Schedule was amended simply because the members of Parliament did not have the relevant copies of the laws. Are you telling me now that somebody in his type of wisdom will tell me that members of Parliament must not have copies of legislation? I am making it clear now that I am a lawyer and it is part of my tools. Any workman who wants to do a good job must have his tools; he cannot go to work and ask to borrow somebody else's tools. I will get a set whether or not it is given me by Parliament or I have to buy it, but it would be unfair to non-lawyers of the Chamber who have got to do the work of Parliament to be without the necessary tools, because even if you put a set or two on the Government's side and one set on this side, it does not mean that every member can take a volume home to check the laws. There are not all Government Ministers on the front bench; there are back-benchers, and they might not have the facilities of going elsewhere to check what the amendment is about. Are you saying that the only persons who are competent to deal with the amendment to laws are the front bench? You have the members for St. Michael West and St. Lucy who are members of the Trade Union, and it is important for them to check labour legislation. As the member stated today he introduced the Labour Act in 1952. Are you telling me that he must be deprived of a copy of the laws which he introduced and which are now bound in new volumes. Only a nitwit or an idiot would think this should be so. Are you saying that members of Parliament must not do their work effectively? What you are doing is creating new laws in Barbados and members must come in here and talk on something in the old volumes simply because they have not had the privilege of acquiring the new set of laws. What must the member for St. Philip South do if he is no longer Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Communications and Works? Are they supposed to make a contribution to the debates in Parliament? This is what the issue will boil down to, where you will be so discriminatory that you will say that Ministers will have a set of laws but nobody else will have. It is like what the hon. member was talking about today. You have a boy of eighteen or twenty and you put him as a porter in a store and you expect him to lift the same 100 pound bag of feed as a man of thirty-six but you pay him a different wage for doing the same job. The whole point is that those in so-called authority seek to do nothing but destroy their own. I go further and say that when

the Piles, the Weekes' and others were in Parliament you would not hear one of them say that you should not give Parliamentarians a set of laws, but it befits our crowd to say so about each other. That is how we think of each other in Barbados, and that is the problem.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I would just like to tell hon. members that I have made notes of their statements and criticisms and I feel I should draw them to the attention of the Cabinet at the next meeting.

The question that Head 6 — Ministry of Legal Affairs — stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 7 — Registration Department — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 7 — Registration Department — stand part.

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

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

Head 8 — Crown Solicitor — was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 8 — Crown Solicitor — stand part.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$124,310 do now pass.

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

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

On motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of four Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, the

Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 8 o'clock.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When this sitting was suspended we were on Government Business and to that the House now reverts.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Order with which we propose dealing Sir, is Item No. 7 on the Order Paper standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, this Bill before us today is another in the series of updating the legislation relative to the practice of medicine and other paramedical professions.

The purpose of this Bill is to regulate the practice and the registration of people who practise certain paramedical professions as listed in the schedule attached to the Bill. We find this necessary because under the existing Medical Act such people as they are now practising are contravening the law — some of them; not all of them. It is really accepted that some of these professions have proved useful over the years, and in places where a lot of research is being done, unlike Barbados, it has been established without a doubt that some of them will continue to play some important role in the treatment of illnesses, whether real or imaginary, as suffered and complained of by people.

In Barbados we know the feeling in certain areas towards these people and it is because of this feeling that we set about to regularize the practice of people engaging in paramedical professions.

The Bill consists of a number of sections beginning with the usual Short Title, Interpretation, etc.; then the fees people should

pay. It also deals with the type of professions that will be registered, and it also provides for regulations to be made under this Act pertaining to the practice and other ethics of the people practising these professions.

I do not think it necessary to go into any detailed reasoning for this type of Legislation. I believe, quite rightly, that if we have been following the trend as evidenced by the introduction of the Medical Act, the General Nursing Council Act, the Dental Registration Act and other similar Acts, it is only a matter of time before such a Bill as this was introduced in this Honourable Chamber. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, without further ado I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

On the separate motions of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Clauses 1 to 31 inclusive were called and passed.
8.10 p.m.

The Schedules of the Bill were called and passed.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

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

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1975

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next order is Item No. 2 standing in the name of the Prime Minister. I am asking leave to deal with that item.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) Order, 1975 made under Section 3 of the Civil Establishment Act, 1949.

The Resolution deals with a number of adjustments in a number of Ministries and Departments, at an annual cost of approximately \$220,872. Of this amount, a sum of \$162,948 is already being paid for temporary staff. The real additional cost is therefore \$57,924.

The Resolution first deals with the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology, and calls for the establishment of the following temporary post on a permanent basis; one Assistant Secretary, one Administrative Assistant, one Executive Officer, two posts of Stenographer/Typist, Two Clerical Officers and one Clerk/Typist.

Under the Ministry of Communications and Works the provision of the following new posts, as set out in the order are proposed — one Telecommunications Assistant, three Telecommunications Operators and one Clerk/Typist.

Under the Waterworks Department the Order calls for the establishment of the following temporary posts at a permanent basis — one Office Manager, One Secretary and two Clerical Officers.

As far as the Ministry of Education is concerned, the Order seeks the redesignation of the post of Chief Accountant as Financial Controller at a salary of \$15,720 a year.

Then we come to the Ministry of Health where there is the proposal for the creation of a new post of Chief Nursing Officer, and the abolition of the post of Deputy Chief Public Health Nurse.

Under the Ministry of Tourism it is proposed to create the post of Research Officer at a salary of \$9,720 rising to \$11,088. The proposals are all set out in the Addendum to the

Resolution, and I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, many of us from time to time have called for the establishment of certain posts in Government particularly where the holders of such posts have been in temporary or acting positions for quite a long time; but certainly in the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology it would seem that we are overloading the Ministry with clerical workers which is resulting more and more in non productivity in the technical side of agriculture which is needed today.

I think that the Government even at this time should take a very serious look at agriculture. I have already drafted a question, and I will have to ask it because I see that the substantive Minister is not here. Why is it that the Government has uprooted the Ministry of Agriculture from Crumpton Street, took it to Codrington, and in less than a year moved back to Crumpton Street.

I want to know what it has cost the Government, and who was responsible for this move. I have been to the Agricultural Department and I went into the Science Room. Everything in there was stripped and the officers were playing dominoes because they had nothing to do.

Now the Government has moved the Ministry of Agriculture back to Crumpton Street. That means a replacement of the services in Crumpton Street. The Government sent letters to certain organisations telling them that they could use the Crumpton Street building. My organisation got a letter; but the Government did not even have the decency to say that they were going back to Crumpton Street.

It just shows that the Government is working by whims and fancies. We see a proposal for one Assistant Secretary and one Administrative Assistant. There has been a gentleman in the Agricultural Department for 26 years.

8.20 p.m

There is a gentleman in Agriculture who has been there for 26 years and will not make a decision even if the coming of God was depending on it. The Permanent Secretary who was there, a very pleasant man, but you could ring him fifty times a day and could not get a decisive answer from him. You have other technical officers who will brow-beat you round

the clock 24 hours a day for 365 days a year and you cannot get anything out of them. There is a gentleman who is called the Chief Engineering Officer of the Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology. I can say here and now that I have his 1973 annual report which takes up one page of a foolscap sheet and half of another. He deals with who has been transferred, who went on holiday, in how many posts he was acting, but not one word about agriculture, and Government sits down and increases the staff to put on two stenographer/typists, 2 clerical officers and 1 clerk/typist, but to do what? The last Minister of Agriculture said that Government was searching for a man who was able to translate the scientific data into everyday man's language for dissemination among the farmers of this country and I have not seen it done. I do not know what has happened to that.

The more recent move now is that the Minister says he wants one voice in agriculture, so you have people running around trying to find that one voice and Government is at a loss. You need an Accountant now because we want to know what money the Ministry is losing, I do not see a planning officer. The current move is that they are going to abandon the sheep breeding station in St. Philip and IDC is to take it over to make an industrial estate. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: Is that so?) If you have not heard and you are in the Cabinet I am sorry for you, my friend. I think what Agriculture needs is a real investigation. Any businessman would first ask the question why must Agriculture be shifted up and down. The ex-Minister of Agriculture led a delegation to the Minister last week with the new group called NAYFAM and then he held a Press conference. (Hon. F. G. SMITH: He is your friend). My friend, my buddy, my colleague and your member, ex-Minister of Agriculture who has all the facts and figures up his sleeve. He said he is going to apply to international bodies to use the unused or under used land lying around in Barbados. Is not this an indictment on the Government and the Ministry of Agriculture which he has just left? Are you saying that these stenographer/typists are needed to create a policy on Agriculture? I think it would be better for you to have a planning officer with a decent salary who could create an agricultural policy.

I have said over and over again that this Government has a non-policy in agriculture, and the moment they put up one officer from Codrington and brought him back to Crumpton Street, and from the Press conference given by the ex-Minister that Government has acres and acres of unused or under used land lying down in Barbados, it has proved my point that as far as

agriculture is concerned there is a non-policy operating under the Democratic Labour Party Government. It is stated in the note that as the workload in certain areas of the Ministry increased temporary staff has been provided to supplement existing staff. The only workload I heard about is when the Minister of Finance gave the Christmas bonus several members of the accounting staff had to work, even on a Saturday, to work it out in order to pay it before Christmas. If you want to talk about workload which has increased it is the non-payment by Government of its Bill for seeds in Crumpton Street, and the last two orders sent out were returned to Government because they did not pay the previous bills. They did not pay for the seeds they had from two firms abroad and the last orders were returned, and that is why the seed store ran short of seeds a few months ago. They have not had beans in the seed store since August last year because the company refused to fill the orders because of non-payment the previous year.

To burden the taxpayers of this country in this way is certainly not what is expected in 1975. You have the Manager of ADC going around preaching and asking people to grow more food, you have the ex-Minister saying he is now going to show Government how to utilise land, but you hear nothing from the Government. It looks as if you are on the outside you will know more than who are on the inside.

Under the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Hon. Minister has made his position absolutely clear. He has now brought in tele-communications and I know why. There have been so many burst pipes because of the cheap material which Government has been using that they had to establish a telecommunications centre. The Minister knows full well that the Boarded Hall area had as many as seven burst pipes in one week. I do not know if this came through the Canadian loan, but I know the material was bought from Canada and it was inferior material. There were burst pipes between Boarded Hall, Hampton and Golden Ridge, so we had to establish a mechanical engineer to run over the bumpy roads which he cannot repair. It would be unfair to burden the Minister in this respect. He has declared his hand and I accept the Minister's position. Without money you cannot do anything, so that is not his fault.

Again, Mr. Speaker, under Waterworks I would like to hear the Minister on this. You are establishing certain posts under Waterworks. There is a thing called the Water Board which should meet periodically. They have been shifting

around the members of the Board and the Board has not been meeting, or some person who is responsible for calling the meetings of the Board has not called the meetings.

8.30 p.m.

I would like to hear the Minister on this matter because he would know why the Board has not met. The Board performs a very useful function.

With regard to the Ministry of Education, Mr. Speaker, this matter of the Chief Accountant being redesignated to the post of Financial Controller is a burning topic in education. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Please stop interrupting.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister does not know about this, I can tell him the name of the officer, where he came from in Government, that certain allegations have been made against him, and so on. They do not know what is going on. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Carry on and speak, please.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I will not torment the Minister with this burden. He knows about it; he is pretending that he is ignorant about the situation, but I will not torment him at this moment. What I want to deal with now is the Ministry of Tourism. There is the creation of the post of Research Officer. Well, this had to come. For years when we on this side said that we needed technical and knowledgeable people in the Ministry of Tourism, we heard from Mr. Tourist Expert — Robinson Crusoe always said that tourism was all right. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot go on with this interruption from the other side.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think you should either. I warn hon. members to stop this interference; it is a waste of time.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is no point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He is obviously referring to an hon. member of this House as Robinson Crusoe, and it is derogatory.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please sit down! Take your seat! No point of order! Please stop the interruptions!

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I have not referred to any member of this House. I do not know what is wrong with the Minister of Communications and Works. All I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we have always contended that tourism has now become very, very specialised. *(Asides.)* I will now refer to the Minister of Tourism. He always contended that tourism was sitting happy and good. Even the Prime Minister has said that tourism is growing. The Leader of the House in opening Welcome Inn, a function which the Minister refused to attend *(Asides.)* If you want to hear more I can tell you because I have copies of the letters indicating that he tried to close down the place. You can defend him now. Ask him if he did not refuse to go to the opening of Welcome Inn? Ask him if the Hon. Leader of the House did not have to fill the breach?

Mr. SPEAKER: Where does this come under this Resolution?

Mr. BOLDEN: It is research on tourism Sir. Ask him if the Hotel Association has not now agreed with what this side has been saying: that more than 50% of the tourist industry was in the hands of expatriates. The Minister stood up in here and said that the Barbadians had more, so we are bound to have a Research Officer to prove who is right or wrong and to prove him wrong. We have always contended that even if Barbadians had a greater percentage of the hotels as such, they had a lesser percentage of the beds available in tourism. If the facts are now coming out there is a need for a Research Officer to tell Barbados and not the O.A.S. the true position in tourism today. If the Minister wants to defend him, he can get up and do so now. He can go to Welcome Inn and talk to the people up there, if he wants to hear the facts. If he wants them, I can send the copies of letters for him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you speaking to the House? Please address the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, there were accusations of people stealing staff, guests, and so on from hotels next door.

Mr. SPEAKER: What has that to do with the Resolution?

Mr. BOLDEN: Research on tourism Sir. I am not a tourist in Barbados, Sir. I am no Robinson Crusoe; I am not in the tourist industry; I do not have a hotel; nothing has been built next to mine; there is no Research Officer to tell me how many guests will come to me and how many will go to Welcome Inn. That is what I am taking about.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to deal with one or two aspects that affect my Ministry. With regard to the question of the Tele-communications Assistant, the hon. member does not understand what this is all about and he did not deal with it, so there is nothing to which to reply. He spoke about a Tele-communications Engineer and a burst pipe. I do not reply to that because, obviously, he does not know.....

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. member was so intent on being disruptive that he did not hear what I said.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of elucidation, perhaps.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I said that he was having so many burst pipes in his Ministry that it was necessary to establish tele-communications because the Engineers were being called out all through the night. I know more than you know about that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, tele-communications is a separate thing. That deals with wireless, telegraphy, etc. I will not reply because, obviously, he does not understand what it is all about. On the other question of the waterworks, we have had burst pipes in the areas he mentioned, but those mains are old mains due for replacement and that has nothing to do with poor quality material. They have been laid down long before the hon. member ever reached this House, and that is nearly six years ago.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. The Minister must not try to fool this House. I can tell him a little bit more than he knows. There have been the coupling of two mains in order to feed certain areas. I can tell you what went on, if you want to know.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of elucidation!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Finally, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will have a chance to debate the policy on agriculture. Obviously, the member, like everybody else, is talking about agriculture and doing nothing about it. We have heard him on about four Budget speeches, but I do not know what he is doing about it. Be that as it may, this is just to make permanent posts that have already existed. He will have an opportunity to talk on the policy for agriculture when the Budget comes up for discussion some time next month.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one or two comments, and I shall not be

too long. With regard to the Ministry of Tourism the notes state:

"In 1973, a senior specialist in Tourism attached to O.A.S. Secretariat conducted a survey in order to advise on a better organisational and institutional structure with a view to the presentation of a comprehensive plan by the Ministry for the development of the tourism sector....."

I should like to find out from the Minister, what is the position of the comprehensive plan, whether it is available, and when will it be available. It would seem at the moment, as the member for St. Joseph has said, that those responsible for tourism in Barbados seem to recognise that all is not well with the tourist sector and that special efforts are needed in order to maintain the trust for tourism which we had in the 1960s. I should like to find out from the Minister how soon will this comprehensive plan be presented to this Chamber for discussion?

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to try and answer the hon. member's very reasonable question. A comprehensive plan for tourism is something which is continually changing. We brought down an expert from the O.A.S. last year, 1974, and he made a preliminary report.

8.40 p.m

There was then, based upon that report, a visit by a much broader based team – the first one was only one man – of about five people, experts in different fields: land use employment and all these various things, in October. Part of their report has now been received. The finalised report has not yet been received. This report will be used as a basis for our consideration. Government has established an inter-departmental committee for tourism planning of which I am Chairman and such persons as the Chief Town Planner, the Minister of Communications and Works, the Director of Tourism the Chief Statistics Officer, the Manager of the Development Bank and one or two other senior Government officials are on the Committee. Once this report from the O.A.S. has been received and studied, it is hoped that from that a comprehensive long term plan will be developed such as we have never really had in Barbados. We have put great emphasis on promotion, publicity and advertising, but we really have not done as much planning in the long term as we should.

Planning of course is difficult in days like these, but nonetheless we have to try and create a comprehensive plan for as far ahead as one can possibly foresee. This will be done once the

recommendations from the O.A.S. team have been received, and I would certainly be glad to try to lay this in this House if the Government decides this is to be done. I would like to do that because it would be no secret about it. The hon. member would understand that a great deal of this depends upon land use planning and he would appreciate the complications that arise from such a part of planning as that; but I appreciate the problem, I appreciate the question, and I will try to do all I can to bring a comprehensive plan before very long.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, we have in this Order a post of Telecommunications Assistant and three posts of Telecommunications Operator. This is something new and I would like to know what is envisaged. The reason why I am saying this is that we have now a telecommunications service in Barbados that is operated by Cable and Wireless, and it should have been stated as a matter of policy what are the intentions of the Government, because this is an area where the people who are telecommunications workers are really organised workers and they are not going to accept any situation where the Government takes over a position and expects them to accept salaries to fit in with the public service whether these salaries are in keeping with what they are getting.

I am a little bit concerned about the telecommunications operators because I have just negotiated for people and I would like to know when the Government proposes to take over Cable and Wireless, and if they propose to take over Cable and Wireless, how it is going to function. I am not an engineer, but I know a little about telecommunications and sometimes the Government are advised about these things and we have to pay in the end the price, because there is no discussion with persons other than the very narrow circle, and I would not like to be placed in the invidious position like you hear now with the buses. Telecommunications is an international service. It is not like taking over the Telephone Company because the Telephone Company to a large extent operates in Barbados and not from an outside source; but when you take over telecommunications like Cable & Wireless you are taking over a service that is different from light or water.

I heard from the Minister who introduced this how he speaks about services, that the cost of services has gone up, and I hope that we would not get that sort of thing because you might find you are asking the public to pay a price for a service where you will find that Barbados may have a very expensive

telecommunications service, and there will be the cost factor of how it functions.

Now the hon. member was at a telecommunications or postal union conference. This is money where you do not get Barbados making a charge and therefore you get people paying to it. It is something of which you are part of the international system, and I hope that in these matters it will be realised that this is a very technical area. Some of the Governments have taken over telecommunications. Trinidad and Jamaica have taken over and Guyana wants to take over, but at this CARICOM level to be quite frank, Guyana and the other countries are finding it is not easy and they are trying to ease out because in these areas where it is not always profit making you are not going to end up like the bus service. You are not going to end up with a profit and loss system where you can show a profit, and therefore it means that you may have to pay more than you are paying now, and I am stating that now so that if there are any misgivings in anybody's mind about taking over the service, be clear in your mind that you are not taking over a service because you can tell people that the service is going to be cheaper or you are going to make money out of it. You should say from the beginning why you are taking over the services and what to expect from them so that there are no misgivings about this because there have been too many mis-hits. You have taken over services without going into them. You took over the buses in 1954 and this is 1975, twenty-one years after and you are still not in a position where you are making any profit and you took them over on the basis that the people who owned them before were charging too much.

Sometimes it may be good to say and sometimes it may not be good to say, but I have not heard anything so favourable said about the public service as such. When you take over these things, who is going to run them? The Ministers? Have the Ministers got a crowd of people in their hip pockets that is going to run them? The Ministers have to run these services with the same people that they have to talk about. What is going to be the position when you take over the telecommunications service that is a highly technical service? They tell us that they cannot even get some of these people to fill posts they are advertising for; so are we going to fill them? Do you know what you are going to get? You are going to get a lot of problems because sometimes you will get these Permanent Secretaries who are not technicians, and I can tell you that the people who are running these services get more money than all the Ministers.

So if the Ministers are going in there with the idea that they are going to downgrade the people or upgrade themselves, let them be prepared for it because sometimes you go into a technical area where you have to accept this. Are we prepared to accept this or are you going to tell the people that you cannot have a service where a man is getting more than a Minister? You have to face all these issues. Or are you going to send them home and pay all the severance pay that I see coming to me? We are paying out more severance pay to the people that severance pay was never really originally meant to cover — \$30,000 to people that are drawing severance pay.

Mr. Speaker, you know sometimes in your own constituency you have to seek out some of the people you represent who have not drawn \$20,000, and you wish you could get \$20,000 for them. These are some of the things we are facing now; so we have to be clear in our minds in these take-overs. You have to be ready for them in a comprehensive manner so that you can take them over, because you have the surpluses and there is no point in taking over certain things and saying your balance of payments position is shaky and you are going to expect human beings in that element to work for less or that you can fire all of them and reduce the service to the pockets you have and get a service for that.
8.50 p.m.

I say this because tele-communications is nothing more than an expert service that you are taking over. It is not like a service that you have been running. The Barbados Government has not been running these services and you are going to have to rely on the people who have been running them. I hope they are clear in their minds and that there is no doubt in anybody's mind about what you are doing, and that you are not taking it over because Trinidad is taking it over, because Jamaica has been taking it over, and Guyana has taken it over.

Somebody spoke today about time. Trinidad might be able to take over something at a time when you cannot do it. Jamaica might be able to take over something at a time when you cannot do it, because they have bauxite and they have other basic resources that you do not have; and there is no point saying that your slender financial resources can put you in the same position in manning a situation to the same extent as somebody else.

Population-wise, you talk about Trinidad with nearly one million people; population-wise, you talk about Jamaica with near to two million people; population-wise, you talk about Guyana

getting near to a million people; Barbados quarter of a million people and therefore with a quarter million people you will know who are the people who are going to make a tele-communication viable.

You are an important link from your geographical position; you are not an important link from your economic and financial position, therefore the people in Barbados cannot send out telegrams as frequently as somebody from the outside send telegrams into Barbados. You have to explain all of that to the public — how this international bag is being used, so you will know how much money there is; do we have to foot something, how it is worked out, so that you would not have any problems about it because I know Cable and Wireless in all of these countries is giving it up now. Cable and Wireless, they have just put up something there and you can take 51% shares, but some of us who understand — you can take 51% shares by any means and say 'all right, the share capital is going to be the profit you are going to make and I do not have to pay you any money,' and you go along running around and running around until you work it out and I don't have to look for any money to pay you, but all depends on the kind of agreement you make. The stronger you are the tighter the agreements you can make but in these matters it is not so good to follow people unless you are sure you are going to follow them along a pathway that is best suited to you.

I am a bit worried myself about these big take-overs. A take-over like this I have not heard anything about, I must say quite frankly. I just hear there is to be the take-over next year, but I feel we are entitled to know when you take over what is going to be the position. What is the policy about taking over this company is something we should know.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have already spoken but.....

Mr. SPEAKER: It is very inconvenient; it is very inconvenient.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Very briefly, Sir. The point as raised by the hon. member for St. Michael West; this particular part of this Resolution has nothing to do with the take-over. The point is that the Ministry of Communications, under the old Wireless Telegraphy Act has certain functions to perform on which the Ministry was advised by the Chief Electrical Engineer. We found that was unsatisfactory and the Government agreed that with today's technology — nothing to do with

take-over of Cable and Wireless itself, but that the Ministry should have a competent engineer and a competent unit to advise us on, not only in relation to Cable and Wireless where the Minister has to make decisions on overseas communications, but also internal communications.

We have got to licence Rediffusion; we have got to licence CBC. There is a question of licences for radios and the granting — for instance. Her Majesty is coming and they want certain number frequencies for security reasons, on which they can operate. Well this section is purely to advise us on that.

On the question of the take-over, the Throne Speech of about two years ago did mention the intention of Government to form a joint company with Cable and Wireless, and the point at this stage is that it has not submitted to the Government the figures, so that the Government is not in a position at this point to decide what form this take-over or this joint company should be. As a matter of fact only last week I had to write a very strong letter to Mercury House in London telling them that they are dragging their feet.

So I would like to assure the hon. member for St. Michael West that we have not reached the point where we have sat down and where we have gone into the statistics. It is just a Throne Speech statement. The Government through the Ministry of Communications and Works is working towards the facts and figures and projections over a period of time which would enable us to know where to begin and how to set about it; but this unit, Sir, is purely to give the Ministry a better advisory body, because we deal with ship-to-shore, radio, fishermen at sea, regulated channels, licencing, tele-communications, and all of that was formerly done by the Chief Electrical Engineer who may not be a man versed in tele-communications.

We are just trying to give the Ministry the best advice, but at this stage it has nothing to do with the take-over of Cable and Wireless, and I would like him to be assured that when the Government has decided to take this step the interests of the workers and the interests of the union will certainly be considered when we are getting down to the nitty-gritty, provided the Government decides to go through with the take over after seeing the relevant facts, figures, projections, etc.

Thank you very much, and I must thank the Hon. House for the indulgence it has just accorded me.

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

BILL TO AMEND SANITATION SERVICE
AUTHORITY ACT, 1974
(ACT 1974-46)

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker the next Item is a Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act, 1974.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, earlier in today's session I was seeking permission to deal with two amendment Bills in all the stages today and I would like formally to request the indulgence of the House to deal with these two Bills today.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections leave will be granted.

There being no objections leave is granted.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: The first amendment before us is a Bill to amend the Sanitation Service Authority Act, 1974. This has become necessary because Section 20 of the Act is to be amended to allow the Minister to delegate certain functions and authority under the Health Services Act, to the Sanitation Authority.
9.00 p.m

When the Act was passed last year, unfortunately that section made specific reference to the Refuse Collection and Disposal Regulations made under the same Act; but since specific mention was made of 1974, and these Regulations were not introduced last year it has become necessary to amend that section to allow the Minister to delegate to the Authority any of the functions conferred on him by Regulations made under the Health Services Act, 1969.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

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

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Clauses 1 to 4 were called and passed.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

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

BILL TO AMEND THE DRUGGISTS ACT, 1894

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Druggists Act, 1894, be the next Order of the Day.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: The reason why the need for certain amendments to this Act has arisen is that at the moment we are handicapped in getting people to fill certain posts in the Health Services, the reason being that people who are qualified must have qualifications registered in the United Kingdom. We believe that in the present state of the world this is unnecessary and may be discriminatory. The most important point is that we have offered a post to a Barbadian trained in the USA, and unless this amendment is made we will not be able to offer him the post.

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

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see the plight of this country at the present moment because of the shortage of druggists as what the Hon. Minister has mentioned indicated; but this brings back to my mind that just about two years ago I sought to bring it to the attention of the Government by asking a question if the Government was aware of the shortage of druggists to dispense medicines and to meet the needs of the people in this country.

The replies that were then given would cause one to feel that the Government did not consider that there was a shortage of druggists at that time. I am glad to see that the Government is now realising what the situation is, because when they advertise posts nobody will fill them; and they will experience greater shortages in filling other posts in this particular Health Service by failing to take heed at the proper time when Government was warned.

This is a joke Government that we have, but there is no doubt about it that it is the health of the nation that will be affected in the long run. I am glad to see that they have come to their senses and realise that when a member brings a matter to the House he does not bring it for his personal interest, but because he has the interest of the nation at heart.

I hope that the Government will look around and see if they are suffering in any other respects. It would be better for everyone.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this, but it shows up something fundamental. For a country that spends as much as we do on Education it is a serious indictment and something that requires close examination.

This is a matter for the Minister of Education to examine. You cannot tell me that you have to amend an Act to be able to get a local man with the level of education that you have, with a university and with more secondary schools than you ever had before. More children are going to secondary schools now than at any time in the whole history of Barbados; therefore it seems impossible to my way of thinking that you cannot get enough druggists in this country.

The U.S.A. can produce theirs and the English people can produce theirs with higher standards. To become a pharmacist in the U.S.A. you have to be of a higher standard than we have to be. This is like what happened about two years ago. You could not get young policemen in Jamaica and in Bermuda. The reason in Bermuda was that you did not have the population, and in Jamaica it was a question of the high illiteracy rate.

In Barbados how can we boast about spending all this money on Education and say that you cannot find enough druggists? I am satisfied in my mind that this requires an examination by the Government. It is not just a question of amending the Act. This community must begin to settle its own problems. You must of necessity begin to be able to provide your nurses, druggists and sanitary inspectors.

You cannot in one breath say that there is unemployment and a population problem and in another breath say that you cannot get druggists when you are spending 28 per cent of your total revenue on Education.

9.10 p.m.

As I said earlier today, when you talk about unemployment and not putting people to work, this is another sense of direction we are getting into. I am satisfied that there must be something somewhere in the medical profession that is stultifying the growth of druggists in Barbados. They are either allowing a closed shop to reign among a certain small coterie of people that you cannot get druggists coming in. Something must be wrong and I do not subscribe to this. Small communities must be able to have the infrastructure. You cannot have a medical profession and not have druggists. All of this talk about health services and you do not have druggists. Are you going to bring in the staff drivers and sanitation workers? These are not men with education, some of them went to prison. Are you going to tell me that in a society where you have a health service that within the health service you do not have an educational system that can give you a surplus of druggists? Something has to be wrong somewhere. This is a challenge to the Government and to the Ministers of Health and of Education.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the various members who spoke. I think the time has come when we should look into the matter concerning the training of druggists, but I must let this Hon. House know that it is the low salary scale which has prevented many youngsters from being trained to become qualified druggists. I am not here to criticise the Government but I am just here to draw to the attention of the Minister of Health that the time has come when the druggists should be placed in a higher salary bracket.

When you compare the salaries paid to druggists in this island with the salaries of certain civil servants who are not even in the top bracket you must come to the conclusion that it does not make sense for any youngster to aspire to become a qualified druggist, and therefore the time has come for us to face facts and get to the root of the evil. You have people in other professions who are paid lucrative salaries and if we are to increase the number of druggists in this island we have to examine the salary structure. That is where the problem must be solved. On numerous occasions druggists have intimated to me that we are not going to get any youngsters becoming qualified druggists because there is no attraction for them with the salary.

When we have reached this stage now, Sir, that those who have attained the age of, in many cases, 65 or 70 years, the Ministry of Health has to sign a contract with those people and implore them, beseech them, beg them, ask them to return to the posts they formerly held and assist. What is going to happen, Sir? As soon as those people go out or as soon as they are unable to perform their duties you are going to get a breakdown in the service. Therefore it is a painful duty of mine to draw your attention to the matter, but it is the crux of the matter and do not let us get in here with all these Bills and so. I can only advise the Minister to examine carefully the salary structure and upgrade without delay the salaries which are paid to druggists. I can assure you if we recognise them as professional men or women and pay their salaries comparable to others who are employed in this Government we will find that youngsters will become very interested in the profession.

I must also let you know, Sir, that there are many clerks who are employed by private firms and are receiving more..... (*Asides*).... I have been elected in here, I did not come through the door. When others are speaking you do not tell them so. Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that we have to think of the salaries paid by private firms to people who have a few certificates, and in some cases some of them do not have certificates. When you come to the profession and you need druggists we must get down to business immediately and see that they are paid well for the service which they are rendering to the community and that they are indispensable.

9.20 p.m.

The doctor and the druggist must work together, and without the druggist the people in this country will suffer. I am appealing to the Minister to look into the matter and to do his utmost to solve this big problem which we, at present, have in this Island.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker I just want to refer briefly to one aspect of this debate and that relates to the education and training of personnel in pharmacy. This is not a matter which we have just suddenly discovered and, hence, we have made provision under our National Development Scholarship Programme for the award of scholarships in the field of pharmacy. This is a continuing programme. One person has already enrolled in a course in pharmacy, and there is every indication that other awards will be made in this particular field.

Locally, as well, towards the end of last year the Division of Health Sciences within the

Barbados Community College was established and training in this particular area is one of the subjects provided. We are taking this question of training seriously. There was also the question that certain professions or callings, probably because of their attraction or non-attraction, were not really very inviting. Young people did not find these very inviting even though there might have been a need nationally for persons to be trained in this particular field. This was proved not only in the field of druggists, dispensers and pharmacists, but it is true in other fields as well. That is why this House approved, some time at the turn of this decade, a provision of a post on the staff of the Ministry of Education in Vocational Guidance to let the students in school know what the different professions and callings are, what is involved in them, and what type of educational preparation would be required so that they could prepare themselves on the basis of that information for the type of careers in some relation to the needs of the nation.

There is provision for training under the National Development Scholarship Programme. That is an Overseas Training Programme. There is provision within the Division of Health Sciences within the Barbados Community College, and then the Programme of Vocational Guidance would open out, or orient, the attitudes and the minds of our young people to various needs of the country and to the various professions and callings so that they can decide and be guided into what field is most suitable for them which the nation requires.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that this question of Barbados having an adequate amount of druggists must be viewed from the system which operated in the past. Those of us who can remember the 1940s would remember that druggists were the rich people of Barbados and it was a closed shop. It was like the lawyers profession. You and I could not get into the lawyers profession in those days. Anybody who became a druggist in those days either followed in his father's footsteps, or opened his own drug store where he ladled out a penny of vaseline and would make 90 pennies of vaseline out of a pound of vaseline that would cost 10 cents. He would sell a little bit of iodine in a bottle for 10 cents. That was the type of druggist profession in the past, and it was a closed shop.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when I left school in 1949 there were two of my colleagues who wanted to be druggists, but nobody would take them because their families were not of the druggist profession and it was a closed shop. They could not get into it. Those who got into

the profession subsequently, or in the early 50s and had any intelligence, as soon as they passed the Druggist Examination, became Drugs Salesmen. It was more remunerative to be a Drugs Salesman for a United Kingdom or an American firm, travelling up and down the West Indies selling drugs, than to stand in the back office of Knights Limited or Annie Jones as a druggist.

Mr. Speaker, you have to look at the set up of what was a drug store in the past. A drug store would sell glauher salts, but today glauher salts is controlled at such a price that you cannot buy it in Barbados. If you asked a druggist about glauher salts, you would be told: "If you know a friend down the Islands, ask him to send some for you. We bring it in and ship to the Islands because the control price is less than what it cost us, and we cannot sell it in Barbados." Vaseline now comes in little bottles, and they have a price on it. The price of milk and plaster is literally controlled. The man who stands in the back of the drug store nowadays is one of the old fellows from years gone by. The system followed by Carlton Browne, the old drug store man, who has money, no longer exists. Nobody is entering into this profession now as he used to do before. The Minister, or the Government, can think of upgrading the salaries of those people who work with the Government, but how can you ask the private firms to upgrade their salaries? You will have to think of what the member for St. Michael West talks about and introduce a minimum salary for certain professions. When you come to the big drug stores in Bridgetown you will be told: "We cannot afford to pay any more. Our overheads do not allow us to pay more." They will tell you what is the cost of operating a store in Broad Street. They will tell you how many people they have to pay and so on. You will have to look at all of these things.

The Minister will have to think about what system he can devise to remove the druggists from in the stores in Broad Street because that is the only place where druggists operate. Other than that the drug stores in Barbados are now operated by those people who learned the profession in the Broad Street drug stores, became Drugs Salesmen, they have now grown tired of flying up and down the West Indies on aeroplanes, and have decided that, rather than taking these trips at their age, they would set up their own drug store in Barbados. The member for St. Michael West has a son who has two drug stores, and he used to be a Drugs Salesman. The one in St. Philip used to be a travelling Drugs Salesman. If you look around Barbados you will find that the only drug stores outside of Broad

Street are operated by persons who were salesmen for the International firms who have reached a certain age, have made a little money, and have decided to remain in Barbados and set up their own drug stores.

9.30 p.m.

This is a very complex problem which you have to sit down and study how you are going to get over this system of poor pay for those who are now doing druggist work. As I said before, this Parliament does not fully understand itself. We still have certain closed professions trying to operate in Barbados. We had to pass a new Medical Practitioners Bill to get a certain Barbadian trained in the United States into the hospital. The Minister knows this case. In certain Government Departments, unless you belong to a society of Great Britain, they do not recognise your training. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not in here to listen when you are talking about certain things. We can get Vets in Barbados, but you have a Veterinary Board which will say they do not want anybody unless he brings a certificate from England.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has got to take a serious look at all of these professions and see how they are going to liberalise them and get people into the professions by getting over the hurdles of those who think they are still sacred societies and only their close friends and relatives can enter into these sanctimonious places. When the hon. member for St. Michael West talks about poor salaries, that is one side. You can raise the salaries at the Hospital and District Hospitals and for the City Council druggist, but you still have to ask yourself how you are going to provide for the other people who want to be druggists at a decent salary. I have always contended that certain people in our community have never been paid what they are entitled to. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? There is a story running around Barbados that if the Minister proposes now to pay druggists a salary equal to or over and above or within the range of a Permanent Secretary in his Ministry, he would get a report which would say it is unfair and that he could not pay this man that kind of salary. Many of the Permanent Secretaries in Government Departments get hot under the collar whenever certain salaries rise above or get too close to theirs. I heard the Minister of Communications and Works say that whenever you get a member acting as Minister, the Permanent Secretary looks at him and says he does not get as much salary as he does. This is what we have to look at. We have to see whether or not we need certain professions in this country and whether we are going to compensate them for the sacrifices they

have made to reach that particular position and not look at those persons who might have crawled up the ladder over somebody's back to reach their position, because these are people who write reports in such a manner that Government cannot take a positive decision.

Mr. Speaker, this to me is no more than a Medical Profession Bill where you will find people coming in from Britain or the United States who did not go to University but who have a diploma, and as it stands, all the Minister is trying to tell us is that as long as they have a diploma, let us take our chances on them and put them there to dispense medicine because we cannot provide the necessary personnel from our Barbadian training. This is what the Minister is telling us; but having got the Bill through this Chamber, I think the Minister and those responsible should really take an in-dept look into the training of druggists in this country. How many drug stores do you see open on Sunday mornings? The doctors in Barbados take the day off on either Thursday, Friday or Saturday, but they operate on Sundays. In the crop season doctors work from nine in the morning until 10 o'clock at night, but the prescriptions are never filled until Sunday morning, and you will find that lots of doctors in Barbados have now established their own small drug store on the premises and have their own private druggist.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only a question of salary, but as I heard the hon. member for St. Michael West say, it looks like a closed shop; but it is a closed shop in respect of who you are. A boy from St. Thomas, St. Joseph or St. Andrew who has not got any connections at the drug stores in Bridgetown cannot even now get in to learn. They still think it is the 1940s when your good friend would go in the back and ladle out a few drops of castor oil and croton oil and you move up until you qualify. Those days are over. We have got to remove this social prejudice that only people out of certain categories can qualify in certain professions.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised to find that there is criticism in respect of the Ministry of Education on its educational policy. I for one feel that this is one Ministry that is spending a lot of money and not getting any great returns for it, but that aspect of it I will leave until another day. I think the Minister has succeeded in more than one way his predecessor, because he tells us about national development scholarships, but as far as I know there has only been one person who was granted a national development scholarship in pharmacy.

He talks also about the recently established health sciences division at the Community College or the polytechnic and obviously is seeking to give one the impression that here the Government is doing something about it. I would have thought the Minister would have gone a bit further and told us whether in fact they are training druggists and if so how many. The Minister makes certain statements and glossed over them, but sooner or later he will find that these statements will be taken up. There is only one person as of December, 1973, who was trained in pharmacy. (A VOICE: How many were trained in your Government's time?) You are the Minister and you are the one who gets vexed when I say you are not doing anything but you brag that you spend \$38 million a year in the Ministry. Everybody is attacking the Minister of Finance or the Ministry of Health and overlooking the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Education is not producing anything, but your turn is coming this day.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, in reply I would like to say that I subscribe to a lot of what the hon. member for St. Joseph said, and I think he has made my task easier in replying. The whole system of training druggists in the past was highly undesirable and it still exists to a great extent today, but we have proposals before us in the Ministry of Health in conjunction with the Ministry of Education for re-organising entirely the training of druggists in Barbados. At the same time one has to bear in mind that the dispensing of medicine in this modern age has undergone a lot of changes from what it used to be 15 or 20 years ago where dispensers were concerned with the preparation of tablets and mixtures. Nowadays many of the medicines come prepared, and it is only a question of counting them out or measuring it out, so the training of druggists has to be readjusted in the light of the changes that have taken place in the drug industry.

9.40 p.m.

Now the sole purpose of amending the present Act, again I would like to state, is to allow this Government to employ people who have had their training elsewhere apart from the United Kingdom; and to us in the Ministry of Health this is very urgent because of the setting up of the Division of Health Sciences as from last year and the offering of courses in certain areas of the paramedical professions — and the training of druggists is one of these — we cannot embark on a scheme of training people in this area until we have a pharmacist who will be able to supervise the courses and in addition, participate in the training of these people.

With the provision of this amendment we will be able to employ such a person. In fact, we have such people — two Barbadians who have been trained and who are awaiting word as to when they can come down and join the Government service.

In passing, I would like to point out that roughly, as we see it in the Ministry of Health we need about three pharmacists in Barbados, and when I say pharmacists I mean people who hold graduate degrees in pharmacy, and that is roughly a five-year course at a university. But we need a lot of other people and I prefer to refer to them as dispensers, at a lower level, and the actual number of these people will depend upon the number of health facilities which we are going to have in the country.

Now in the interim we have provided facilities at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the training of people as dispensers, or, to use the common word, as druggists, because we recognize that the system of apprenticeship in that area has a lot of undesirable qualities in it and it has led to a lot of frustration and discouragement to people who have been seeking to be trained as druggists or dispensers.

However, with this amendment I would like again to stress that this prepares the way where we can embark on a better re-organization of the training of druggists, and hence the employment of these people in the near future in Barbados.

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

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

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

On the separate motions of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, seconded by Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND, Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

RESUMPTION ON BILL CITED AS HOTEL PROPRIETORS ACT, 1975

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that we resume consideration of the Bill to regulate the liability of hotel proprietors for loss of or damage to property, which Bill was being considered and on which further consideration was postponed. It was then in Committee stage, as Your Honour will recall.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before I put this question I must ask you to bear very strongly in mind, hon. members, that we are exceeding the time which has been agreed upon between the staff of this House and the Union. We cannot do this likely.

I will put the question, if this is your wish.

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this will be controversial at this stage. We have agreed on the amendments already.

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

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

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, thanks to the assistance of the hon. member for the City

and the hon. Member for St. Michael North West, I believe that the problems that we faced this morning with regard to this Bill and certain aspects of it have been resolved, and I hope that the House will agree to the amendments which are proposed in a paper which has been circulated.

Now because one of the proposals is that Section 7 should be omitted, it means that certain re-arrangements of numberings have to be done, and this goes back to the very beginning of the Bill with the Arrangement of Sections; in consequence of which I believe it will be necessary to recommit the entire Bill to the whole Committee of the House and this I beg to move.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 7 be re-committed. (ASIDES) Mr. Chairman, I see we have too many lawyers in here. I beg to move that Clause 7 be deleted.

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

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 8 be Clause 7, and subsequent Clauses be renumbered accordingly.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that in Clause 10 which is now Clause 9, subsection 3 which contains the words "A person who alleges that a proprietor is in breach of his duty under subsection (1) shall have a right of action before the High Court" be deleted. (Asides) Mr. Chairman, I move that the amendments which were circulated be adopted.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. P. G. MORGAN seconded by Hon. F. G. SMITH Part V of the Bill was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. P. G. MORGAN seconded by Hon. F. G. SMITH the Schedule was called and passed.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg to second that.

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

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

SUSPENSION

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. In view of the prorogation of Parliament next week and owing to the fact that we have urgent business, it is necessary to meet again tomorrow in regard to the Bills which will have to be considered by the Other Place. Unless we do that they cannot pass the Senate and we will have to come back here with them all over again.

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

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When this Sitting was suspended Government Business was the instant order of the day and to that it now reverts.

BILL TO REPEAL REVENUE EQUALISATION FUND (TEMPORARY USE) ACT, 1961

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper is Item No. 4 — a Bill to repeal the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1961. As the Objects and Reasons set out,

this Bill would repeal the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act, 1961, (Act 1961-62).

Honourable members will recall that the Revenue Equalisation Fund was set up by the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1952, Act of 1952 (5) to be used in the event of a temporary recession of public revenue. Section 5 of the Act also states that from time to time part or all of the fund may be withdrawn for the credit of the general revenue of the Island. But in 1961 a new Loan Act was necessary for financing the Development Plans 1961 (65) and the Local Loan Act of 1961 was passed. As a result a new Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act, 1961 was also passed. This allowed the use of funds from the Revenue Equalisation Fund for initial expenditure until money authorized to be borrowed under the Public Loan Act of 1961 was raised.

Section 2 of the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act of 1961 also required payment of any sum borrowed from the Fund to be made within a year from monies borrowed under the Public Loan Act, 1961. The Accountant General has minuted us to this effect. I do not know why it was decided that moneys from the Revenue Equalisation Fund should be available for borrowing only. However, in the light of present-day circumstances, I suggest that consideration be given to repealing the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act, 1961-62 and amending the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act of 1950 so as to permit the use of moneys available from the Fund as the need may arise, and also to treat any moneys borrowed as withdrawals from the Fund.

So that it is the object of the Bill, Sir. It is to repeal the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act, and that is the advice of the Accountant General, and various authorities like the Attorney General and the Ministry of Finance and Planning, they all support that view. It is for that reason that this Bill is before us.

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe I am right in saying that from what the Leader of the House has just given us to understand, we are at last admitting that we are scraping the bottom of the bucket. If we are to accept what the Leader of the House has just said, the last source

from which a dollar can be made available to us to help us to tide over affairs until the moneys we expect to receive from various sources as loans is made available; we have it before us in no uncertain terms that this is now the true financial position of the country at the present time. This brings us face to face more or less with the true position of the country at the present moment.

In other words, if we were to borrow from the Revenue Equalisation Fund 1951 or 1961 Act or whatever funds are made available to us as a result of these amendments to these Acts, whatever we may do in this particular respect, if we can draw upon the Revenue Equalisation Fund and loans that we expect to have available to us to bail us out — that is the most appropriate term — if anything should happen to those loans and they are not forthcoming at the point of time we expect they would be available to us, it would mean that we have really eaten the calf out of the cow's belly long before the mother would have given birth, and we would have gone on any little reserve that might have been made available to us. (*Aside*)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am hearing the Minister of Communications and Works uttering some asides. He is now in his glee, because you know, a pack of cards has 52 playing cards but some packs have two jokers. The Minister of Communications and Works qualifies for one of the names that you give to these extra cards in the pack.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. member that that has nothing to do with the Bill.

Mr. HINDS: I agree; but he is in the game. He will fight back; he will fight back until the break of day, and he will realize that the break of day is certainly drawing near.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purpose of this undertaking here today with respect to the repeal of this 1961-62 Act is of utmost importance to us all because when things are sufficiently rosy that you can afford to spend almost \$24,000 a day entertaining people from abroad, you do not have at the same time to draw on this Revenue Equalisation Fund. You do not. This is a sort of standby. So when you find, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you have raked and scraped, you have drawn in, you have contracted, you have taken in from every quarter possible where a dollar could have come, but in the face of this there is growing unemployment in the country, and with the

growing unemployment, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there must be growing unrest in the country. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is no member on the other side of this Honourable House who is not aware of the near starvation situation that faces this country. There is not a member who is not aware of the fact. They have been warned by the industrialists and they have had their own experiences, that for the quarter just ended 31st December, we have seen that there has been quite a recession in the trade pattern in this country; we have seen that the stores in Broad Street and Swan Street, in Bridgetown generally, that have been accustomed in past years turning over a certain volume of trade, it was not with them during the period leading up to Christmas and New Year shopping which has just gone by. 3.20 p.m.

It would mean therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government would be receiving less trade tax, income tax and so on. Because I had in my office only yesterday morning one of these cases and I was minded yesterday to speak on this matter with respect to the Wages Council.

A lot of employers, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have had cause to reduce the number of their staff. It means that an additional amount of people have been drawn out of the employment force. We know that the Ministry of Communications and Works is the No. 1 case of employment in this country. Let the Minister tell us now what his employment position looks like, examine how many have been thrown out of work in recent months and the past weeks, and tell us how he feels with regard to being able to offer any form of employment to people who have been laid off.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, no one can deny the fact that to seek to repeal this particular Act today for the reasons given by the Leader of the House is a clear indication that we are heading nowhere, financially speaking.

In other words, when we for instance decide to take the few pennies available to us and fritter them away in the manner that the Minister of Communications and Works so loyally pontificated upon yesterday, I would say that we are bolting down a dark alley, and where we will end not even the Minister of Communications and Works seems to know or even to care.

I have often heard the Minister tell us about how much this is our country. I believe

that the Minister could serve his country better if he would attempt to give honest and sincere advice to those persons in whose hands.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think that you can say that as a Minister of Government he should give honest and sincere advice. What you are saying is that he does not give honest and sincere advice.

Mr. HINDS: No, Sir. He may not be giving any advice at all. What I am saying is that if he is not indeed giving any advice, he could set out to give honest and sincere advice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I remind the hon. member that he has approximately three minutes more.

Mr. HINDS: If it has to be accepted that I have been on my feet for 12 minutes I would say that we are not living in the difficult times that you and I have been led to believe. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that I will take my seat because I am under doctor's orders.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the repeal of this Act really brings us face to face with realities. It brings us to the point where the Government is now accepting that the economy is not moving further. In my humble opinion it points to the fact that those people with money in the community no longer have confidence in the Government; because one has only got to look at the Act which this Bill seeks to repeal and you will note that in Section 2 (2) of the 1961 Act it says: "Any sums so borrowed shall be repaid by the Governor-in-Executive Committee (it would have been amended as from Independence) within one year from the date on which it was borrowed out of money raised under the Public Loans Act, 1961."

This is very important. It shows two things. (a) That the Government has borrowed substantial sums of money out of the Revenue Equalisation Fund and has not been able to pay it back because it has not been able to raise any money as provided for under the 1961 Act; and (b) in order to get around it the Government is seeking to repeal this Act and get back to the 1952 Act.

From the time I came here I have been asking for the 1952 Act. There is no copy of the Act in Parliament or in the precincts of Parliament.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that members are contravening the rules by standing in the corridor.

Mr. BOLDEN: Not members, Sir. Strangers, Sir. As I was saying, there is no copy which members can check. I understand that a decision has been made that Parliamentarians will not be issued with copies of the new Laws of Barbados. Here is a very vital piece of legislation where members are expected to vote to repeal the 1961 Act.

There is no money in the money market in Barbados, or we would not be repealing this Act today. The repeal of this Act should tell the Government that something is seriously wrong when it cannot even borrow money to pay back into the Revenue Equalisation Fund which the law allows it to do.

At a Press Conference the Prime Minister is reported to have said that in 1975, Barbados will have \$65 million over. I will call on the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance to reduce personal income tax rates of the people of Barbados, give relief to companies and allow money to flow back into the money market so that we will not have to repeal this Act.
3.30 p.m.

Instead of repealing the Act which states that you can borrow money it means that a year has passed and the money has not been repaid and you cannot raise money on the market because the economy is very shaky. The people with the money are very doubtful as to what is going to happen. What the Cabinet should have decided was to reduce the personal income tax, increase spending, reduce corporation and company taxes. The banks are bursting with money and if this was done we would not have to repeal this Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, one has got to seriously look at the type of legislation which is coming into Parliament. I have said before and it is recognised that retroactive legislation is bad legislation. Paragraph 3 of the new Bill also shows the serious situation in which this Government is placed. It states: "Any amount borrowed from the Revenue Equalisation Fund under the Act of 1961 and which at the commencement of this Act has not been repaid in accordance with that Act shall, upon such commencement, be treated as having been withdrawn under section 5 of the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1952." It is a

very dangerous piece of legislation that can cover so many ills that nobody will know in future what has happened to the accounts of this country.

I have heard members who specialise in perusing Government accounts say that the Central Bank is not issuing correct figures. This sort of legislation must support those who say that because everybody knows that there is a system of losing money in accounts. Today the Government is certainly showing all and sundry that all is not well in the Government and its financial position. When we come in here and say there is no money in the Treasury Ministers and members on that side get up and accuse the Opposition of running down Barbados. They say we are preventing people from spending money and investing, but what will this Act do now? We can only say what we suspect, this Act in itself will tell anybody who wants to invest in Barbados that all is not well. The Opposition does not have to say anything now, but time is longer than rope and as much as people on the other side will accuse us of running down the Government they themselves have now brought forward in a Bill sufficient evidence to prove that the Treasury in Barbados is literally empty. It cannot even repay what has been borrowed from fixed funds and therefore in order to escape its legal liability, the Government has repealed the Act which lays down certain guarantees. To make a fund set up by Government repayable within a certain time or to be restored to its original position within a certain time is a system of guarantees, and if you have broken that guarantee and removed that fund anybody is entitled to look and say that something is desperately wrong with the economy of this country.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the Opposition get away with nonsense. I would suggest to the hon. member for St. Peter that instead of repeating himself he should study his papers and then give a reasonable debate. He starts every debate in this Hon. Chamber with remarks about scraping the barrel. This is either a barrel with a lot of money at the bottom or a barrel with a very large bottom because for the last three years he has been making this refrain. If the hon. member for St. Joseph had a clue about what he was talking then he would deserve a reply, but he obviously has got into everything and he is jumping into something which is beyond his depth as soon as he puts his foot in the water. They cannot understand that all the remarks they have made for the time they have made them that this country should have been at a standstill, no Civil Servant should be getting paid, none of the social benefits like school meals

should be continuing, because they have been continually telling the public, not only the local public – I do not mind so much when they say these things to the local public because I know that the local public will deal with them when the time comes – but what does worry me is that in their whole debate today not one of them has produced one financial or fiscal statistic to justify the allegations they are making. Ask the member for St. Joseph how much was borrowed from the fund and how much is due to the fund.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Sir, this is what you call dishonesty.

Mr. SPEAKER: What point of order is that?

Mr. BOLDEN: Because the Minister who introduced it and the Minister who is seeking to say something should produce the figures.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please withdraw the word "dishonesty".

Mr. BOLDEN: I withdraw the word "dishonesty" but he is indulging in cheap politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Politics in which he knows he should provide the answer.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, you get a budget speech and you get a reply and statistics are thrown about by the Opposition. The Pressure Group is talking about the cost of living but no statistics are shown, the Opposition comes in telling the country that the Government is so bankrupt that it is repealing a law to pay back money it has borrowed and is unable to pay back, and yet they cannot tell the public whether the alleged money is one farthing or \$20 million. The Government has brought down legislation in the best interest of the country, but I am really tired of coming into Parliament and hearing that there is nothing this Government has ever brought down to this House that the hon. member for St. James or the member for St. Joseph can find in the interest of the people of Barbados. Yet you read throughout the papers that people who have come here have heard that our international reputation is high, financially and otherwise.

I shall not say any more because when you read Hansard or if this is reported, assuming as I assume that Barbadians are literate and intelligent, what can they find in anything that has been said by the member for St. Joseph or the member for St. Peter which would make

them think that the legislation is wrong legislation? They use all the cliches like scraping the barrel, no money there or that the Government is bankrupt. I am tired of it and if the Opposition wants to be worthy of credit and wants to show that they can run a country with this type of effusion and hot air without any facts to support it they must stop, otherwise the people will deal with them not as serious contenders for office but as poor critics for criticism's sake.

3.40 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I have been listening very carefully to the comments of the Opposition. I want to draw to their attention the fact that the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1952, was introduced by the Labour Party Government in those days, and it is a piece of legislation with which this Government has never agreed to the principle involved. The Revenue Equalisation Fund Act was a means of raising money for hard times, but the millions of dollars which were raised under that Act during the regime of the Barbados Labour Party Government in 1952 were invested abroad through the Crown Agents, but not in developing Barbados.

Now, the policy of the Democratic Labour Party Government is to try and develop Barbados and to utilise whatever funds that are available for the benefit of people locally and not for the benefit of people abroad who have more funds than we have here. We cannot allow our money to be invested at 5% or 6% by the Crown Agents or whoever they are. The millions of dollars that we have abroad under the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act, 1952, are being misspent or badly invested. It is better to invest that money here locally to provide employment for the people and to raise the standards generally. It is all right to talk about unemployment and so on, but the fact is that worldwide we are going through difficult times.

Mr. Speaker, we have inflation, we have the oil crisis, and worldwide conditions are bad. To get here and criticise the Government for calling in and utilising funds which are abroad to be spent locally in the time when things are low is nonsense. There is nothing wrong in doing that. You are not scratching the bottom of anything at all. You are acting sensibly, wisely, and using the money at your disposal to the best possible advantage. It is a change of policy of the Government and that is all. That is the ignorance we hear from time to time.

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

Ayes: Mr. WEEKES; Hon. C. E. TALMA; Hon. A. MORRISON; Hon. P. M. GREAVES; Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE; Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD; Hon. F. G. SMITH; Mr. LOWE; Mrs. EASTMOND and Mr. HOPPIN — 10.

Noes: Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN 2.

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

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

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

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and passed.

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this is the time for me to inquire from the Leader of the House what is the strength of the fund. What amount of money is in the fund at this particular moment? What sums have been withdrawn and have not been repaid in the allotted time and have brought the Government to this point? I would like to know what stands to the credit of the fund at the moment, so that we can gather to what extent it can aid the economy of the country, or can create activity for employment, or to do any of the things which we know the Leader of the House would like us to know are taking place.

We have a very wonderful person playing the role of Leader of this Honourable House in that he must have served every possible Government that has had an opportunity to govern this country for the last quarter of the century or more. When this fund was established by the Government of which he was then a member, that is, the Barbados Labour Party Government, it was then thought to be a wise act of the doers, he being one of the doers. As soon as it is thought now that it was an unwise act, he happens now to be numbered again amongst those who are now considering it to have been an unwise act upon his part. In other words, the part he played and thought was right yesterday, he is now trying to establish that what he did yesterday was wrong. Mr. Chairman, it shows us exactly what shifting sands can do for us.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. In 1952 I was not Minister of Finance or Minister of anything, and for that reason I won an independent seat in 1951. Let us get the record straight. In 1952 I was not a Minister of Finance or a Minister of anything to decide on the policy or to know that the money raised under the Revenue Equalisation Fund would be put in the hands of the Crown Agents and invested at a lower rate of interest, 4½% or 5%, and not used for the benefit and advantage of the people locally and the development of Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. That is a point of explanation.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I could not be so silly as to stand here and accuse the Leader of the House of having been the Minister of Finance in 1952 or at any particular time in his life. One has to be in possession of certain knowledge before one can become a Minister of Finance in any country. The Leader of the House has not yet conveyed to us that he has reached that stage or has ever been in possession of the particular type of knowledge to which I have referred. I could never have accused him of being a Minister of Finance at any time in 1952 or 1956. What the Minister could have risen to tell us is exactly what is the strength of the fund now. I do not know if his Government has any investments abroad, whether in St. Lucia, Dominica, or anywhere else. It is true that we might be withdrawing ourselves from the arms of the Crown Agents to other arms nearer home within the Commonwealth, but investment abroad is investment abroad however one may look at it. It is pointless, to my mind, for the Minister to be trying to hammer home that he wants to do this and that for the local people.

3.50 p.m.

It is pointless for the Minister just to be trying to hammer home that things are being done for the local people. Mr. Chairman, how long is too long that the Leader of the House had when he could have done all he wanted to do for the local people? He had all the time on his hand in which he could have done things for the local people that would have kept them in their jobs rather than have them laid off as the Ministry of Communications and Works has had to do from time to time. Let the Minister understand that all this is ballyhoo and what is now being trotted out will no longer fool the young people of this country. All that his Government had to do they will realise now the time is too far spent, and having done nothing and finding that the chickens are coming home to roost, the Minister

must appreciate that he too being at the end of his tether can now turn to do absolutely nothing for the people of this country. They are fed up, disgusted and distraught and the sooner they can advise that an election be called and let the people settle the issue once and for all, the better it is for all concerned. We now look forward to hearing from the Leader of the House what has been withdrawn, what he expects to withdraw in the near future and what has remained unpaid over the period and how he proposes to invest what is to be withdrawn if there is any left because unless the Minister can give us something tangible on this, we have reason to believe that we are only acting on paper because every cent out of this fund has already been manhandled and used to somebody's advantage and not to the advantage of the local people that the Leader of the House so constantly makes reference to, as though he wants local people to know they are local.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I will do like the member for St. Peter and call on the Leader of the House if he is really sincere to tell us how much money has been borrowed from this fund which has not been repaid. I want to challenge the Leader of the House in the statement he made when the Bill was in second reading.

Some people have very short memories and I do not want to be rude to him, but I want the Leader of the House to understand that when he gets up to make a statement like the one he just make, he is doing himself more damage than he is being brilliant. Whenever he attempts to follow the Minister of Communications and Works he will follow that man down the bottomless pit because as has been said he is sitting down in the graveyard of politics and he thinks he is the natural successor, but he will end up in the bottomless pit. I want the Leader of the House to understand that when he gets up and says that the Act was passed in 1952 and money was invested by the Crown Agents at 4% or 4½% interest, he was part and parcel of that decision because he was in the Cabinet; he was among the pioneers of ministerial Government in Barbados and on his shoulders that rests. At that time he held the post of Minister of Agriculture, and if he thought it was wrong then he could have repealed it then. I taught him agriculture and he cannot deny that.

Mr. Chairman, the great exodus of people from Barbados begun in 1955-56 and in the race riots of 1958 he was part of the Cabinet. Did he know then that we had our money invested by the Crown Agents, and that we wanted employment in Barbados for Barbadians? But it

suits him to talk about bringing home the money now. If he were in England at the time when the black people from the West Indies were being chased around Britain with iron spikes and bicycle chains, he should have put forward in Cabinet that instead of leaving the money in Britain, they should bring it home and find employment for Barbadians in Barbados. It suits him today to say that this Government is not in favour of a policy which he lived under, because as far as I know the Leader of the House has been in a governmental position practically as long as he has been in politics. You know they say that time changes, and as time changes and as political parties change, so too your thoughts change, and it would have been better for the Leader of the House to keep quiet. We do not mind the Minister of Communications and Works. He has already established his position. When things are difficult, he runs and leaves us behind; a coward dog keeps whole bones. He who fights and runs away will live to enjoy another day as far as he is concerned. He is not fighting again; and when he sits in his seat and says he is 51, he was telling me he was forty-four, forty-five and forty-six and he cannot do better and every year he is a year older. This is his excuse as a defender of the faith. When he says that the Opposition cannot give anybody figures, ask him if the Prime Minister has not stood on that side and said that he cannot get figures to which he is entitled as Minister of Finance, and any figures to be published have got to come from those who are in command of the figures which is the Government side. This is a condemnation of the very Cabinet and of the Minister of Communications and his party, because if the Leader of the House had meant to be just and fair to Parliament in introducing the Bill, he would have said that so much money has been borrowed from the fund which has not been paid back and that this is the reason why we are repealing the Act, because we figure the money should be invested here. You do not come with a big Report as was done with the Agricultural Development Corporation and say you will read what you want us to know and that we cannot hear what is in the other part of the Report, and then say that people will think you are a joke party unless you give the statistics.

I heard the member for St. Lucy who is a member of the Trade Union say yesterday that when you ring Government Departments and ask for information you do not get it; or if you write they do not reply, and yet you must come here with figures. The public at large will judge the Minister of Communications and Works for what he is, a joker. He wants to be on the side of

those who are in power. He believes in making fancy speeches, but when the bell rings next time the people outside will judge each and everyone of us, and it is after the polls have been closed that we will know who have been weighed in the scales and found wanting; and I guarantee that he will not be coming back because as I said he is in the graveyard of politics. I will tell him that he must not try to tell the public at large that the Opposition does not know what is going on. He must look at what is fair and decent politics, but some people regard politics as being able to stand on your feet and lie and then ask how they sound. The public outside is not the public of the last ten or fifteen years.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, the hon. member is not making any speech in Committee; that is a second reading speech. He is dealing with section 3, so how can he be trying to abuse me.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, who is he?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both hon. members will take their seats. I will await the hon. member's point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, the speech for the last five or ten minutes by the hon. member for St. Joseph is contrary to the Rules of this House. He is dealing with a specific section of the Bill and because he got lashes on the second reading, he is using this opportunity to reply to me. Let us stick to the Rules, Mr. Chairman. You know the Rules and you always give us a certain degree of latitude, but I am afraid the latitude to abuse me is out of order. You give him an inch and he takes an "L".
4.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, let us stick to the rules; you know them well. Mr. Chairman, you always give us a certain degree of latitude but I think the latitude to abuse me is a bit much. You gave him an inch and he took an "L".....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I am saying that that is absolutely no point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Leader of the House to tell us how much money is due to the Fund. That is what I would like to know. (ASIDE) Mr. Chairman, you know what's wrong with the two of them over there? They are trying to show who will out-do the

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

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

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

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — 3.

BILL TO AMEND POLICE ACT, 1961

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item that we propose to deal with is Item No. 5 standing in my name. It is a Bill to amend the Police Act, 1961. As the Objects and Reasons set out, this Bill would amend the Police Act, 1961, in order to permit the Minister to determine the amount which should be paid as funeral expenses of non-gazetted police officers dying whilst in the Force.

This matter was considered by Cabinet, and Cabinet is of the view that the funeral expenses payable under the Act of 1961–50 should be reasonable expenses of a suitable funeral rather than whatever claim might have been submitted in respect of a funeral, and that the funeral grant normally payable under the National Insurance Scheme should be taken into account.

This matter was referred by the Cabinet to the Police Association, and the views of the Central Committee of the Association are the same as recorded in Section 5 (a) of the Act of 1961–50: "Funeral expenses of the members of the Police Force except gazetted officers dying whilst in the force shall be paid out of the revenue of the island". Notwithstanding that, Sir, the Committee felt, having made enquiries of the various funeral agencies, that the figure of \$1,200 in normal circumstances should be regarded as reasonable. This figure, of course should be negotiated if extraordinary circumstances prevailed.

The rationale of the Central Committee is based on the cost of an average funeral for a policeman and would necessitate a review every three years; but the Cabinet feels that the power should be vested in the Minister to determine the amount which is considered reasonable. The matter has been referred to the Police Association and we have their agreement.

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

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker we are glad that the Government has come around to bringing in a measure of reasonableness in this House. It may be good that they are looking after a policeman when he is dead, but I wonder if the appropriate Minister has given enough thought to the conditions which exist among the police at present while they are living.

The Minister ought to know that there is burning concern as to the reason why no Deputy Commissioner of Police has been appointed. There are many men who have served this country and the Police Force faithfully and yet have been denied promotion. And there is the question of how others have gained very marked success over the heads of those who have not been promoted. These are things which make for considerable dissatisfaction among members of the Force. We believe too that the time has come when consideration must be given to providing greater opportunities for promotion to members attached to the Police Band.

4.20 p.m

The limited scope there is for promotion in the Band leads to grave dissatisfaction amongst the members. They have reached the highest point of their performances, they will continue to educate themselves and to make it known that they have acquired additional qualifications, but all of this apart from bringing in an extra bit of remuneration does not in truth and in fact make for promotion since the old system is still in force.

These are matters we would like the Minister to look into. However, if on this occasion when we hear that the Central Committee of the Police Association has given its approval to the figure of \$1200 for such a purpose as we are discussing here, I do not doubt the Leader of the House in this respect, but it only brings to mind how many occasions we have had when matters pertaining to the Police are brought before this Hon. House and we have been told that whatever was brought had the blessing of the Police Central Committee and what not, and then as soon as we accept what is told to us we find that the Police Central Committee had not given its approval as we had been led to believe. We believe Mr. Speaker, that there may be occasions where the immediate relatives of a deceased member of the Force might not themselves desire to do better than what is provided here and we

Honourable Minister of Education for Chairmanship of the party. That is what they are trying to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely nothing at all to do with the Clause, and I am going to ask hon. members to adhere to Standing Order 33(6), and the hon. member will also contain himself to Clause 3 of this Bill.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, what is all this noise about? Sir, I see the Leader of the House indicates that he is ready to give us the figure. I will give way so that he can tell us how much money.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your time is almost ended.

Mr. BOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, for all the years I have been in here I always thought that a second reading speech deals with the principle of the Bill. I tried to deal with the principle of the Bill in my few remarks in introducing the second reading, and I think that was the proper practice as such from time immemorial, and I hope such practice will continue.

In so far as the actual amount is concerned, it will come under Clause 3 which we are now considering. I intended giving the amount, but when we reached Clause 3.

The exact amount which has been borrowed, Sir, is \$7,475,556.52. That is the amount of money which has been borrowed under the Revenue Equalisation Fund (Temporary Use) Act. So this amount will not be repaid, and will be used for purposes which both the Hon. Minister of Communications and myself indicated.

As far as what moneys are yet in the Fund under the Revenue Equalisation Fund Act of 1952 is concerned, I am afraid I cannot give him that off-hand, because if you want to get the exact figure — and in a matter like this you would have to be exact — you have to ask substantive questions and get chapter and verse. This has to be investigated, and I do not even have the file dealing with this; there are several files on these matters. So that he would have to ask substantive questions to get the exact amount which is still in the Fund — quite a few billion dollars, Sir.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Are we to understand that the Leader of the House comes here to repeal an Act, and he

is without his file? He knows how much money has been borrowed from the Fund they do not intend to pay back; but do you believe the Leader would come here without knowing what remained in the Fund, knowing he borrowed so much?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. HINDS: All right, Sir.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. G. MORGAN, Mr. WEEKES, His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND and Hon. F. G. SMITH — 10.

Noes: Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. C. L. BOLDEN — 2.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: 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 and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported to Mr. SPEAKER who resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

4.10 p.m

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the Bill be read a third time.

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

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

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

Noes: Mr. MOTTLEY, Mr. HINDS and Mr. BOLDEN — 3.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill do now pass and be cited as THE REVENUE EQUALISATION FUND (TEMPORARY USE) (REPEAL) ACT, 1975.

are hoping that this decision will not put any hindrance in the way of a person's relatives.

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. A. MORRISON, Mr. SPEAKER, left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

The Clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Item stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is Item 3 on the Order Paper.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF PARCELS OF LAND IN THE LAKES FOLLY/EMMERTON LANE, ST. MICHAEL AREA

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this matter deals with the acquisition of land at Emmerton Lane, Bridgetown. This had been the subject of much comment not so long ago, and the land is required for the purpose of siting in that area the sewerage treatment plant for Bridgetown. According to this Resolution there are 23 parcels of land involved.

A survey has been carried out in that area by the Town Planning Office and also by the National Housing Corporation which also has land in that area. According to the survey carried out by the National Housing Corporation it has been revealed that 163 units sited on these private lands will have to be removed in order to make way for the treatment plant. Some of the houses, according to the survey, can be removed from the site and some are in such poor condition that they will have to be destroyed. In such cases of course Government will pay a fair compensation to the owners of houses which will have to be destroyed. Government will also have to

undertake the responsibility in assisting all those persons who have to be removed from the area to another site where they will be relocated. This is a good opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to do something for the people of that area who have been living in poor conditions for quite some time.

The area is subject to flooding. It is low lying, and because it is low lying drainage is very poor, and this is an opportunity for another reason, that is, that the resiting of these people will form part of a total project of the treatment plant so that some assistance can be expected from that international agency which will be financing the setting up of the treatment plant. As I said earlier, there are 23 parcels of land involved, privately owned, as is set out in the Schedule to the resolution. It is thought best rather than carry out an arrangement of private treaty to acquire these lands by using the Land Acquisition Act because of the many parcels of land involved and because of the fact that we have been advised by the Crown Solicitor that some of them involved will not be able to get a good title, so we will use the Land Acquisition Act.

4.30 p.m.

I know, Mr. Speaker that this is a matter which could generate some debate but I think it is a worthwhile matter myself.

I move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. MOTTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is indeed gratifying to hear some sort of statement coming from the Minister involved in relation to the project which the Government is undertaking in this area and what will happen to the people. The Minister states that there are 163 houses involved in this project, but I do not think it has ever been stated what effect the establishment of the Plant will have on the other houses in this particular area. After listening to the Minister, it would appear as though there are 163 houses which must be moved for the purpose of establishing the Plant, but it is not clear whether or not other houses will also have to be moved.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter because, from my understanding of the situation, the people in the area are somewhat anxious to know what is going to happen to them. I think that the residents in the area would welcome a statement by the Minister in relation to a time table. I have been approached by several people saying that they want to do this and that to their property, but they want to know whether they

are among those listed to be removed and so on. At this stage, I think it would be in the interest of the residents of the area if the Ministries involved would state quite clearly the names of the families in the 163 houses who would have to be removed and also what provision would be made in respect of these families.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of persons living in that area who are closely related. There are also a number of old people who have lived there for several years. As the Minister has said, some of the houses are in very bad condition and, probably, cannot be moved. He says that they will be paid a fair compensation. I hope that they will be paid adequate compensation, and, in addition to the compensation, I hope that the Government has some sort of plan for the siting of all of these people whose homes cannot be removed so that they will be given houses as soon as their homes are broken down. I hope that the Government is not expecting to give them \$800 or \$900 and expect them to go and buy new homes. I would like an assurance and an undertaking from the Minister that, in cases where houses cannot be moved and will be destroyed, the Government will not only pay the people \$800 or \$900. Obviously, if a house cannot be moved and will have to be destroyed, then it means that the house is in such bad condition it will not be worth very much. The Government should see to it that such persons are given priority in the Government Housing Schemes and should not be left by this Government with \$800 or \$900 cash in their hands looking around to purchase a house in this day and age.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the names of the persons who will have to move. I would like the Minister to state what houses other than the 163 houses in that area will have to be moved, as a result of the establishment of the Plant. If that is the case, then I think that the Ministries should publish a list of the persons who would have to move. We have heard of reports being done by the Ministry of Health, the Town and Country Planning Department, and the Ministry of Housing. At this stage the Ministries must be aware of the names of those families who will have to move from the area. I feel that these people should be told at an early stage what the Government plans to do with them. In the case of those people who will have their homes destroyed, I think that the Government should not only give them compensation, but it is imperative that adequate housing accommodation should be provided for them before they are called upon to move.

Mr. Speaker, you will find in that particular several families. I feel that in cases where the people are not moving of their own choice but by an act of the Government, every effort should be made on the part of the Government to have the families resited so that they will not be broken into small units. In other words, you should not send a portion of the family to Silver Hill, Christ Church, a portion to Redman's Village, a portion to Lodge Hill, or the Farm. That would be unfair to the residents. They did not ask to be moved, but this is something the Government is doing. The Government has undertaken the project of resiting a number of people. I daresay that before the project is finished the number of houses that will have to be removed will be in the vicinity of 250 instead of the 163 which the Minister has mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, even 163 homes with a family of three or four, at least, will indicate that you are dealing with well over 500 to 600 people and I think that these people should be given every possible consideration. From the point of view of the time schedule I think the people should be told how soon the Government intends to move them, and what is the time table for doing this. This is going to affect the children who are going to school. You are moving a community and not two or three people. I hope that every effort will be made by the various agencies of the Government to assist the people in readjusting themselves to their new environments. This may be done through the Welfare Department or the Community Department. This is where all the agencies of the Government must now come into play even before these persons are moved in order to assist and acclimatise them to the whole idea of what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, the people do not know what is happening. I would like to see a full and frank statement from the Ministers involved as regards the time table; the full proposals; a published list of the names of those persons who are affected; circulars should be sent to those persons who will have to move, and they should be told what is proposed to be done for them. You should tell the people that you are prepared to pay the complete expenses for moving and resiting their houses on land and so on.

4.40 p.m.

I think the Government should send out circulars or something to the people giving them the undertakings that I have asked for. I do not intend to make this any long debate nor even to make it a personal debate, but I ask the Minister to remember that he is dealing with human beings in a large community that are being resited, not three or four, but a complete

community; people who have been living together as friends and family for years. I think I am told that in one case there are 234 who are inter-related in the area. This is one of the problems that we have to deal with, and this is where the Social Welfare Department and the Community Officers should be inside the area at the moment dealing with these things and telling the people what is going to happen to them.

One of the questions that will come to mind is the question of schools. When these people are resited, what proposals are going to be made for assistance for them? In cases of children going to comprehensive schools, will the Ministry involved look at the position? If people are moved from that area to country areas, if a child is attending Ellerslie or St. Leonard's school and is moved to some place in Christ Church or St. George, will the Minister give the undertaking to the families of those children that they are going to be guaranteed entry into those schools? All these are problems that the people are interested in, and I would like to have a full statement from the Minister. I think the Minister should have no objections, and I would lend whatever assistance I can to the Government in this matter, because if it is the only way that the residents of the area will ever get better housing, then never let it be said that I stood in the way of their getting better housing, better living conditions for my own benefit. Whatever assistance I can give I will be prepared to give the Government in this matter.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the question of displacement of people from their traditional homes has always been a tedious affair and burdensome. I remember early in 1965 before I ever thought of entering politics I had a discussion with a particular member on the other side about the system of housing which I believe Barbados should embark upon. I believe this is one of the cases in which the Government should use this opportunity, if they have to remove people from any given area, and particularly this area, to think carefully of the method of removal and how they are going to resite the inhabitants of that area. I have always firmly believed that if you establish a housing area, no matter how good the construction, no matter the environment in which the area is situated, if you move people from a particular area and place them *en bloc* in that area you are going to perpetrate the same behaviour patterns. I believe this is what we should try to get away from in this particular move.

Many of us who practise law in the courts know what it is daily to get parties out of the

housing areas coming before the courts on charges of indecent language and you as a practising attorney, even if you have not been actually involved in any of these cases have heard the charges. My belief is that the Government should look upon this move as a method of uplifting the society. Do not look at an old house and say it is worth \$200 or \$300 and give the respective owners that sum and send them astray. There are a series of landlord and tenants cases which are coming before the Magistrates Courts now. They are repeatedly referred to the Housing Authority who tell them that they will give them a spot or a house at a later date. I believe the Government should regard a person's house as his home and not as a house worth \$500, and my concept of the move is that Government should take some sort of census of the people who have got to be removed from the area and make provision for the number of homes. They should know how many houses are incapable of being re-erected and provide a number of apartments, houses or whatever you care to call them for these people and you should give these people a choice as to where they want to go, because it is through Government's action that they are going to be removed. A person may own a house, the roof begins to leak or the side begins to fall in, but it is human nature that he feels it is his and he owes nobody for it and he will endure the weather. If Government has got to remove these people, they should be given some sort of choice. If a person wants to go and live at Wildey, the Government should be able to provide in that housing area for that person and give him an opportunity of having a proper re-settlement due to Government's disruption of his previous home. If that is done I believe we will get over the problem of all these quarrels of resiting people.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is this: resiting people also brings with it the problem of schools for the children, and this is something which I believe should always be looked upon. Removing a child from a particular school in an area and sending it to another school is going to cause some sort of set back to the child unless it is done at a particular period, and I believe that the children should be removed in a sufficient time that they can become acclimatised to the area and make friends in the area so that when they go to the new school they can enter feeling at home with children they know, rather than moving them in the middle of January or February and pushing them within the next week in a school where they have no connections or friends. I believe the Government should think along those lines in resiting people and not take a bunch of people from one area and put them

into another area and hope that that is good enough. I think we have to be a little more conscientious as to what people will want. You should think of how we would feel if we were uprooted from our homes and taken somewhere else with our children. Recently I have been hearing complaints from people applying for spots. I do not know what the arrangements will be, but I would like to hear what the Minister has to say on that aspect of it.

4.50 p.m.

I still believe that if the Government is going to resite you, we should not go on with this rental pattern in wooden houses today. If you are going to resite them, I believe the Government should have a particular area, offer those who do not have houses to move, one or two or three alternatives; those whose houses cannot be removed offer two or three alternatives and let them do the administrative work as to resiting, so that people would know well in advance where they are going and they will be able to settle in without the usual acrimony which arises; because I believe the Minister of Housing is well aware of this, that when you go in a housing area for some time if you bring somebody into court from that area, you hear 'from the time I move in there I never used to speak to him.' You hear that sort of thing. I believe this is one of the reasons why the Housing areas as areas have not taken on as they should have taken on.

In 1965, I went to Martinique and one of the peculiar situations which there is in Martinique which I love very well, is that when Government put up a block of housing they do not take all the people from one given area in this particular case and put them in this block of flats. They put a carpenter, they may put a scavenger, a school teacher, and a doctor; but they break up that situation, so that you do not get the same environment being moved from one section of the country and plumped into the other one; and this is what I would like to see done, because, believe you me, you pass through the housing areas, Mr. Speaker, and the language you hear coming out of the housing area!

Again, I would say this. I believe the Government's policy should be a little bit more rigorous when it comes to housing areas. I believe you should set up what is called Housing Committees, made up of the people who live in the housing areas. There should be a standard of behaviour and if you are going to subsidize housing at a cheap rate, people should be made to appreciate the housing; but you cannot do it if you take all the people from one place and put them down in the other place, because you will

get the same sort of behaviour that you moved from one area, in the other area. All you would be doing is removing the people but you bring the area, its environment and everything together.

I would like to see the Government look at this seriously and make this as an example of a new concept of rehousing people.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I heard it being said that this is one of the best speeches made by the hon. member for St. Joseph. He has made a very good speech, he has made very good suggestions. Most of it is nothing new because some of it has been tried in housing before, as for example, Housing Committees. That has been tried before and did not succeed.

The point made about the housing of different structures of society in Martinique is noted, but I think it must be remembered that France has a more integrated society than the British which we have inherited, and I cannot see the scavenger and the doctor in Barbados, certainly at this time, occupying the same block of flats in a housing area. We have to be realistic. However desirable it may be — and I do not want to throw cold water on it as an idea but I want to make this point absolutely clear — I believe if he wants a levelling off of society, that perhaps this is the kind of thing that should be done, but he cannot get it done in a British structured society outside of its totalitarian regime. You are going to have to force people to live in this way, and Mr. Speaker, in the absence of this forcing and coercing people to live this way, it is not going to work. We have to be realistic. However desirable it may be it is not going to work.

I want to say this in respect of the hon. member for the City. I can very well understand his concern, and what is more I think the assurances he has sought from the Government are very reasonable. The chances are that we will have to resite many more than the 163 houses or whatever it might be mentioned here earlier. But whatever that may be, I want to make this clear that the Government will undertake the operation as painlessly as is possible.

The Government does not place a greater value on a treatment plant than it does on people. As far as this Government is concerned it is people who matter, and people must come first. And I want again to give this assurance that everything will be done to make the relocation, the resiting or whatever it might be, whatever you may care to call it — the moving of these people from one area to another or to other areas — we haven't got that much land area that we

can give people several choices of where they would like to go; and, I agree with the hon. member for St. Joseph that when you resite people *en bloc* from one substandard area to another it will not be long before that area will also become run down because of the various habits and so on of the people. These are known facts.

However that may be, we will do all in our power, as I said earlier; the Government will do all in its power to try to assist these people when they have to be removed, to move from one area to another. I am not in a position now to give any time table as to when the removal will start. For one thing, we will have to acquire a couple of areas of land on which to remove these people. There are some areas that we already have in mind, and I am not now in a position to give — at least within this forum — to give the names of these persons who will have to be resited; but when the time comes, when all the plans have been made for the resiting of these people, they will know long in advance what they will be required to be moved, from the area, of the area to which they are going, and that all efforts will be made to assist them in their moving.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business.

QUESTION TIME

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

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

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Question standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, because of the condition of my throat I will not be able to add supplementaries as I would like.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh! I see. Just call the numbers.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker. 273.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is the wish of the hon. member that they all be laid — is that his wish?

Mr. HINDS: That is what I was asking Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections the Replies to all of these questions will be laid. Nos: 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279 and 280, all asked by the hon. member for St. Peter.

There being no objections permission is hereby granted to lay the replies to these questions.

5.00 p.m.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker in view of the decision just taken, I am pleased to lay the replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279 and 280.

Mr. SPEAKER. Question Time is now ended.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker in accordance with the undertaking which I gave earlier, hon. members can proceed with Private Members' Business.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Private Members' Business Time. (Pause)

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 4th February, at 12 noon.

Mrs. EASTMOND: I beg to second that.

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

5.04 p.m