

## House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971-76

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 27th January, 1976.*

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

## PRESENT

His Honour C. A. E. HOPPIN, J.P. (Speaker); Hon. C. E. TALMA, C.B.E., (Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the House); Mr. R. ST.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Mr. W. R. LOWE, J.P., (Chairman of Committees); His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, (Deputy Speaker); Mr. W. C. B. HINDS; Mr. L. S. CRAIG; Mr. J. B. SPRINGER; Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B.; Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, O.B.E.; 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 Communications and Works); Hon. A. MORRISON, (Minister of Agriculture, Science and Technology); Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, B.A., M.A.(Econ.), (Minister of Health and Welfare); and Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.

*Prayers were read.*

## MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 20th January, 1976 have been circulated and are before you for your confirmation. There being no amendments or corrections.....

Mr. HINDS: I must address myself to Your Honour as Speaker, but these Minutes at page 4 line 10 suggest that the election of a Speaker was not conducted in accordance with the requirements of Standing Order 2. I believe, Sir,

that it may be argued that as long as His Excellency the Governor General has assented to it that it will be considered a nomination of this Hon. House and that his assent cures all defects, but nevertheless one ought to bear in mind, and particularly so this Hon. House ought not to be seen or to appear to be requesting His Excellency's assent to wrongdoing knowingly.

I believe that it is an affront to His Excellency's prerogative, I believe it is an insult to his intelligence and also further it is an attempt to show how well a majority of this Hon. House can abuse the privileges accorded this Hon. House.

I would move at this stage, Mr. Speaker, that this Hon. House before it proceeds with any other business this day set about to regularise for its own good, for the benefit of the record and for Your Honour's own security the election of the Speaker of this Hon. House. One thing one has got to bear in mind is that on the 20th January there was not a case where any second person had been nominated for the Office of Speaker.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I had been under the impression that it was a question of the confirmation of the Minutes. I am surprised that you have allowed the hon. member to speak this long, but up to this point I have not heard it contended that these Minutes are inaccurate. What the hon. member is doing is contesting a procedure which to my mind is completely out of order. He is not only challenging what is in fact a previous ruling by you, he is not challenging the validity or the authenticity of the Minutes, but the accuracy of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have asked for the confirmation of the Minutes and that is what is before us now. Any further discussion will have to come at some other time.

Mr. GRAIG: Mr. Speaker, my understanding from the hon. member for St. Peter's address to you is out of the confirmation of the Minutes. This is what he is leading up to. The Minister of Housing is seeking to tell the member how he must set about to address the Chair and how he is to agree or disagree with the confirmation of the Minutes. This is what I understand the hon. member is doing, leading up to either agreeing or disagreeing with the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is taken. There seems to be some ruling and I am giving the ruling now that there will be no alteration of what has taken place. The question that the Minutes be confirmed....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I believe I have a right in this Hon. House and I am sure that Your Honour will be the last person to set about to deprive me of exercising that right.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have no intention of depriving anyone.

Mr. HINDS: The point is that I was addressing the Chair, the Hon. Minister of Housing rose on a point of order, as soon as he sat the hon. member for St. James rose and I think in fairness to me I ought to be allowed to continue making the point I am making.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled that that debate be discontinued, that this is a true account of what took place and that the Minutes be confirmed. I realise that you are not regarding the decision made by the Speaker and that has already been decided upon and it will remain. There will be no change or alteration nor can you question it.  
12.20 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you are being misled on this matter. It is not for you to say whether or not they will be changed. That is a matter for the House and not for the Speaker. Your election as Speaker does not give you any right to encroach on the rights of hon. members of this House, and because you are Speaker you are not the House. That must be borne in mind, Sir.

This is the same type of behaviour that caused me to be on my feet now. The same type of behaviour. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member to make his point.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hope.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. What is before us? You have already ruled on this. What are we dealing with?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you are being told that you have ruled. On what?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James got up and denied the accuracy of the Minutes, and I give him time for so doing.

Mr. CRAIG: Did I question the accuracy of the Minutes, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry. It was the hon. member for St. Peter who was addressing the House, and at this stage I rule that there will be no further discussion because you said that they are not accurate Minutes of what took place and you have questioned the confirmation of the Minutes. At this stage I have ruled that confirmation of these Minutes – will you please take your seat.

Mr. BOLDEN: With all due respect, I want to deal with the accuracy of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Those in favour please say "aye" (*Asides*).

Mr. BOLDEN: I am rising on the point of the incorrectness of the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I hear the hon. member for St. Joseph?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I was addressing the Chair. He has not risen on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what he said. I heard that.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if I may point to Page 4 of the Minutes after "time 12.45 p.m." I believe that we are.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I did not rise on a point of order. I rose to continue my address to the Chair. The hon. member has not risen on a point of order. The point is that you have stated while standing on your feet that I have denied the accuracy of the Minutes and stated that it is not a true record. Nowhere can it be found, if reference is made to the Reporter that I made any such charge. So I am submitting that Your Honour's interpretation of what I have said up to the present does not measure up to what the hon. member for St. Peter has said or intended saying up to this point; and Your Honour is now denying me the opportunity to continue my address and allowing another hon. member to

address you. If that is so, I have got to enquire what is Your Honour's assessment of my presence in this Hon. House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am denying no one.

Mr. HINDS: I would like to urge upon you, Sir, since you have got an intimation that another hon. member from this side is rising to question some parts of the Minutes, that confirmation of these Minutes be deferred in the circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this point, if....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Hon. members must have a right to say that the Minutes are not accurate, and I want to make it clear that the Minutes are not accurate.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member for St. Peter to prove or show where the error is in the Minutes. If he can prove that then we will defer the Minutes if necessary. I am willing to hear the hon. member for St. Joseph, and after that the question will be put. (*Asides*)

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, you are telling me that you are challenging me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Two hon. members are on their feet. Both will please sit.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, if we look under Election of Speaker, there was no motion in this House that the hon. member for St. George North do take the Chair of this House as Speaker. What the Leader of the Government said was that "I nominate you as Speaker". So, this is an incorrect statement written there.

The second point after "time 12.45 p.m. during the suspension of the sitting, Mr. Speaker elect was approved by His Excellency the Governor-General". That cannot go into the Minutes at all. It never took place in this House. These are the Minutes of this House. A statement has got to be read either by the Leader of the House or somebody from the Governor General that Your Honour was confirmed as Speaker of this House.

The Minutes are incorrect. I am nothing to do with the fallacious argument or the fallacious situation which existed in putting you in the Chair; but when we are confirming Minutes they have to be a true record of what took place in this Chamber and nowhere else. I would like to know how this got in here; because I do not know that Your

Honour has been confirmed as Speaker by the Governor-General yet. If the Clerk knows, then he is God Almighty. It shows what is going on behind the scenes in this House. I believe that Your Honour should check the record of the Reporters and see what was said by the Leader of this House last week Tuesday because there was no motion that Your Honour do now take the Chair.

That was the whole argument, that if there is a Deputy Speaker, how can you ask somebody else to take the Chair. So, this is wrong. The Minutes are wrong and incorrect. Get that straight. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: May I hear the hon. member for St. Peter.

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member has made reference to the Governor General. That is the point that I wanted to lead up to. Now you have heard it and you are asking me to repeat it. I do not come in here to repeat things.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. On this matter of the confirmation of the Minutes I said that the statement under Election of Speaker "Mr. L. S. Craig spoke" is incorrect. Mr. Craig spoke on a point of order. Reference to the Reporters will show that. Mr. Craig spoke on a point of order and asked what are we doing. Erskine May points out that election to fill a vacancy has to be observed in the same manner as an original election. That is on Page 272, that it has to be done in the same form.

Mr. Craig pointed out on a point of order that the Clerk should have received the nominations. The Minutes then omit to show that you ruled upon Mr. Craig's point of order. The Minutes do not have that. You ruled that Mr. Craig was incorrect or that in fact that Mr. Erskine May was not correct because the Clerk did not give you the advice that would assist you in the matter; and the Clerk, not having advised you, now omits the whole transaction from the Minutes.

I also then rose and objected because I said that no opportunity had been given for making nominations because the hon. member for St. James had spoken on a point of order and you ruled on what I said; and that is also deleted from the Minutes. That will be found in the record of what the Reporter has written. I objected to you putting the question. Under the rules, Sir, the hon. member for St. James could not have spoken on a nomination, and in those

circumstances there could not be a debate unless there is another nomination.

12.30 p.m.

He could only have risen to make a nomination, or to speak on a point of order. He could not have risen and spoken, and I am sure the procedure will show that he spoke on a point of order. It will show that I said that no opportunity had been given to us for another nomination because the hon. member was speaking on a point of order. There is also another point, Sir. I cannot remember how His Excellency's approval was communicated to the House. Erskine May says that the Speaker elect has to communicate it. I cannot remember when that was done, and the Minutes give me no assistance. It may very well be that (a) it was not communicated; (b) the Leader of the House had properly communicated it, or (c) that Your Honour, whether the election was valid or not, communicated it. For the Minutes to say something that happened outside the House should not take part in our Minutes, as the hon. member for St. Joseph will show.

I am respectfully submitting that reference to the record of the House will show all the mistakes in the Minutes. I would not say obvious infelicities. I am respectfully submitting that these Minutes be returned to the Clerk for the proceedings at the start of the House to be correctly recorded. I move that these Minutes be returned to the Clerk and his attention drawn to the entry "Mr. L. S. Craig spoke", and the omission of the points further raised by Mr. J. M. G. M. Adams and his attention drawn to the italicized words "*During the suspension of the Sitting Mr. Speaker elect was approved by His Excellency the Governor-General.*" His attention should be drawn to the omission as to who actually declared the approval of the Speaker.

You, Sir, have had the privilege of presiding over meetings of the Northern District Council, I believe, and I am sure that you have presided outside of Parliament in an over-heated political atmosphere at many Committee Meetings every year. You have been in here for 10 years, and you should know that Minutes are a fundamental part of the business of any organisation. Once you get into the habit of allowing the Secretary to write wrong Minutes and approve them, then some day somebody will take up the Minutes and say: "Look what kind of idiots we have in the House of Assembly! Look what idiots were there; look what idiots were there on that day, and look what idiots signed the Minutes or wrote them." When they can compare the Minutes with the record, they will see that the Minutes are wrong. (*Asides.*)

I hear some talk about hair-splitting. A majority can always talk about hair-splitting. This is no splitting of hairs where something has been universally acknowledged as having been false and wrong, according to the tradition of Parliament, has taken place. If everything is hair-splitting for the Government, then the people will have to judge that these Minutes are wrong. We made a mistake last week, and we are now compounding it by seeking to write Minutes that conceal the mistake.

The Clerk who should have told you what to do and who should have altered the error of allowing you to take the Chair and to preside over your own election and to say: "I was elected" — something that is so contrary to the history of Parliament, that it is hardly conceivable to me that it has happened! The Clerk who should have done all of that has written Minutes now which, perhaps, he hopes will hide things from future generations. The record will be there; the Hansard will be there, and it is time that the House pulls itself together, correct the Minutes, and decide whether or not it made a mistake. There will be a Motion about that, anyhow, in the fullness of time. (*Asides.*)

I am dealing with page 272 of the old Edition of Erskine May. You can refer to that and see whether Erskine May is wrong or Chezley Boyce is wrong. That was drawn to my attention by the former Speaker of a Parliament much greater than this. He telephoned me to ask how could a mistake like that be made in the Barbados House of Assembly. That was drawn to my attention by somebody who, I believe, is neutral in this matter. (*Asides.*) It was neither Sir Theodore Brancker, Mr. Asquith Phillips, nor Sir Stanley Robinson who, I do not believe, would know. It was not anybody in Barbados. I am speaking of a greater Chamber than exists in Barbados. (*Asides.*) I do not have to say who it is, but I will tell you privately.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ADAMS: I am moving that the Minutes be referred to the Clerk for correction.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage I...

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you put the question, Sir....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not putting any question. I am making a statement. I am referring these Minutes, and I would ask that the Clerk looks into this whole matter again.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If I am in order, Sir. As Leader of the House, I think you should, at least, grant me the indulgence of saying a few words. I am not trying to correct you. I have not had an opportunity of saying a word yet, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Go ahead.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not impolitely jumping up and trying to interrupt people, but it does not mean that I do not have anything to say. I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in certain respects. I also agree that the hon. member for St. James spoke on a point of order, to the best of my knowledge, but to say that I did not make a motion is not so. I spoke, and I could have spoken in more glowing terms of Your Honour, the Speaker, but I reserved a certain amount with the intention of congratulating you at a later stage. What actually happen was that I was denied the opportunity. Your Honour made the declaration as to what...

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member cannot....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, what? I am explaining what happened.

Mr. BOLDEN: He cannot ask me on a point of order, what?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am listening to you. May I hear your point of order.

Mr. BOLDEN: The hon. member cannot deny what is written here by saying nobody gave him the opportunity of moving a motion. I spoke on what was done here. If the hon. member forgot to do it, then he must accept what is written here.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is taken.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has the knack of misunderstanding everything I say. I spoke in glowing terms of you, and I made a motion.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The hon. member has the knack of not understanding anything.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! You may proceed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I spoke in favour of your nomination and made a motion. The hon. member for St. James spoke on a point of order and then, as far as my memory serves me, the hon. member for St. Michael West joined in. That

is the omission I see here. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct in certain respects, but he has even forgotten that the hon. member for St. Michael West had spoken after the hon. member for St. James.

In so far as our journey to Government House and our return from Government House — this is what I was speaking on and you misunderstood me — when we came back in, normally, I intended congratulating Your Honour, making a speech, and declaring what had gone on at Government House, but you denied me the opportunity of doing it because you made the declaration. I thought it was really peculiar, because you were Deputy Speaker, then you were Speaker, and you were already carrying on all through. The Standing Orders....

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, again. The hon. member has no right to explain what he intended to do. What we are dealing with is what we see in the Minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is settled. I have ruled that the Minutes of the 20th January, 1976, be deferred.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, with very great respect to your ruling, I....

Mr. SPEAKER: That matter is closed. Order!

Mr. GRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am under the impression that there is a motion that the Minutes be deferred, and not that you deferred the minutes. I would like to put the record right again. You had better seek the advice of the Clerk at the Table.  
12.40 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I made that motion, and it ought to be seconded and put to the vote. I want to start you off on the right foot in the early morning of your term of office. Do not take bad advice to get you seasoned in wrong doing. We do not want that for you. We want to have the highest respect for you from the very earliest hour.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In seconding the motion moved by the hon. member for St. Peter, I just want to make this clear. This is an unusual happening for which the Standing Orders do not make provision.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have ruled and that is the end of the matter.

The Question is that the Minutes for Tuesday, 20th January 1976 be deferred.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am submitting to you that the proper motion to be put to the House is that confirmation of the Minutes be deferred, because we know all the circumstances that led up to this. That I am submitting is the proper motion, but that it be deferred to the Clerk or whoever does not arise. We know the circumstances and your only motion I submit is that the confirmation of these Minutes be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was the understanding.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I would like to know whether the motion is that further consideration of the Minutes be deferred. Is that what Your Honour said?

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is that confirmation of the Minutes of 20th January, 1976 be deferred.

*The question "that confirmation of the Minutes for Tuesday, 20th January, 1976 be deferred", was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the Accounts and Statement for the month of September, 1975, prepared by the Accountant General.

#### DOCUMENTS LAID

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded to lay the following:

The Nineteenth Annual Report and Statement of Accounts of the Transport Board for the year ended 30th September, 1974.

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

1. The Resolution to grant the sum of \$90,037 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1975-76, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1975-76, No. 32, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
2. The Resolution to authorise the Government to enter into a Contract of

Guarantee with the United States Agency for International Development for a loan of \$1,360,000 U.S. to the University of the West Indies.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask for leave to deal with the second Resolution in all its stages at a later stage today. It is very important to get this in order to comply with their work arrangements - I refer to the University of the West Indies - in order to facilitate them in getting this loan, and for Barbados to guarantee its part of this particular loan programme along with the Mona Campus and the Campus at St. Augustine. Copies of this Resolution are available and I will ask that it be circulated.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

The Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Farm Road, St. Peter, for the purposes of constructing a well, and pumping station.

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

A Bill to amend the Electrical Wiremen (Licensing) Act, 1974.

I also give notice of my intention to seek permission to deal with this Bill in all its stages today.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I think that advantage is being taken of this situation where a request is sought to deal with a matter in all its stages, the Opposition not having seen the particular Bill in many instances. If a request is going to be made for any such opportunity to debate whatever it is, it ought to be in the hands of the Opposition before Your Honour is asked to give assent to this being done for it to be debated in all its stages.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received from the Leader of the House a request for permission to deal with a Resolution and I understand that this Resolution had been circulated to all hon. members long before he made mention of it here. If you have not received your copy of the Bill probably it could be questioned, but I have received mine; but the Bill which the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works spoke about was circulated to me.

Mr. HINDS: If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, it is being taken that you are not only the first

among equals under the circumstances, but that you have no equals at the same time, because my point is simply that, not that you must refuse or grant permission as the case may be, but it is common decency which dictates that if you are to give permission to debate a Bill in all its stages, the right of the minority is being denied at that particular moment.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I point out that the hon. member is seeking leave; leave has not been granted as yet.

Mr. HINDS: We appreciate that.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was just correcting the hon. member that to which the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works referred was circulated. If you have not received yours a query should be made. The Leader of the House is seeking leave to deal with some other Resolution and that leave has not been granted yet.

Mr. HINDS: So then exactly where are we? Who has leave up to the present, the Leader of the House or the Minister of Communications and Works?

Mr. SPEAKER: I will just make the point clear. You said that the Opposition should have these Bills in their possession for some time, and I was letting you know that I was aware that the Bill referred to by the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works had been circulated at an earlier date. Leave has just been asked for to deal with a Resolution.

Mr. BOLDEN: If you are talking about the document that came to me yesterday, a Bill to amend the Electrical Wiremen (Licensing) Act, 1974, I do not think that 4 o'clock yesterday evening was an earlier date. If my colleague has not received his, I can see why he has not received it, but I had this coming to me at the last minute, and when we are asked to deal with specific matters in all their stages, I consider it bad because on several occasions the Opposition has not had a chance to prepare the matter properly to make a worthwhile contribution, and it can be seen in the limited time in which we are given notice of these documents and the contribution we make always result in coming back to the House for an amendment which we pointed in the early stages. Looking at this Bill I see it contains a provision which I pointed out to the Minister of Communications at the time when the main Bill was going through the House.

12.50 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: At this stage the question is that leave be granted to the Leader of the House to deal with this Resolution in all its stages today. I want to be sure that leave can be granted. (*A pause*)

There being no objection leave is granted.

Is it also your pleasure that the Bill be dealt with in all its stages?

Also there being no objection, leave is granted. You may proceed.

#### NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the question is as follows:-

"Has the carrying on of a daily newspaper been approved by the Minister of Finance as a development enterprise for the purpose of the Barbados Development Bank Act, Chapter 323?"

#### FIRST READING OF BILLS

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill to amend the Electrical Wiremen (Licensing) Act, 1974 (Act 1974-4) be now read a first time.

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

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

#### ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The Clerk called for Oral Replies to Questions.

Mr. HINDS: Yes, Sir; but I have been following the order of Business quite clearly as announced by the Clerk and I was struck to find that when he got to (d) Messages from His Excellency the Governor-General, that there was no Message through the Chair to this Honourable House that His Excellency the Governor-General had given assent to Your Honour's nomination as Speaker, and when he got to Ministerial Statements from Ministers, I was struck then to find that there was a total omission from the records of this Honourable House of Messages to this effect, and I am querying this, Sir. I would like to know something from some Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: On that same point of order, Sir, we should not in my submission have

passed that point because the proper procedure as indicated by Erskine May is that after the House has elected a Speaker, it is not at the same sitting that the approbation of His Excellency or the Monarch, whoever it is, is announced, but that the new Speaker himself at the next sitting announces to the House that he has been approved of, and at that stage acknowledges or gives the House thanks or whatever. The only difference between the procedure at the start and the procedure in a vacancy is that when a vacancy has been filled you do not say that you are going to uphold the privileges because the privileges have already been claimed. That is what Erskine May indicates.

There are various other things which the Clerk could have found and shown Your Honour, which have not been followed, and we can only take it if we have no Message from the Governor-General today being a new sitting, we can only take it that he has not approved Your Honour's election as Speaker. We cannot take it as anything else.....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have come back again on this. I made it clear that when we came back in from Government House, Your Honour as Speaker did make a declaration. I would have spoken on it, but as you spoke and made a declaration to that effect, I said nothing. We did not want to say one thing twice.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, what worries me is the contention of the Leader of the House about what he intended to do but what has not been done by anybody in this House....

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am saying Your Honour made a declaration to that effect; I gave way and said nothing. I am not excusing myself.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am talking about what has not been done. It worries me even more about the attitude of the Clerk of the House to circumvent the Rules of this Chamber and I would like to find out, if not now, or quite shortly, who gives instructions to the Clerk and who is the guiding light in this Chamber because if we read Standing Order No. 10, Order of Business, "unless the House otherwise directs the Business of each sitting day shall be transacted in the following order."

There is no motion. I have not known since I have been in here that the House agreed

to the amendment of the Orders of the Day. Therefore it is incumbent upon the Clerk to call every Head that is set out in the Standing Orders, and then the House will decide what it will do and what it will not do, and, since December this Clerk has over and over and over circumvented these Rules as if to throw them through the window.

It is time somebody tells the Clerk in plain open language that he is a servant of the House and he has to follow the procedures and the Rules of the House and not what he thinks or what somebody outside tells him. This is exactly what has got to be done.

1.00 p.m.

I am part of the House and I have to uphold the traditions of this House and if he as a lawyer cannot read the rules it is time he is changed. Every day you are missing something, even today. Why miss out something? Ask the Shorthand Reporter to check it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been following the Order of Business. The Clerk called Papers; Government Notices; Private Members' Notices; Notices of Questions; Reports from Select Committees; First Readings of Bills; Statements by Ministers; Congratulatory and or obituary speeches; Personal Explanations; Motions for leave of absence, and the last I heard him call was Oral Replies to Questions.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I want it on the Record. I am talking about Standing Order 10 and what is in Standing Order 10. The Orders must be called according to Standing Order 10, there is no right for the Clerk to omit anything that is written down here unless the House so directs.

Mr. SPEAKER: I agree with the hon. member. We shall proceed.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

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

#### COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

*On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went*

into Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76  
No. 29

*The Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$90,487 was provided under this Item in the current Estimates to meet expenditure in connection with the services of Marshals, Jurors, Medical Practitioners and Witnesses, local and overseas, as well as fees payable to members of the Liquor Licensing Authority and other expenditure in the Judiciary Department. Of that amount which was voted \$34,628.45 was spent up to 30th September, 1975 leaving a balance of \$35,858.55. The average monthly expenditure at 30th September, 1975 was approximately \$9,000, or approximately \$1,460 more than that of \$7,540 which was envisaged under this Item when the Estimates were being prepared.

The increased expenditure is due mainly to an increase in the rate of expenses payable to medical practitioners and unexpected expenses in respect of overseas witnesses. The rate of expenses payable to medical practitioners was increased by the Law Revision (Miscellaneous) (Amendment) Act, 1975-18 and it is therefore estimated that an additional amount of \$1,000 will be required to meet the expenditure for the remainder of the financial year.

The expenditure so far as overseas witnesses go under the Item amounted to \$13,469.29 to 30th September, 1975, that is, \$1,869.29 more than allocated. It is estimated that an additional sum of \$9,000 will be required to meet the expenses for the seven months, so that the whole amount required is \$10,000.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: This Item was one of the casualties in the last Estimates where in the face of the fact that the expenses in the Judiciary Department were clearly not going down the Government yet voted a decrease in the Item under consideration, and as I take it it is this decrease that they are now seeking to restore and bring up to a reasonable level.

This particular Head of \$100,000 when this is passed is undoubtedly the most important in the Judiciary Department. Although it is not as much as Personal Emoluments, it is much more than the other Items embraced thereunder and it relates effectively to the whole administration of criminal justice at Assize level and a good deal of Civil Justice in the High Court of this Island. It is probably a mistake in the panic of the coming expenditure to have reduced this Item a year ago in the first place.

We in the Opposition are not objecting to its restoration now but I will ask those responsible, and by that I have to mean the Minister who has introduced the Bill, the Leader of the House, to convey to the Judiciary authorities the necessity for economy as far as it is possible in the conduct of prosecutions. At the present time economy is principally effected by underpaying the Marshals, the Jurors, the Doctors and the Witnesses, it is not effected by taking a careful look at the prosecutions and seeing whether they cannot be conducted somewhat more cheaply than they are at present. Indeed, and I am not in any way speaking for or seeking to speak for the profession as a whole, I would urge on the Government the necessity for looking at some of the measures of reform of procedure in serious criminal cases in this country. You have extremes in common law proceedings. In the United States where you still have the antique and cumbersome Grand Jury procedure which is expensive, tedious, time wasting and unnecessary in present conditions. On the other extreme in Great Britain you have a streamlined procedure where Magistrates are not called on to sit down and take pages and pages of evidence, and some different counsel may find a discrepancy. Instead you have a system by which the written evidence the witnesses are going to give is served upon defendants and upon the face of those written statements prosecutions are conducted, witnesses appear in person at the court below until they are specifically called up to be cross-examined.

1.10 p.m.

Witnesses appear in person at the Court below only if they are specifically called for to be cross-examined. This has the very useful and economical effect of saving, for example, bring overseas witnesses twice — bringing him or her to the preliminary enquiry and letting him or her go back to England or Canada and letting them come back here and give evidence a second time.

It also effects a saving of the time of policemen. I estimate that a large percentage of all policemen called to give evidence in the

Court below are never questioned, and indeed their evidence is never required in the Court above; and it is a great waste of their time to be sitting around the courts when they could be helping to reduce some of the difficult traffic conditions in Barbados.

It saves the time of lawyers, and it will save time and money for the Government under the Legal Aid Scheme. I think that the example of the Courts of England and Wales, at any rate, reveal that there is no loss to the administration of justice as a result of that and I will recommend this saving to the Leader of the House who, I observe, has not been paying the slightest attention to what is going on; but you, at least, Sir, are at the present time.

Out of such savings I expect that jurors could be properly compensated for the time and trouble involved in coming to court, and that marshals' travelling allowances could be paid on a much more liberal scale. Up to comparatively recently Marshals of the Supreme Court were expected to find transportation. I have seen some of them catching a bus to go to St. Andrew and St. Lucy to serve writs; and I would suggest that they are very inadequately compensated at the present time. All of these matters could be placed in a more favourable position if some stream-lining of the general procedure is adopted.

I would also suggest that it is time that another look be had at legal aid. A number of us who have been active practitioners at the Criminal Bar met unofficially in the courts this very morning to comment on how many people appeared at this Assizes undefended and find themselves serving three or four years in prison.

A moment ago I attacked the administration of justice in the U.S., condemning the antiquated and unnecessary Grand Jury procedure. Now I want to praise it. It just is not possible for a man to go to prison in the U.S. unless he has had an opportunity of having a lawyer to defend him. It just is not possible that a man can find himself serving time for a felony — and all stealings are felonies, broadly speaking — unless he has had the opportunity which in America is held to be a constitutional right to have a lawyer.

It is time in this country for the Legal Aid Scheme to be extended to every case where at the Assizes a man may be condemned to imprisonment at first instance. In other words, where the sentence of imprisonment is provided as a penalty and not merely as the alternative to a

fine. It is time that everybody facing a jury in Barbados on any type of charge that carries imprisonment should have the right of being defended by a lawyer.

The legal aid funds which are voted, consistently are never spent. They are insufficient in any case really to be attractive to lawyers; but I remember the Chief Justice recommending to a number of practitioners at the Criminal Bar their acceptance of the legal aid provision on the grounds that you could arrange, he said, even though the fees were small, to have three or four legal aid cases up for you to do in a week and you would gain on the volume what you lose on the small fees.

That has not materialised because legal aid is very seldom given to persons in Barbados. I have not got the most recent Estimates, but any hon. member who cares to refer to the information in last year's Estimates will appreciate that very seldom is the whole amount of money which is voted on legal aid ever spent on defending people.

I believe that the Police estimate, as compared with other countries, shows that we do not have a lot of thieves in Barbados. I think that the figure is only 140 or 150 known thieves. That is not a very large number of people and I would suggest that legal aid to cover all sorts of offences against the person, all larcenies as well as murder and manslaughter and that type of case would not be too heavy a burden on the taxpayers of this island.

Only today a young man in the courts is being retried after having been tried and having a very bad direction by the judge which was upset on appeal. He is now being retried on a sex charge. On the last occasion that he was tried he was sentenced to four years and twelve strokes. Is it right that such a man should not be able to have a lawyer to defend him? Had he not had a lawyer to defend him in the Court of Appeal he would have had the strokes by now and be serving hard labour.

Can you honestly say that in this day and age with offences carrying the cat's nine tails and many years imprisonment that a poor boy from a plantation tenantry in the constituency of His Honour the Speaker should be having to face a jury when he is hardly even able to face ordinary people, or otherwise he might not be finding himself involved with little girls, under aged and so on, if he is so involved?

Now, Sir, these things are not right in a day when we say that we are devoted to the

liberty of the subject; and I would urge on this Government to give serious consideration to a larger vote for the legal aid funds and a broader spectrum of offences in which lawyers can be made available in the use of those funds.

Mr. SPRINGER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition adopt this attitude. I have said before in this House that the entire administration of justice in this country needs looking after. Although we have heard for all the years that under the British system an arrested person is thought innocent until he is found guilty, a visit to the Law Courts any day will prove that the treatment meted out to people who are only charged with minor things like traffic offences — they are not treated as though they are genuinely innocent.

They are placed in the dock, and very often magistrates and prosecuting sergeants are allowed to drop dirty remarks at them for minor offences. This goes further than legal aid. It affects the whole system.

You go to cases at the Assizes and the man is only charged with an offence and has been passed on like most magistrates do, from the low court to the Assizes. He is placed in the dock. Two policemen are put behind him as if he is going to break out. He cannot consult his counsel even if he is paying his counsel; and I have heard defence lawyers say that some judges allow prosecuting attorneys too much latitude in handling people who are charged; that they often refer to them as prisoners, and not as the accused. I do not believe, I could never expect, that a person going to the Assizes for the first time as a juror, going into court and seeing someone charged and placed in a dock and who himself sometimes knows nothing about court procedure could hear a prosecutor refer to him as the "prisoner" long before the jury retires to consider a verdict and still have an open mind.

1.20 p.m.

I can never accept that a person could, honestly, feel that that person is innocent until proven guilty. I have said over and over again that the defence lawyers, in the interest of themselves and the community at large, should take this matter up with the Bar Association, the Judicial Committee, and other Authorities in order to make sure that people get a fair trial from the time of suspicion up to the time of conviction, or release. For too long I have known people who, if there was proper administration of justice at the beginning, would not even have been charged, but they were convicted. It is true

that, because of the social strata of the people administering justice and prosecuting nowadays, things are not as harsh as they were 30 years ago and the sentences handed down are not as severe as existed then, but the fact is that there are still innocent people who are finger-printed, flogged, persecuted, imprisoned, purely because the entire administration of justice needs to be looked at.

I cannot accept that Barbadians are so violent that you cannot allow a charged person to sit down and consult with his lawyer during a trial. He has to take all of the cross-examination and abuse, sometimes, by prosecuting Counsel, and he cannot turn to his lawyer and say: "That is not so; that did not take place." A person visiting a court for the first time as a juror can be carried away by the entire theatrics of the prosecuting Counsel, and the attitude, sometimes, of the Judge very often suggests that the person charged is guilty.

It is all right for the lawyers to say that we should give them more money. Let the lawyers get together and do something to improve the system. I have been to the courts. I have seen a man charged with manslaughter and it was brought down to dangerous driving. When the court adjourns, a policeman hands him over to a Warder, and he is taken to a cell. Can you tell me that somebody visiting a court for the first time is going to accept that that man is innocent? He is a prisoner in his mind, and there are some people who will, say: "If the police did not know he had done it, they would not have arrested him. If the magistrate did not believe the story of the police, they would not have sent him to the assizes. Who am I to say that he is not guilty?" The entire system of justice needs to be looked at. I accept that what is paid for legal aid is not enough, but the entire system is not good enough.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question. It is very unfortunate that the Hon. Minister for Legal Affairs does not sit in this Chamber, because this is a direct attack on the administration of justice in this country. I do not hold that portfolio, but as Leader of the House, I am expected to say something in a case like this. It is a very serious statement that the hon. member has just made. Having been in the political arena since 1938, I think he is referring to 1938, 1939, 1940, 1945 and so on, but certainly not under our administration. I do not know if the hon. member is criticising the Government of the day, because the Government of the day is the party to which he belongs. I am not saying that everything is perfect, but to stand

here in this year of grace 1976 and speak as he would have spoken 20 years ago is not fair to the administration of justice as of today under this present Government. It is a criticism of this Government. After all, some members do not seem to realise that when you criticise the administration of justice you are also criticising the regime that runs the country. That is what you are doing in effect.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hope that nothing in the remarks which I have made indicated that I think there is such political control over the Judiciary that to criticise the Judiciary is to criticise the Government. My remarks are not in anyway meant to say that in this country the Judiciary and the Government are the same.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am not saying that either. It is separate and distinct. We all know that, but the fact remains that in this year of grace 1976, I am appalled to hear a stringent attack upon the administration of justice in that way. I feel that justice is fairly well administered today. This is not the days of the riot in 1937, and in those days. The set up today is entirely different. I firmly feel that you are getting a square deal today. The hon. member should be very careful when he gets up here to launch criticism, or to launch attacks unless he is quite clear about things.

Mr. SPRINGER: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is suggesting that I am attacking the Government for the administration of justice. All I am saying is that the same methodology should be used when a man is arrested. In 1937 he was put in the dock, and he could not consult his Counsel. Today the same thing happens. That has nothing to do with the Government and the administration of justice. The same thing happens when the court adjourns. You hand the prisoner over to the Warder, and he is taken down to the cell. He cannot get bail unless somebody goes there and signs for him every evening at the lower court. That has nothing to do with the Minister and a Judge administering justice. The method of treatment is the same. It has nothing to do with people wrongfully imprisoned in 1937 or wrongfully imprisoned now. I am talking about a system, and the approach is the same. I even went further and said that we are fortunate that the Judges are today drawn from people who are somewhat conscious of the responsibility towards the society, and do not hand down the harsh treatment and penalties that existed before. This is not an attack on the Government.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has got up to apologise for certain things arising out of what the Minister has said. I cannot associate myself with everything he has said but, certainly, in the case of prosecutors, you can see with prosecutors some attitudes that remind you, ominously, of 1937. It will make the hair of hon. members in here stand on end to see how one particular prosecutor deals with citizens of Barbados when he is cross-examining them when they have the misfortune to be before him on a charge.  
1.30 p.m.

This is so far recognised that the entire legal profession and the Bar Council have risen up upon the news that that man is going to be promoted to a very senior position indeed. One particular prosecutor I would say, merits to the full every word of the hon. member for St. Michael South East has said, and this business of not communicating with a prisoner in dock in which he said he praised the Judges, there is one Judge on the Bench who has attempted to limit the right of prisoner's counsel to communicate with him during a trial before a jury to get up and go and speak to him, where for example in America you have a system of no dock no matter what you are charged with. You sit down next to your lawyer so that you can say this witness is lying, it did not happen that way, and give the lawyer instructions as the trial goes on, and you are shown to be a human being and not somebody to be put behind bars and described as a prisoner. There is a lot of merit in what the hon. member for St. Michael South East has said.

*The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$10,000 do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975-76 No. 30

*Head 2 – Parliament – was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of this Head for the sum of \$22,898, this as hon. members are aware is a request for supplementary provision under Item 11 – Operating Expenses.

The amount of \$29,910 which was provided in the Estimates proved insufficient. The Clerk requested more knowing of the experience which he has had over the years and in the last financial year, but the amount was reduced. The Clerk of Parliament has advised that he had originally applied for an amount of \$40,000 at the time of submission of the Draft Estimates for 1975-76

based on the experience of expenditure during the preceding year and an anticipated increase in expenditure, but the amount was reduced in keeping with a directive given.

The position right now is that the cost of supplying refreshments is based on set rates: lunch \$7.00 per person, Dinner \$9.00 per person, Tea \$50 flat rate, Drinks \$84 flat rate for one sitting, and for the Senate, Drinks \$125 flat rate, Tea \$125 flat rate and Dinner \$275 flat rate. There are 54 persons who are normally served at a sitting of the House and 50 served at a sitting of the Senate. The Clerk of Parliament has also advised that a supplementary of \$22,898 would be required under this Item to meet the expenses to the end of the financial year. I have given a full explanation and a breakdown as to what the meals cost, and I do not suppose that hon. members will want to ask any questions on this.

I beg to move that Head 2 – Parliament, stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am not asking any questions on this. Apart from the persons who are members of the staff of the House, I feel this vote is a waste of money. I do not feel that members have any right to any vote for refreshments. They should pay for them. When it comes to a day and age like this when members are being given remuneration for serving, they should pay for their lunch. This a relic of the past. There was a time when members served in the House and there was no remuneration and therefore lunch was served; but I think the State could save a lot of money, and the only persons I see having any justification would be the staff, and the staff should have proper working conditions that they can have proper lunch breaks and time off, and the Clerks and the staff of the House should organise themselves so tightly that the Members of the House would have to respect their organisation and what they stand for. Either you employ more people to do the job efficiently so that they can get proper breaks for refreshments or they should give the House a rude awakening by going on strike if they are kept too long and do not get meals, so that the members of the House would understand that they have people working for them. I am not going to sit in here and because I am a member of the House be party to a system that does not make commonsense to me.

I do not see why the members of the House should be such privileged persons in 1976, and if

we want to save money and spend it on some other things, although this cannot do a lot of things, we can start off with making sacrifices in the right places. The members should start off making sacrifices where they really matter. The members of the House in my view are well remunerated and can buy a lunch once a week and save the taxpayers this unnecessary burden that they have to bear which in my view has no meaning in 1976.

*The Question that Head 2 – Parliament stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 3 – Auditor General – was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 3, Item 3 – Other Personal Allowances for the sum of \$744, the position is that the Auditor General has resigned and another Auditor General has been appointed and we have to pay, under the Constitution, this house allowance to the two Auditors General. That is the whole thing in a nutshell, but if that is too short I will give the whole thing.

In the current Estimates the sum of \$3,460 was provided to meet the payment of a house allowance of the Auditor General, but this amount proved inadequate after it became necessary to pay the house allowance of the former and present holders of the post of Auditor General for the period 1st August to 4th December, 1975. Under the Constitution we have power to do that. The Auditor General proceeded on pre-retirement leave on 1st August, 1975, and in keeping with the provisions of Section 114(2) of the Constitution another Auditor General was appointed with effect from 1st August, 1975. The house allowance is payable to the office of Auditor General and both officers are entitled to receive such an allowance; so in accordance with section 4.25 (ii)(a) of the General Orders of the Public Service of Barbados, the former Auditor General is eligible for the payment of his house allowance during any period of leave on full pay. 1.40 p.m.

The present Auditor General is also entitled to receive house allowance by virtue of his office. Well, I have said the same thing in a few words, but this is to give further information.

Sir, I beg to move that Head 3 – Auditor General – stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, under the Constitution of Barbados, the Auditor General

has a very important role to perform in respect of his duties as the Auditor General of Barbados, and this is the first occasion since the retirement of Mr. A. G. Brandford that I have certainly had in public to acknowledge the tremendous contribution which he made during his tenure as Auditor General, and indeed in the Public Service as a whole.

I think it is correct to say of him that his reports to Parliament during the time I have been in this House have been punctual and they have been candid and they have been frank. I believe that these reports not only enamoured him to people in governmental circle or indeed to people in the Public Service, but Mr. Brandford is one of those brand of civil servants who feels that he must be impartial; he never sought to get his promotion by means of joining any particular political party or saying things that would enamour him to any particular politician in power or out of power.

I think I want to stress this quality. It is a most important quality that we must stress because regretfully it cannot always be said today in the public service that many of the public servants bring this attitude of impartiality to bear on their approach to public affairs, and too many of them believe that their duty is to be partisan first and foremost rather than to be true public servants, and I regret very much that with a distinguished career such as his behind him some proper acknowledgement of his contribution to this country has not been made publicly.

He is not a man who would seek this sort of thing but I think we always ought to hold up to some of the other civil servants the sort of role that he had shown.

I know that on many occasions during his life in the public service he has suffered from the pin prick of other civil servants. I think they even have him down-graded in the list of persons in the order of importance to have honours and that sort of thing in the country but none of this moved him at all.

I am also happy to say on the floor of this House that his successor, Mr. Lincoln Thomas possesses all the qualities which make him adequately qualified for this job. I had the honour and privilege of being born in the same district and being a very frequent visitor to his family home, and we were school-day friends together and we came up through the same Christ Church Boys' School together — the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and myself — and then into Foundation School.

Not that his friendship with me would in any event prevent me speaking truthfully about him but I think as a young man in the public service he again is an outstanding example of people who dedicate themselves to duty and who can do his job regardless of who is in power.

I think when we get an opportunity in Parliament of seeing this, we should always try to recognise it. Too often in Parliament we take the opportunity to attack civil servants and other officers. We are always either referring to them as an army of occupation or incompetent, and that sort of thing; and when we have outstanding examples of public servants who are dedicated and hard-working we are always slow to give them praise.

So it gives me great pleasure in passing this measure in this House to add those few words of tribute to particularly Mr. Brandford and I hope that his successor would carry on in his good stead.

*The question that Head 3 — Auditor General — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### HEAD 4 — SERVICES COMMISSION

*Head 4 — Services Commission — was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, Head 4 — Services Commission, Item 11 — Operating Expenses, for the sum of \$570. I think the note there is good enough and fully explanatory, Sir.

Then the other item is Item 16 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings in the sum of \$110. Due to an increase in the cost of office furniture the sum of \$150 which is provided under this item to purchase a filing cabinet is insufficient to meet the cost of the cabinet which is now quoted at \$260. So that is the reason for this.

Sir, I beg to move that Head 4 — Services Commission — stand part.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, this Head for the Services Commission: it is true that the leader of the House is not directly responsible for this matter but I have a comment to make on this matter, and it is because my function, apart from being an honourable member of this House is to represent workers. It would seem to me that there is a tendency now to remove some of the Services Commission and leave some of the

persons who work in the Service at the mercies of the people who serve on Boards – the people who are Chairmen or representatives of the Boards.

Now I know that some of these members of Boards when they have a rule, a thing that is like a toy to some of them, the person they think they must play with is the work people. To some people the dismissal or the suspension of a worker from his job becomes a very fashionable thing, and the hon. member for Christ Church West made a statement about public servants. Now some Chairmen of Boards do not have the capacity to run these institutions and some of them think they have to please the Minister concerned, and the only way they can please the Minister is if they are dismissing somebody or acting in some silly way like that; and the workers are very concerned about some of these areas where it looks like we will be going back to the old-fashioned days when people used to work with vestries and your job was dependent on the January elections and you had to be worried, but I would say the hon. member for Christ Church West – Christ Church does not have a very good reputation for producing – the politics in Christ Church were not very much above board in the early days. You had to line up with the powers that be and either go and pump the organ or go and get around the Reverend's house and clip the fence and do a lot of these jobs in order to get a school.

1.50 p.m.

If you were a schoolmaster you had to go and read the Collect and bury the dead; all these things in order to get something. I am speaking about the Vestry. We do not want to go back to the Vestry, we had the Vestry since 1925 and this is 1976, and when you remove the Commissions, and without any Appeal Board – and I do not want to cast any reflections, Mr. Chairman, some of the Chairmen of the Boards are as modern as the Vestry system of 1625. Their thinking is not much different because they believe that authority is something you use and you must understand where authority resides. The happenings in Jamaica must be a lesson to some of us here. Stupidity breeds stupidity, violence breeds violence, if we put stupid people to run sensible organisations they will make the organisations stupid, because they will turn around and use people and make a mess of things, and then you get the reaction of some of the people. I am saying that today because there is a mad tendency now. I can see it like a cloud setting up, that people who work are not important, only people who control people who work.

I hope that Jamaica is enough of a lesson to some people. There are more potentially violent people in a society than there are otherwise and if you put people to create and provoke violence you are in for trouble. I say that because the ominous signs are there. I see them, I deal with them daily so I know what I am talking about. If you do not have an Appeal Board, because working in the Public Service is a different thing from working with a man down Broad Street where we can go to the Labour Department when things are over, the Public Service is not owned by any individual, it is owned by the State and it must give the community the feeling that to be in it – and I say this quite broadly – every citizen of Barbados who wants to work in the Public Service and is qualified to work in the Public Service, and by the Public Service I do not mean any narrow Civil Service, I mean the Public Service *per se*, working on a Cemetery Board or on a Statutory Board has a right to get a job as long as he or she is qualified without any allegiance coming into it. Allegiance is secondary, you have to be a citizen first, you have to go to school first, you have to be qualified first. When a person works in any of these institutions he must be free to be able to exercise his position as a worker and we should not in any way inhibit him and he should not be in any way deprived from having his rights and privileges impeded by removing safety valves like Commissions.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member will give way, I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, it is one minute to two and the Standing Orders have not been suspended.

I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders have not been suspended. That being the case I beg to move that the sitting be suspended for three quarters of an hour which is the usual time prescribed by the Standing Orders.

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

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

2.00 p.m.

*On Resumption:—*

Mr. SPEAKER: The sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move, Sir, that the bell be rung.

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

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

*The bell was rung for one minute and a quorum was obtained.*

#### QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to lay Oral Replies to Questions that have been asked.

*There being no objection, leave was granted.*

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 45 asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy is ready.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that Replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 62, 67, 57, 65, 66 and 68 asked by the hon. member for St. Joseph are ready.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Communications and Works I beg to give notice that the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 49 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael West is ready.

#### QUESTION RE HOUSING PROJECT FOR ST. LUCY

Mr. SPEAKER: Reply to Question No. 45 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance: 1. Can the Minister state when the proposed housing project for St. Lucy will begin? And 2. Will the Minister state (a) the area where the project will be developed, (b) the size of the project, (c) the facilities to be contained in the project, and (d) whether or not the houses will be for rental, for sale or a mixture of both?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:—

An area comprising about 18 acres of land at Nestfield in St. Lucy has been identified for housing development.

The land is under sugar cane and as soon as it is cleared development of the project will begin. It is proposed that the rural development project will consist of houses for sale as well as open lots for the siting of houses.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Can the Minister give any indication of the size of the lots which will be made available to people who will be moving into the project?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that Supplementary Question it is proposed to sub-divide this land as part of our plans for rural development into ¼ acre lots. The minimum size lot as approved by the Town and Country Planning Department is 2,400 square feet; but for rural development it is proposed in our plans to promote housing development in Barbados to sub-divide lots into areas of about a quarter acre so that purchasers may have some land apart from what is needed for siting their homes to plant some crops or raise some animals.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister state if a survey was carried out to determine the yield of sugar from the particular area which they are now about to have developed in view of the fact that we are still very much dependent on sugar cane?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, no such survey has been carried out by my Ministry. I want to state from my own knowledge that from investigations carried out the land itself is low yield land, not very productive, and it is an area of land that has been earmarked under the Physical Development Plan of Barbados as a centre for further housing development.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Minister saying that this area is earmarked in the Physical Development Plan, will the Minister take into consideration that since Barbados is very much dependent on sugar, has the Minister carried out a survey to determine what the yield has been for the past year or years, and therefore find some alternative site? I understand the Minister to say that no survey was carried out, but he went on to say what was his knowledge. I want him to make it very clear if a survey was

done. You just cannot take sugar cane out all the time and ignore it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, that question has already been answered by me.

#### QUESTION RE ROADS IN DISREPAIR

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further supplementaries, the next is Question No 49 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Communications and Works: 1. Is the Minister aware that the following roads are in a state of disrepair: Weekes Land, Deacons Road, Yearwood Road, Wavell Avenue.... (*Asides*). I am sorry to interrupt members over there, but you may ask them to leave and go outside and carry on the conversation.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Do the Standing Orders not provide that when an hon. member asks a question, prior to an answer, that he shall do so by reference to its particular number? Therefore, all that is necessary in order to ask a question is just to get up, give the particular number and sit down. I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 16 which says "4. At Question Time, the Speaker shall call upon the Member in whose name the question stands. The Member so called" (*Asides*) Am I on a point of order, Sir? (Mr. WALCOTT: You are wasting time).

Mr. SPEAKER: I will hear you.

Mr. ADAMS: "The Member so called shall then rise in his place and ask the question by reference to its number on the Order Paper, and the Minister to whom it is addressed shall give his reply."

Mr. SPEAKER: That is true. We are well aware of that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Because the hon. member is so unmannerly in his seat and kept so much noise and I paid attention to him? (*ASIDES*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: If you had me as Speaker, you will be all filing outside. One party work. I will continue my question. I was referring to Dears Land, Black Rock.....(*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. WALCOTT: You have a lot of questions to ask in St. Thomas. Do not worry about me.

Mr. SPEAKER: If members are not addressing the Chair, they must speak in under tones.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will continue. Dears Land, Black Rock, 2nd Avenue Fairfield Road, Lennox Avenue B, Goodland, and Cadogan Road, Grazettes? 2. Is the Minister aware that these conditions are causing a considerable amount of inconvenience to the residents? 3. Will the Minister take the necessary steps to have those roads repaired?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, the roads enquired of are not all in a state of disrepair.

A section of the road at Weekes Land, Deacons Road and at Second Avenue, Fairfield Road were repaired during the current financial year and are now in good condition.

The remainder of the road at Weekes Land, and the roads at Dears Land, Black Rock, Cadogan Road, Grazettes, Yearwood Road, Wavell Avenue and Lennox Avenue B, Goodland have been included for either heavy maintenance or reconstruction in the Ministry's roadworks programme for the current financial year.  
2.55 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Is the Minister prepared to make a statement about the road policy as it relates to tenantry roads throughout the Island?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of making any statement, but for the benefit of the hon. member I would like to draw to his attention that it is the Government's decision to repair tenantry roads in those areas where it is necessary. Normally, the tenantry roads are the responsibility of the owners of the tenancies, but the Government recognises that, due to the heavy burden which may be placed on the owners to repair these roads and the resulting increase in cost to the people who rent these lands, it would be wise on the part of the Government to assist in the repair of these roads, and this is what the Ministry does.

Mr. CRAIG: Would the Minister state what was the condition of the road before the question was tabled on the 30th September, 1975? (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like members to read Standing Order 33(6): "A member whilst present in the House during debate must maintain silence except when called to speak by the Chair." I am making sure that this Standing Order is still in force, or members will have to leave the Chamber.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as a Supplementary Question. On what dates were the repairs referred to by the Minister carried out?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I do not have the precise dates on this file, but a minute here states 22.10.75.

Mr. ADAMS: Can the Minister state whether these roads would have taken longer than three weeks to repair?

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: I cannot state how long they would take.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 57 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph, who I do not now see in his seat. Is someone willing to ask those questions for him, or should the replies be laid?

#### CANE SEPARATION PLANT AT UPLANDS, ST. JOHN

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for St. Joseph, Question No. 57: To ask the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state: (a) whether the new cane separation plant at Uplands, St. John did go into operation as promised, during the 1975 cane reaping season; (b) if the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state (a) the number of tons of sugar canes ground by the said plant and the tons of sugar produced; (b) what has been done with the residue of the sugar cane? If the answer is in the negative, would the Minister state (a) the reason why the plant did not go into operation; (b) when is it expected to go into operation?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 57 is as follows:

- (a) No, Sir.
- (b) The plant did not go into operation because of a technical fault in one of the components of the plant.
- (c) It is expected that the plant will be tested during the 1976 crop season and

put into operation as soon as possible thereafter.

Mr. ADAMS: Would the Minister state why he has not previously made a statement to the people of Barbados relating to the utter failure of this much heralded experiment to be carried on at Uplands, St. John?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I was not in a position to make a statement on this matter before now because the whole background to this problem of the cane separation plant at Uplands, St. John.

The Government of Barbados obtained a loan of \$1.65 million Canadian in 1973 from the Government of Canada for the purpose of improving the operations of the sugar industry rationalisation programme.

This Agreement provided for the installation of a 40-ton of cane per hour cane separator at Uplands Sugar Factory in St. John and for the funds to be used to pay the cost of professional engineering and technical services, plant and materials required for the design, construction, start-up and commissioning of the separation plant.

The Agreement also provided for the Government of Barbados to make available and bear the cost of the land and buildings necessary to instal and house the machinery. The Government then entered into a Tripartite Agreement with the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation and the Barbados Sugar Factories Limited for the erection of the building. Following this, Barbados Sugar Factories Limited entered into an Agreement with a firm of local contractors for the erection of the building and construction which was commenced in July, 1973.

The Government of Barbados also entered into another Agreement with Messrs. Sandwell & Co. Ltd. of Canada for the provision of professional, engineering and technical services, plant and materials required for the design, construction and commissioning of the plant.

The installation of this equipment was completed sometime in July, 1974. After the end of that year's crop season we had to wait to test that equipment some time during the 1975 crop season. There were a number of problems which were encountered; therefore, testing was not started until May, 1975, when the crop season was almost at an end and even then the testing

was further delayed as the separator broke down soon after the start-up of the plant.

As a result of the breakdown, representatives of Messrs. Sandwell & Co. held discussions with CIDA in Ottawa regarding repairs to the separator and other matters affecting completion of the project. Following these discussions, CIDA decided to send down a team of engineers and technicians, with experience in the various aspects of the plant, to examine the separator, the diffuser and any other potential sources of trouble in that machinery. The team came to Barbados in September, 1975, at the expense of the Canadian Government. I can read to members of the House the views expressed by the team of experts after they examined the machinery.

3.05 p.m.

I quote:

"The conveyor system for the cane will require minor adjustments, before it will work efficiently. These adjustments can be done in a short period of time. The separator system was poorly designed and cannot be operated. There are two proposals:

- (a) bring in a separator system that was used in St. Kitts. This can be done at no cost of the Government and can be accomplished in about one month after it has been agreed;
- (b) remove the present system and have a completely new one manufactured in Canada.

If the separator from St. Kitts is operated, there will be a need to modify the conveyor system to carry the material to the conventional mill.

It is possible that the conventional mill can take the separated product if the mill is fed at the same time with whole cane. This will have to be worked out by trial and error. The Comfifth Diffuser system has never been previously tested. It is proposed to test the system mechanically with bagasse to see if the machinery will work. However, it will have to be subsequently tested with comfifth etc., to determine the extraction of sugar."

The team and the Barbadian officials concerned with the project agreed that the

most appropriate solution would be to obtain the conventional type separators presently in St. Kitts for further testing in Barbados. The Government of St. Kitts agreed to make the separators available.

The Government of Barbados has agreed to the proposal that the separators currently in use in St. Kitts should be installed and operated at Uplands until such time as the problems affecting the Uplands Separation Plant can be solved. The Canadian Government has advised that this arrangement will not result in any additional cost to this Government. It should be noted that in accordance with the Agreement between the Consultants (Messrs. Sandwell & Co. Ltd.) and the Government, the Consultants, *inter alia*, are required to witness and certify a 72 hour test run at an average of 40 short tons of cane per hour. In addition, the Consultants are required to carry out an extended reliability test and assessment over a typical three-month production period. Due to the breakdown of the separator, it has not so far been possible to carry out these tests.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member put his question, I am again appealing to hon. members. Standing Order No. 33(5) is being contravened. Let us have a little decorum, because if the Government Benches do it, the Opposition will do it and I am going to rule. If any hon. member on either side contravenes that Order, he is going out. Let us have order in here.

Let the hon. member proceed.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister tells us that there was evidence that the separator had broken down. He said that the Report made mention of the separator and other matters, but that the Report also made mention of other potential sources of trouble. Can the Minister tell us what action the Government took in the light of that Report making specific reference to other potential sources of trouble?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I have given to this Honourable House the full story unabridged of all the problems that were encountered in the installation of that separation plant at Uplands. I have not kept back any of the information in the file, and the Government, based on considered technical opinion by the experts, has agreed to follow the course recommended by the experts. It is at no extra cost to Government.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Hon. Minister tell this House and this country whether or not the

Government of Barbados has been given the interior design of the equipment which has been installed at Uplands?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that the designers have refused point blank to disclose the interior design of the so-called separator plant?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, .....

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I can hear a voice that is not addressing the Chair.

Mr. BOLDEN: Will the Minister state whether the plant is in a position to carry out a trial during the 1976 crop season?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, it is the intention of the Government to have the plant tested this crop season and we are doing everything to make this possible.

Mr. HINDS: Can the Minister tell us how far from ready is the plant for carrying out these tests?

Hon. A. MORRISON: I do not know how far from ready it is for carrying out tests, but I can assure the hon. member that everything will be done to make sure that we will be able to test this plant in this crop season.

#### QUESTION RE DAIRY INDUSTRY REVOLVING FUND

Mr. SPEAKER: Parliamentary Question No. 63 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the question reads as follows:

To ask the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state: (1) the total amount of money now standing in the Dairy Industry Revolving Fund; (2) whether or not any money is paid into this Fund from the profits of the Pine Hill Dairy. If the answer is in the negative, would the Minister state why the Pine Hill Dairy is not contributing to the Fund; (3) whether or not any sums have been paid out from the Fund. If the answer is in the affirmative, would the Minister state how much and for what purpose?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 63 is as follows:

1. The amount standing to the credit of the Dairy Industry Revolving Fund is \$415,804.97.

2. No Sir.

There was never any arrangement for the Pine Hill Dairy to contribute to the Revolving Fund out of its profits.

3. No. Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hour being 3.15 p.m., except a motion is moved to continue Question Time, this will bring us to the end of Question Time.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be extended by half an hour.

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

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

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that the Pine Hill Dairy has been making excessive profits while the dairymen in this country who supply milk to the Pine Hill Dairy have been losing through this exercise?

Hon. A. MORRISON: A request for an increase in the price of milk supplied to the Pine Hill Dairy by farmers has been received and processed and has been agreed to by the Ministry of Agriculture. As a matter of fact that was agreed last month and that has been communicated to the Pine Hill Dairy already.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that although the Ministry of Agriculture has approved the increase in the price of milk to dairy farmers that the Pine Hill Dairy has refused to pay saying that they are not paying until they get a corresponding increase to the consumer. And further, is the Minister aware that when the Pine Hill Dairy increased the price of milk to the consumer in May last year that the price to the farmer was not increased?

Hon. A. MORRISON: I am not aware, Mr. Speaker, but what I can assure the hon. member is that these matters will be looked into and be regulated. I can make a note of the information revealing that question.

3.15 p.m.

that the consumers are getting the quality milk that they are paying for?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, this I cannot answer, because I do not know the last day tests were carried out, but I know that there has been a continuing custom by the Pine Hill Dairy to constantly test milk at regular intervals to see that the quality is always good for the consumer; but I can investigate and get the date that the last test was conducted.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister make sure that all persons or institutions involved in the dairy industry contribute to the Revolving Fund so as to help the development of the dairy industry in this country and therefore relieve the import of sub-standard milk powder from New Zealand and elsewhere?

Hon. A. MORRISON: This is a matter that can be examined and worked on and I can assure the hon. member that I too am all for working towards the benefits from the dairy industry to be very well shared by the farmers themselves who produce the milk and send it to the processing factory. So any measure which tends to help the dairy farmer in this country, I am prepared to examine and give careful consideration in an effort to resolve these problems which come from time to time.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the Pine Hill Dairy has been using the price of milk in New Zealand as a determining factor as to what price they are prepared to pay dairy farmers in Barbados despite the fact that feeding material bear varying costs between the two countries?

Hon. A. MORRISON: I am not aware, Sir, but what I can assure the hon. member is that whatever was put up by the Stock Breeders Association and Dairymen, those figures and facts were examined by my Ministry, the Agricultural Economic section, and we are in total agreement, and the price that we have agreed to as recommended is the price which was asked the Stock Breeders Association milk people.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the Pine Hill Dairy which holds a licence to manufacture evaporated milk has made considerable profits by importing the said evaporated milk and neglecting the local production aspect of evaporated milk?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of being aware of stock. When the

Pine Hill Dairy was made the sole importer of evaporated milk, that was a device used in order to help subsidise the local milk, and we felt that when that was done, that would be able to help them in solving their financial problem.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister saying that it is fair to give the Pine Hill Dairy a monopoly to import evaporated milk and to sell it at a profit to themselves, all at the expense of the Barbadian consumer, and not employing any local labour whatsoever in the production?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, matters of being fair and being right are things of being philosophical but wrong, and I am not in a position to comment on those matters. What might be right for me might be wrong for somebody else and we get to the point where we do not know what is right and what is wrong. It is all a matter related to some particular thing, and I am afraid, Sir, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, I am not asking the Minister.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You have had your complement of three questions.

Mr. HINDS: I am not asking any more questions, Sir. I am just clarifying the position. I am on a point of order. The Minister apparently does not understand the question.....

Mr. SPEAKER: If he cannot understand I cannot help for that; he cannot understand.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, that is why when he is speaking I am entitled to rise on a point of order. He is dealing with what is right and what is wrong but I only asked him what was fair.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no further supplementaries, I turn to Question No. 65 by the same hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker

To ask the appropriate Minister: Would the Minister state: (1) how much money has been allocated to the Agricultural Credit Bank in the years 1973, 1974 and 1975; (2) what was the total sum involved in applications received by the bank during the said years? Would the Minister consider: (1) increasing the total sum of money available to this bank in order that it may meet the sum involved in applications received; (2) amending the Act under which the Bank

1. (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) This information is not available from the records in respect of the financial years 1971/72 to 1973/74. Applications received in the financial year 1974/75 were 366 and 169 have so far been received in the current financial year.

(c) The number of applications processed and the amount of money paid is as follows —

|         | <i>Applications<br/>Processed</i> | <i>Money<br/>Paid</i> |
|---------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1971/72 | 260                               | 60,102.02             |
| 1972/73 | 179                               | 48,269.14             |
| 1973/74 | 229                               | 48,314.11             |
| 1974/75 | 269                               | 65,400.02             |
| 1975/76 | 179                               | 47,096.53             |

(d) Four applications have been processed but not yet paid and another eighty-three are still in hand. These are receiving attention and will be paid as soon as possible.

2. There was an isolated case in which payment was not immediately made due to an error but which has since been rectified.

3. Does not arise.

Mr. BOLDEN: I am only asking for a clarification. The Minister says that (3) does not arise. I am asking where is (3) in the question. I wonder if this is one which has been found of those which have been lost. (*Aside: the third paragraph.*)

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister aware that there are numerous boat owners who have made applications and have been told that their papers cannot be found for the 1974/75 period?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, information is not available in the records in respect of the years 1971–72 and 1973/74; but I think that we have some order in the proceedings from 1974 to 1975, because when I first took over as Minister I was very much concerned about the loose manner in which the Fisheries Officer was conducting his work. As a matter of fact, he was ill for several months. He was given continuous sick leave, with the result that there was a breakdown in communications between the head of the section and the subsidiary officer. For those years we do not know what was going on.

I think it is fair to say that from 1974 to 1975 we got some kind of order in the proceedings and we got the right figure of applications which were actually lodged in the Ministry.

Mr. BOLDEN: Is the Minister saying that money has been paid out during those relevant years and there is no record to show whether or not the money has been paid on correct bills or vouchers or to the correct persons?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that. I am saying that I do not know the number of applications received in the Ministry. We know the applications that have been worked on, but the overall number of people applying for the subsidies we do not know. We only know what we have received and what we have been able to process. I cannot give you the figure of total applications which may have been sent to the Ministry and not processed.

#### QUESTION RE SALES TAX ON VEGETABLE, HORTICULTURAL SEED AND PLANTING MATERIAL

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 68 standing in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. BOLDEN: to ask the appropriate Minister: Is the Minister aware that: (1) there still exists confusion in the application of the five percent retail purchase tax in respect of vegetable horticultural seed, fruit trees and horticultural plants; (2) at some Government stations the sales tax is applied while it is not so applied at others? Would the appropriate Minister consider making a statement, removing the five percent retail sales tax on all vegetable, horticultural seed and planting material?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, the Reply is as follows:—

(1) No, Sir.

(2) Sales tax is charged on seeds sold at the Ministry's Seed Store at Crumpton Street, but sales tax is not being charged on fruit trees, seedling plants or other planting material sold at the Ministry's Agricultural Stations. The removal of sales tax on seeds and other planting material is being examined by the Ministry of Finance on an application from the Ministry of Agriculture.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state how long it will be before the Ministry of Finance makes up its mind on this matter in view of the importance to agricultural development of the removal of such a tax?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the Ministry of Finance; but we have sent reminders to them and we have made an application in full time and we have not got any

reply yet from the Ministry of Finance. We are waiting on them for their reply.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister state when was the application made to the Ministry of Finance for the removal of the relevant tax?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Speaker, the representation for the removal of the tax was made in May, 1975; and we understand that it is receiving attention from the Ministry of Finance. That is on file.

Mr. SPEAKER: It being now 3.45 p.m., that brings us to the end of the extended time and of Question Time.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Private Members' Business is now the instant Order of the day.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that we can do No. 1, Sir. I do not think that we can do No. 2. The hon. member for St. James wishes to move Order No. 3 which is to move the Second Reading of a Bill entitled an Act to amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act 1968.  
3.45 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3, under Private Members' Business, is the instant Order of the Day.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

##### SUGAR WORKERS (PROVIDENT FUND) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1975

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Bill which I seek to have amended and to ask to give it a second reading deals with the Provident Fund for the sugar workers. Some time ago Government brought in an amendment to the Sugar Workers Provident Fund whereby a worker is no longer entitled to what one would call a lump sum as well as a pension. The worker is now debarred from having that. I have looked at this matter very carefully over the years and have talked with a number of sugar workers who, through their hard work, toil and sweat, have made a contribution in order to provide something for themselves.

The Bill was amended in 1970. The Act was brought into force on 6th January, 1975. The amended Act effectively provided that no sugar worker who became 65 years of age after the

stated date would be able to draw a National Insurance contributory pension and also a pension from the Sugar Workers Provident Fund.

We feel, on this side, that we should go back to the old law where the worker would get a pension from the National Insurance as well as something from the Provident Fund. Many of them are in dire need, probably, having their homes repaired, and they find it difficult to do certain things with the small sum of money they are getting from the National Insurance. As you are well aware, Sir, today's cost of living does not afford a person, who gets a small sum of money provided by the National Insurance, to do very much with it. These people are no longer entitled to funeral grants. I have had a number of complaints from people who come to me day after day. Sir, I do not know if they come to you, too, in matters of this nature. Most of them are confused as to why they are no longer getting that sum of money along with the National Insurance.

I would urge this House to look at this amendment in the light that these are people who have been working all of these years and have provided for the country's economic backbone. They should not be denied that sum of money from the Provident Fund, and they should also get the National Insurance money. I would urge my colleagues and members on the other side to examine this matter. I am quite sure we are all sympathetic to these people. Most of them are very old people, and many of them are very poor. The small sum of money given to them does not permit them to do very much with it in these days. I am not prepared to make any long speech on this matter. I would not attempt to dramatise the situation, since our existence depends on the sugar industry together with Tourism and a few small industries now existing in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, at this stage, that this Bill be amended and to point out the objects and reasons. This Bill will amend the Sugar Workers (Provident Fund) Act, Cap. 271 in order to transfer the administration of the Sugar Workers Provident Fund... (*Asides.*) I would like to urge hon. members to look at this Bill in the light in which it is brought and to realise the torture which these sugar workers have to face. I am sure that a number of them look forward to something, especially when they hear of their friends who draw sometimes \$1,200 or \$2,000 and also get a small pension, and they all feel very concerned about it. I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. ADAMS: In rising to second the Motion that this amending Bill be now read a second time, I would ask hon. members to look at these facts. By reason of the Sugar Industry (Provident Fund Levy) Act for a number of years the sugar industry was required to make a contribution to a Provident Fund whose purpose was to provide a retirement pension for sugar workers in their old days to the extent that the monies paid by the sugar industry into that fund represented monies which could have been given to the workers at the time. The workers have made a contribution to this Fund. That Fund started in 1956, and, if my memory serves me right, went on until at least 1964 and, maybe, even for some years more.

Sir, there are many people in our sugar industry today on whose behalf contributions were made to the Provident Fund, but who will not now get any benefit from that Fund due to the last Bill which we passed in 1974 which has debarred them from receiving both a National Insurance Pension and a Sugar Industry Provident Fund Pension.

3.55 p.m.

In 1970 the House passed a Bill, Act 1970-43, which provided that the receipt of an old age pension or a grant from National Insurance should not debar any sugar worker from obtaining a grant or payment of retirement pension under the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Act. In 1970 the House specifically decided that you could draw your Provident Fund pension or get your grant as the case may be and draw the national insurance pension as well. But in 1974, I must say not really observed by members on this side, we turned ourselves around and passed another Act which said that no retirement pension should be paid to a sugar worker who is entitled to invalidity pension or old age contributory pension under the National Insurance Act.

Now I am suggesting this is extremely unfair to sugar workers who were at work between 1956 and 1964, and I very much hope that this Bill will receive the support of the Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union whose union represents so many sugar workers. I am urging hon. members to see the Bill of 1974 as one of the panic measures passed at a time of extreme financial stringency in Government circles, at a time when inflation was running at nearly 40 percent and when the Government had no money and had to seek to cut down expenditure in every possible regard. One of the avenues which they sought to close down was the possible use of Provident Fund

monies or indeed the provision of Provident Fund monies to be paid for provident fund pensions. Everybody at that time was looking to cut down on expenditure and the Government chose to cut down at that time on the expenditure of the old and needy sugar workers. We are urging the House in these perhaps easier days because what with the sales tax and the contribution that the sugar industry has made to this Island in 1975, the Government has money now as we will hear at 4 o'clock, to waste and spend on all kinds of projects. I am suggesting this is a more noble project than most of those in which the Government is at present engaged, and we should allow sugar workers to receive their Provident Fund pensions as well as the National Insurance. There is an important safeguard, let us remember in the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Act, in that nobody has an entitlement as of right to the Provident Fund. Under Section 15 of the Act the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Board does not have to pay the pension if it does not want to. If it finds out that somebody is very well off or in some way does not deserve a pension, or maybe he is recipient in an institution from Government assistance. I do not know what the circumstances are which they take into account, but I think the hon. member for St. Michael West should be able to enlighten us, and it may very well be that the Board will not feel that a man who was only recruited in 1964 and on whose behalf contributions were made for one season would be entitled to retirement pension. This is a matter which can be dealt with by Regulations. But the fact is that there are many old sugar workers who arbitrarily, although they have worked for the full qualifying period have been denied the right to Provident Fund pension.

Sugar Workers who have retired I think since 6th January, 1975, are not entitled to a pension. I remember one unfortunate man who came to me. He was actually born on 5th January, 1910. Now it is not perhaps known to many hon. members that until a Bill which I brought in here called the Minors Act, you achieved a particular anniversary not on what is popularly called your birthday, but on the first hour of the day before your birthday, so that if you are born on 1st January, 1960, you are 21 years old on 31st December, 1980. That used to be the law. Well perhaps it passed unnoticed. I introduced it and had it passed. I did not hear any hon. member advert his attention to it, but that has been changed, so this poor man was caught between these two new Acts. He got his application ready and he was caught by

the operation of the two Acts. First of all his birthday now fell on 6th rather than on 15th January and he happened to be born on the last possible day when he would not get the pension and you can understand he felt very aggrieved. There was nobody born before him who has not got a pension.

That is only by way of illustration of what we can do in this House without perhaps appreciating what we have done to individuals who are just on the receiving end of a hard case. I am urging the House in these more relaxed financial circumstances to revert to the old law and allow the Sugar Workers Provident Fund Board to exercise the discretion given to it, but at least to make it possible for sugar workers who have retired after 6th January, 1975, to qualify for a Provident Fund pension where the Board feels appropriate.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, it is fairly clear to me that some background information to this whole matter is required, and in doing this I may have to give a bit of the history of the Provident Fund. I believe some has been alluded to by a previous speaker or speakers. Persons who retired on or after 1st January, 1956, became entitled to a Provident Fund pension. Of course by that you will understand that persons who retired on 31st December, 1955, will not be so entitled, even though they too have given of the sweat of their brow to the sugar industry.

The whole idea to the setting up of this fund was to have a source of fund out of which to pay benefit entitlements to persons who qualified, that is, persons who attained the age of 65 years and had been working for the previous consecutive ten years in the sugar industry. It was estimated then that the investment of the capital of this fund would have been enough to compensate those persons who qualified for pensions under the Provident Fund. The first recipients of this fund did not receive their pensions until some time around 1969 when this Act came into being. Subsequent to the establishment of the Fund, Government established a National Insurance and Social Security Scheme, and by the provisions of this legislation under which the scheme was established persons who qualified for National Insurance were not entitled to both pensions, that is, the National Insurance as well as the Provident Fund pensions.

For some reason in 1973 which I do not now recall, it is quite right to state, as had been referred to by a previous speaker, that the

legislation was amended to entitle persons who had been in receipt of National Insurance pension benefits also to receive Provident Fund pensions. Now subsequent to this, in December, 1974, a mere thirteen months ago, we came back to this Chamber and the previous position was re-established, that is, that workers would not qualify for both. But it was not just done that way. A reason was advanced why at that time workers should not qualify for both, and it was unanimously accepted by this Chamber, and the reasons were these. There springs to mind about four pensions for which Government has some kind of responsibility; public service pension, Provident Fund pension, National Insurance pension, and there may be another one.

4.05 p.m.

Sir, when the Government established the National Insurance and Social Security Scheme however, it was always the intention that at some point in time that this scheme would become responsible for all these social benefits that would be paid out of the scheme, and in fact this is precisely what the Government is working towards. Oh! The other fourth pension is old age pensions. That is the fourth one. (*Aside*) But who reminded me? Did you remind me? The fourth is old age pensions. So those are the four pensions that I said spring to mind.

I am not saying that they are exhaustive. There might very well be another pension, or other pensions, which I cannot think of at the moment.

Local Government persons who served the Local Government and had been pensioned off even before the Local Government Service was centralised, I consider those to be public pensions. There are other pensions for which people qualify under certain Boards; again, I consider such a pension to be a public pension.

Sir, the whole idea is that at this point in time the social security — we do not really have social security in Barbados. In a very limited way — we have National Insurance. We want to move to embrace other forms of social security, and this is one aspect of it; but it is not quite as simple as this. All the records will show that up to 1975 the pensions payable to persons who qualified under the Provident Fund Act was \$3.60. Persons who up to that time had qualified for a pension under the National Insurance Act — that had not been qualified under that law and persons working in the sugar industry — had been drawing a mere pittance as well as a pension

somewhere between \$7 and \$8. When you lump the two of these together, Mr. Speaker, that is somewhere between \$15 that the workers who have been receiving the two pensions, that is, the pension under the National Insurance Fund and the pension under the Provident Fund, all that such persons were receiving was about \$11 in pension, but there were other persons who were not receiving national insurance pension and were only receiving Provident Fund Pension because they either had made no contribution to the National Insurance Scheme or had made too little contribution to enable them to receive a pension under the National Insurance Act.

So we have two different categories even from the very beginning, of persons who had qualified for a pension; (1) a sugar worker who had been receiving pensions from National Insurance as well as the Provident Fund, (2) a sugar worker who had been receiving pensions from the Provident Fund only but not from National Insurance because he had not qualified. So let us take these two categories separately; the one who had not qualified for National Insurance Pension and had qualified for Provident Fund pension. What we did was, since it was such a small amount — as I said earlier the amount of money payable under that pension was merely \$3.60 but we had no National Insurance in any event; all he could receive was this pension of \$3.60 as well as old age pension. So we raised his pension from \$3.00 to \$5.00 and at the same time we raised the old age pension from \$8 to \$10, so that if he qualified only for a Provident Fund Pension and not a National Insurance Pension he still would have received the \$5.00 from the Provident Fund and the \$10.00 from his old age pension, amounting to \$15.00; and for those persons who had qualified for both national insurance and provident fund and who had been only drawing a total of \$11 a week, we raised this minimum level of National Insurance to \$15, so that based on the computation of a person's contributions, even though he should, under the law only have been receiving a pension, say, of about \$7 based on his own contribution out of his own pocket as well as those paid on his behalf, when he should have been receiving \$7 or \$8, in fact he is receiving twice as much — he is receiving \$15.

So that it was not just a sudden or arbitrary decision just to cut off the pensions of persons like that because in fact now that person was better off under the old pension than he was when he was receiving the two pensions.

At that point then — we worked it that way to give effect to our earlier plans and projections, that is, to establish a social security scheme whereby that one scheme would be responsible in time for all payment of pensions in Barbados. In course of time the same thing will happen to old age pensions. They will go out. They too will go out. Old age pension will reduce itself because more and more persons will become pensionable at 65 rather than 68 under the National Insurance Pension; and if one is receiving National Insurance pension, according to the means test he will be entitled to be receiving old age pension as well. I think all that is well known.

So these were the points raised at the time; they were explained to the House and in fact they were fully accepted by the House a year ago — precisely a year ago — when these facts were presented.

Sir, this still remains the position of the Government today. We will continue to work towards the establishment — I cannot say “full” because I do not know in what point of time or if at all Barbados will be in a position to pay unemployment benefits. I do not know when Barbados will be in a position to do this, or if at all; but if we can take this up, there are other forms of social security which over a period of time we would want to introduce to embrace all the social bits of legislation from which persons benefit now either in the short term or the long term.

It is not true to say that these were introduced merely because of financial stringency. That is absolutely untrue because the source from which these pensions were paid was a fund which was reserved for that purpose only and no other purpose. In other words, for the general expense in running the country or any other purpose at all this Fund could not become available. The fact is that some persons did not qualify too is because in fact all funds were exhausted.

I said earlier the intention was that the benefits should be paid out of the funds of the investments, but in fact, the number of persons who came on to be compensated far exceeded the original estimate, so that when we had exhausted the earnings we had then to turn to the capital, and that too had been wiped out; so from time to time we had to come here and even put money into it. I am sure hon. members will remember well, when in fact there was no money in the fund for a couple of weeks well, and it

was a question on this, I believe, on the floor of this House to pay persons who qualified and were entitled to the pensions, because the source of the funds was wiped out. We do not want to return to this situation again.

4.15 p.m.

We do not want to return to this situation again and I want to state that with the arrangements at the time when Parliament decided to agree to it the worker was better off then than he was when he was receiving the two pensions. That is still the view of the Government to this day, it has not changed.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who introduced this Bill and I had a discussion purely on the history of it, because history is something you cannot do anything about. I believe I shared more in this Provident Fund than anybody else in this House because it came from our organisation, the Barbados Workers' Union, and the hon. member has reminded me that he was the Minister. I had a row with him too because I told him that the people should have paid more money, but there is always this idea of holding back for the sugar industry and members on the other side can remember about ten years ago they thought they were talking on a good theme when they decided to give the workers the money. You can now sit back and see their stupidity and futility but what must you do? If you have better ideas than other people you cannot sit back and wait for them.

Now that the Leader of the Opposition has come back I will remind him of the facts. It is the Union that was responsible for the Provident Fund and the problem we had with the Fund was that his Party which was in power, because we were putting forward this idea, they dragged their feet for nearly six years before they implemented the scheme.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member was a member of the Executive Committee responsible for this subject six years before the Provident Fund was brought into force, so how can he say that our Party of which he was then a responsible Minister dragged its feet when the Minister was trying to do it?

Mr. WALCOTT: How can he be so wrong? History is something you cannot mess up, you have to get your history right. This goes back to the 1st January, 1956 so get your facts straight.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Was the hon. member denying that six years before 1st

January, 1956 he was a member of the Executive Committee?

Mr. WALCOTT: What the hon. member is saying is that six years before that you decided to have a Provident Fund. Is he a clown or what? Is he a clown to suggest that in 1950 you decided to have a Provident Fund and waited for six years?

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, no hon. member can be called a clown. The hon. member said that the Labour Party dragged its feet for six years but it is he who is the clown, not me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not finished yet, I am only dealing with history, I am not dealing with the hon. member yet, I will deal with the hon. member in the process of time. I want to help the hon. member for St. James whose Bill it is, but the hon. member was only dealing with the facts of the Provident Fund. The delay with the Provident Fund has nothing to do with the Government or the Minister, the delay was with the former Government which was in power before. They did not implement it.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, I cannot sit here and hear all this talk going on when I was the appropriate Minister who implemented the Provident Fund. I want to draw to the hon. members' attention that the ministerial system started in 1954.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you making a speech?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Certain things which are wrong need readjusting.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I will rise on a point of order again. The hon. member must not mislead the House, he is misleading the House in relation to Statutes which are the Laws of Barbados. If the Laws are read it will be seen that the Provident Fund came into existence at 1st January, 1956. The Government went out of power after five years in 1961 and the Act to dispose of the Fund came eight years later, in 1969. Look at it here, 3rd November, 1969.

Mr. WALCOTT: I have a book too, there is no book here that has 1956.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, if the hon. member turns to chapter 271 he will see 1956 written on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! Will members please obey the orders of the Chair? I think the Leader of the Opposition should know better.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is talking about is so wrong you do not need the law books, I am not dead, I am alive.

A levy was introduced in here and the Hon. Minister for Agriculture brought in a levy for 40 cents per ton and I said it should have been \$1.00 and should have been paid by the sugar industry directly and not out of the Labour Welfare Fund. I was not a member of any Government so the hon. member does not know what he is talking about. When that was introduced I was sitting on the other side saying that that should have been done and that is what I want the hon. member to get clear. You must understand from 1954 I have been standing apart from the Labour Party, this is 1976, 22 years, nearly a generation later. At that time you did not expect I would have survived so long, you thought I would have been dead. At that time unless you were in the Labour Party you were dead. You are asking now to amend something and improve something that I initiated, so I am 22 years ahead of you.

4.25 p.m.

I may be 22 light years ahead of you, not ordinary years. I can give you the facts. I am only dealing with the idea of the Fund, and the Fund was never really created and utilised until sometime in the 60s. The problem the hon. member is faced with is, and the reason why he is bringing this in now is that the Government came into it and they had to set up a Committee to implement this. The fund was already there.

Now we have such fine fellows here. The hon. member for Christ Church West says that you must not criticise Civil Servants; that we have some fine people in the Civil Service. They left the money in a fund without giving any interest. That is the sort of thing you get. The laughable thing was that they appointed one of the Public Servants to carry out a survey and they said they had 2,000 people; and so you worked on the hypothesis that you had 2,000 people. Therefore, you set up a fund to meet 2,000 people. It turned out that when people started to come in and put down their names you had 7,000 people. It meant that if you calculated for 2,000 people you had three and a half times that amount. The money ran out and you are forced to set up a committee.

From 1956 you had a cut off point. You had to cut off and make a lump sum payment in order to give compensation to people because if you went back to 1956 on the calculation that you had, you would not have enough money.

The \$3 million that you had would not have been able to give to every person a pension.

To make it work you had to work it on the basis of 50 per cent of the amount that would have been due to everybody who would have been alive at the time. You therefore had to make a compromise and give them a lump sum payment. That was a palliative in order to get the scheme started.

It was started against the background of giving a lump sum payment of \$3.60 a week, but at \$3.60 a week to 3,000 people you still did not have enough money. That was one of the problems because you did not have enough money going into the fund to provide the revenue for that amount.

It is true, as the Minister has said, that from there on other social benefits came into being; and that is where you got the talk that if a man or woman is getting National Insurance and getting old age pension they should not get this money too. Some of us felt that you should get this pension because it was only \$3.60 a week; but the Government said that if they had to put up the difference, they wanted to know who was going to put the money up if the funds were not there. They were committed to paying people the money wherever they got the money from. The Government would not commit themselves to putting up the money.

Then, I believe, they used this compromise and an arrangement was made to look at these two funds and see what would happen. Then, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Government passed the Severance Payment Act which covered the Sugar Industry inclusive of the Plantation workers because there was severance payment which was only dealing with factories, but now there is a Severance Payment Act which includes factories, so that if a factory worker is entitled to severance payment, he is not also entitled to the Provident Fund.

The arithmetic of it proves that severance payment for over 30 years work is more advantageous than the Provident Fund Payment. That is so because \$3.60 a week is \$260 a year, but if a man is going to get \$6,000 or \$7,000 he will prefer the lump sum payment.

I do not consider that this matter is one that we can deal with unless we are going to sit down and study all of the variations in the two schemes. I am a believer, and I represent an organisation, which is a believer in social benefits.

This whole question of the Provident Fund and severance payment came from the trade union movement.

That is why I say, with all due respect to the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Leader of the Opposition, the legal theory is that a person is not entitled to severance payment. The lawyers argue that you are under contract and therefore when you come to the end of the contract you were paid; but we say that you have a vested interest in your job and that therefore your job represents property in the same way as real property is the property of any person; and that therefore when you are deprived of your property you should be compensated. Our concept is, that when a man loses his job you are taking away his property from him and therefore he is entitled to be compensated. That is different from the legal theory.

In recent years we have changed the consciences of men so that we see now that severance payment is a matter that we can accept. I am not even as pessimistic as the hon. member about unemployment. I believe that sooner or later you will have to make provision in your thinking, in your ideas, about unemployment benefits because it is the whole concept about pensions and the whole concept of how you treat pensioners.

I say that because I am not a believer that you should subscribe *per se* to a pension, but that a pension should be provided for you. It should be intrinsic in the business enterprise that you are engaged in that it should be like the educational system. It should be intrinsic like how parents have to educate their children and not the children saluting and asking their parents to send them to school.

It should be intrinsic in your economic system that a pension should be a matter of something like a built-in light meter. I will not begin now to lecture members of the ABCs of social development concepts when I have so far passed that stage and there are still batting on these slow wickets. I am only hoping that some day you will get around to it, but I am not going to be here today advancing that theory because I know I will be butting my head against a wall, because somebody will be saying that Frank Walcott wants people to sit down at home and get money.

My view is that pensions should be intrinsic in a business operation so that it provides for it in the same way that a business has to provide for obsolescence and depreciation. You do not ask

the machinery to do anything, but you have to provide for it. Income tax and all those things are provided for as a matter of running a business.

Therefore, all businesses should start off by making provisions for pensions in the same way that they make provision for the other things; and every man and woman would know that at the age of 50 or 60 he or she is going to be in this position in the community.

I think that the hon. member will agree —, I do not know if they want to go into Committee or not. So far as I am concerned this is a question of examining what is happening. I do not believe that it is any electioneering parish pump thing. I do not believe that where you are dealing with sugar workers now that you should deal with it in that light. You have to examine the cost. You have old age pension and you have National Insurance. You cannot get both. I am on the National Insurance Board. They had a meeting today. Unfortunately they keep meetings on Tuesdays; but one of the things that the National Insurance Board has to examine is that just as provisions have been made for severance pay, fresh provisions, you have to think in terms of how you will revise the whole National Insurance Scheme.

I agree with the Minister of Housing that you have to work towards a comprehensive National Insurance Scheme.

4.35 p.m.

Unfortunately, we do not have the people in Barbados with this insight to deal with this sort of expertise, and you have to borrow them, although the Government here is not a strong believer in the International Labour Office from the point of view of active participation. When they require this kind of knowledge, they have to use such an organisation. It is the only International Organisation with this kind of knowledge. Such persons can be used to give you the kind of participation you require. They are studying ways and means of embracing the entire national pension — not only at the sugar industry level, but at the commercial level. I work in an organisation that provide pensions, but we do not believe in giving the money to any Insurance Company because we believe that, as an organisation, we are here in perpetuity. We carry our own pensions. Instead of giving somebody else the profit, we believe that we can handle our money. We have learned the hard way how to manage money. The same way somebody in Canada can manage money for us, we can manage the money for ourselves. We must get down to the idea of providing a National Insurance Scheme to take care of everybody.

The Government has already stated that if you leave the Public Service and go into a commercial firm, or you leave a commercial firm and join the Public Service, you will not lose your years of service. It is this kind of thinking that surpasses the narrow porkshop, or bread-and-fish politics that you will get if you are near a domino game. If you are talking of national insurance and insurance at this level, you will have to go a bit deeper into the matter because you are dealing with people in a real manner.

I want to let the hon. member know the facts of history. The hon. member cannot change his birth-date, and I cannot change mine. I have been around a little longer than the hon. member. I do not have to look through the law books to get the dates. The Provident Fund is one of my babies. I saw it in Cuba when Cuba was a bit different. It was a good National Insurance Scheme, and I brought back the idea. It was nothing original, but the Cubans had a very good Insurance Scheme for the sugar workers, and I felt that we should have one for our sugar workers, too.

The hon. member was born a member of the Labour Party, but he was not always an active participant in the Labour Party. He cannot take blame for what his predecessors were slow in doing. If I say that they dragged their feet on the question of the Provident Fund, he can read about it and analyse it. Anything I have said in the 50s from over that side, they were a little bit slow in doing. They felt that if I said so they were not going to do it because the people would think it is something unusual. The hon. member knows that, so far as this matter is concerned, I share everything that he would share in a matter like this. We would like to see the workers in Barbados getting the maximum they can get both in sugar and outside of sugar.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter this debate, but in order to clear up certain points which have been made, I think I should, having been the first Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries and the Appropriate Minister at the time when the Provident Fund was implemented. I want to commend and congratulate the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands and National Insurance for his general explanation of all of the Funds and on his speech in outlining Government's policy as he has done. I hope he has made it clear that the Government does not intend to support the passing of the second reading of this Bill. I got up to make that point doubly clear, and we

now know the position. There is no mistake now. The position has been clarified and settled.

Mr. Speaker, as the first Minister of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries in 1954, I happened to be the Minister who did a great deal in assisting the Union. I remember Mr. Husbands, apart from the present General Secretary, and the various meetings I had with a former Speaker in the person of Mr. Kenmore Husbands who did a lot of work in those negotiations with me, too. It is all well and good to get up here and say all sorts of things in 1976 when things have changed so rapidly. The conditions in 1956 were entirely different from the conditions of today. The very passing of legislation to bring in the Provident Fund Act and to impose a levy — (*Asides.*)

Mr. Speaker, I have listened all the time, but none of the Speakers made it very clear — I think the hon. member for St. Michael West, the Union boss, did say \$1 — what was the position of the Fund. The Fund was built up through a levy. It was 40c in the first instance, and fighting with the sugar barons in those days was not an easy matter even to get the 40c a ton. It is all right to stand up now and talk about 40c a ton and decry the efforts made by other people. It was a big issue in those days, and it was later increased to \$1 a ton. What I want to draw to the attention of hon. members is that there are thousands of sugar workers who have passed the age and are entitled to this pension. We had to build up the Fund from 1956 — 1961 in order to have the money to pay out. Everybody seems to be forgetting that. Some people are acting as though the money was there to be paid out and we would not pay it out.

Mr. Speaker, the levy was 40c a ton, and then after three or four years it was increased to a \$1 a ton. Everybody seems to be blaming this person and that person for not paying out the money in the Fund. I understand, Sir, that the money was not properly deposited.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt, but according to Standing Order 20, 4.45 p.m. brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going by the Standing Orders.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, it may be a good thing for us to dispose of this. We

have reached the point where it would be better to dispose of it. If hon. members will agree, we can extend the time for half an hour or 15 minutes, as hon. members may think fit. The hon. member may want to reply to the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Standing Orders have not been suspended. If you want to continue, then someone will have to move a Motion to do so. I am sticking to Standing Orders.  
4.45 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: I beg to move that Private Members' Time be extended by half an hour.

Mr. SPEAKER: The relevant Standing Order is No. 25.

Mr. ADAMS: We have extended Question Time without suspending a Standing Order. We extended Question Time and that is why we cannot finish now. I am making a motion now to extend Private Members' Time. You do not have to suspend any Standing Orders to extend the time. The rule is that Your Honour shall not accept any motion the effect of which is to suspend a Standing Order without being satisfied of the rights of the minority, but there is no rule saying that you have to suspend a Standing Order to extend the timetable. The effect of it is to suspend the timetable, but if the Opposition moves it and the Government accepts it, no minority is involved, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going in accordance with Standing Order No. 20(3). Standing Order No. 20(3) says that Private Members' Business shall commence immediately after the conclusion of Question Time but shall not continue after 4.45 p.m.

That time has now passed, and I am ruling that we revert to Government Business.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the day.

When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it automatically reverts.

*Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported, the hon. member for St. Michael West was addressing the Chair. He may now continue.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I was at the point of saying on the subject of the Public Service Commissions that I hope the Government and the Minister in charge will see the point we are making. We do not like the idea of a person in any branch of the public service holding an appointment or continuing an appointment on conditions other than his ability to do the job he has to do as a citizen, and other considerations are going to be minor. For that reason we feel that there should be some appeal body so that if discipline has to take place, whether it is the Chairman or the Board itself which is going to discipline that person, there should be some area for the worker himself to have some appeal to so that people would have the feeling that not only justice is done but appears to be done, and you do not take a job from underneath a person's feet on the basis that you do not like him or he does not like you. Barbados is a small community. I am a member of a political party and I would not like persons to feel that the only way they can hold a job in the public service is because they are subscribing to the same political party to which I belong. I do not feel that should be a condition of service or a condition for holding an appointment. If they like me I would welcome that, but there are some people I would not like to be members of my party, because I do not believe they would be any help to me; but I do not think I should deprive them of having the right to work, and if they are to be dismissed or disciplined, they should have the right to have a fair trial and it cannot be said that they do not like the Government in power or the Minister and therefore they must go.

For that reason I am a little bit worried about some of the Commissions that have been taken away without a substitute body, not as heavy weight, because a rose of another name is still as sweet — of impartial persons. There are cases where some of the Attorneys who are unconnected with them and some other persons could sometimes sit as an Appeals Board which can hear evidence and before which people can put their case. That is the sort of thing I would like to see established on a loose basis so that it would give an opportunity of a wide area to people learning something about industrial affairs rather than having a Commission of Enquiry. It should be something of an informal basis so that people can go before the panel and they can get down to the truth of the matter, because some people do put up a false case and do a lot of filibustering when they have to go before bodies, but people who are accustomed to taking evidence would be able to sift the wheat from the shaft and be able to tell a truthful witness from one who is not so truthful. Just as was said

today, good lawyers do not question truthful witnesses long; they have enough sense to know if the witness is speaking the truth to ask two or three questions and sit down, otherwise you will find you are the person who will have to be ducking about, and that is why I was telling the hon. member not to press the Minister of Agriculture today. He is too soft. You would look stupid when you ask a question and each time you get the same answer.

Mr. BOLDEN: On a point of order, the hon. member must try to distinguish between a truthful witness and one who does not know.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Even that is a good point, a truthful witness and one who does not know, but the truth win out. Have you never heard that?

*The Question that Head 4 – Services Commissions – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 13(1) Cabinet Office – was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In moving the passing of Head 13 – Cabinet Office, there are two items; Item 7 – Communications, and Item 13 – Compensation. An amount of \$6,975 was provided in this year's Estimates for the payment of telephone rentals in respect of the Cabinet Office and the Printing Department and to meet the cost of overseas calls, telegrams and postage. On 18th December, an amount of \$5,313.31 was expended leaving a balance of \$1,661.69. That is owing to the increase in telephone rentals from 1st January, 1975. The amount has proved inadequate.

As far as the second item is concerned – Compensation, the amount of \$3,600 which was originally provided to meet claims for compensation has proved inadequate. A supplementary vote of \$1,800 was subsequently provided. Expenditure to date is \$5,329.32 leaving a balance of \$70.68 and this is inadequate to meet payments to the end of the financial year, and \$2,000 is now being sought.

I beg to move that Head 13(1) Cabinet Office – stand part.

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

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

*Head 22(1) Ministry of Health and Welfare – General Administration – was called.*

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 22(1) Ministry of Health and Welfare – General Administration – stand part, in respect of Item 16 – Grants to Non-Profit Agencies, the amount provided, namely \$279,424 has proved inadequate and a further sum of \$29,892 is required to supplement the particular item. This has arisen, I am advised, due to an oversight in respect of a commitment of the Government towards the Caribbean Food and Nutrition Institute. The Government is a party to the cost of operating that particular institute which has as its overall objectives the establishment of an adequate diagnosis of the food and nutrition status of each country in the Caribbean region, the formulation of food and nutrition policies in all the countries, the strengthening of nutrition units in the Ministries of Health and improvement of food planning capabilities in Ministries of Agriculture and National Planning Agencies, the training of personnel at all levels for nutrition and nutrition related services, the improvement of programmes for the diagnosis, prevention and treatment of nutritional diseases, improvement of institutional food services, and increase of knowledge of food and nutrition through practical operational research.

4.55 p.m.

That work is very important towards the development of this country in particular and countries of the region in general, and that is why we participate in the institution. However, I indicated, due to an oversight the sums of money due for the years 1973, 1974, and 1975 remain unpaid, and these amount to some \$29,892. This money is paid at the rate of 9.40% of the operation costs of the institute.

I therefore beg to move that Head 22(1) Ministry of Health and Welfare – General Administration – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, nobody would seek to deny a vote in the sum of \$29,892 asked for, but when one looks back to see the type of staffing that we have been asked from time to time to vote money for to bring the various Ministries up to date with efficient accountants and one hears further of the importance that the Minister has drawn to our attention of the various agencies that this matter is allied to, and the programme taken in its broadest light and what it would reflect, one has got to come to the conclusion that the officers who are responsible

for this oversight or whatever it is ought really and truly to be surcharged. They could not be doing their work. They are not earning the taxpayers' money in our view. What is wrong with them?

If we were to look back, Sir, we would see that these Ministries, the staffing has been updated. We have carried out training schemes, granted scholarships to people to go overseas to study accountancy and improve themselves generally with a view to assisting the administration in matters of this sort. Now we hear 'due to an oversight.' Tell us who is responsible. What has brought about this oversight? It is not an oversight in respect of one year. It is an oversight in respect of the years 1973, 1974 and 1975. You mean there are three oversights and you are going to count them as one? This is what we are concerned about.

We are not withholding our support from the voting of this money, but we do not want the Minister to come and merely say 'due to an oversight.' Due to an oversight by who? By people who are drawing the taxpayers' money? If they are not doing the taxpayers' job, what are they really doing for the money? That is our concern over this matter, Sir; and in view of the importance that the Minister has illustrated here today — he has given us to understand it means so much to the community — it means so much to the Caribbean territories; the programme relating to food means a lot to the people of Barbados, and the officers, you mean they are all asleep? Are they not concerned about all of this? And the Minister can come and say 'due to an oversight'. The Minister ought to be in a position to give us a much better explanation regarding this oversight and what not that has caused us to come here this afternoon to be asked to vote an amount of \$29,892 in respect of the years 1973, 1974, and 1975.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I must join my colleague in this because I believe that certain officers are charged with the duties of preparing Estimates each year and that all Heads relevant to a particular Ministry would have to come before the Estimates Committee or have to go before the Minister before they get sanctioned.

I have constantly said in here that Barbados seems to be the only place where we have got Ministerial Government but Ministers do not accept the responsibility that goes with Ministerial Government. In all other countries where the officers in a particular Ministry go wrong, the Minister has to take the blame, and he stands up because he is following a tradition, but

to tell us that for three years our subscriptions have not been paid to an international organisation is certainly something more than an oversight. Somebody is responsible.

We had a situation with the C.P.A. where funds were not paid but we knew why. There were insufficient funds to pay our dues. Were there insufficient funds to pay the dues in this particular section or not? It is not a question of an oversight. There must be a more logical explanation. If it is an oversight, somebody is not doing his work, and I think the Minister should have told us today what has happened, because if there is an oversight in this Department and it goes this way, God knows how many more oversights there are in other Departments.

What benefits do we lose as a result of the negligence of some civil servant or somebody? What surcharges do we have to pay? And it is costing the Government more and more if you find you owe something and you do not pay. It should not be a question of money being not available. If money is not available, that is a logical excuse. There is no money available so we could not pay on the appropriate date; but to tell us that for three consecutive years no dues have been paid.... Well, somebody has been sleeping at their desk, and I would think that the Minister could do a little better than this to tell us how something like this could occur.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I can only state that I will take the points that have been made and draw these to the attention of the Administrative Head of the Ministry responsible. I can point out that these funds to external bodies are normally made through the Ministry of External Affairs, and the explanation that I have been given is that this was due to an oversight.

I would like to assure the members who have spoken that I will draw this to the attention of the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry to ensure that such things do not recur. I will give the members that assurance.

*The Question that Head 22(1) Ministry of Health and Welfare — General Administration — stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

5.05 p.m.

#### HEAD 22 (9) — WELFARE DEPARTMENT

*Head 22(9) — Welfare Department — was called.*

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, in respect of Head 22(9) — Welfare Department,

Item 9 – a supplement is being sought under this Item in the amount of \$144,000. It is very difficult to estimate with any degree of accuracy the amount of money that would be required during a financial year for services to individuals who either through old age or through their financial position are unable to cope with the problems of day to day living.

The particular supplement we are dealing with is in respect particularly of old age pensioners. As the note indicates, in June, 1975 – which would be some two to three months after the start of the financial year – the number of old age pensioners was 14,600 and by December of the same year that number had increased to some 15,017. I think this trend will continue in this country because as our medical services provide better care for our citizens more of them will be living longer and we will get this increase in the number of persons eligible to receive old age pensions. This Government has always accepted its responsibility towards the old age pensioners and I think it is well known in this Chamber and in the country generally that increases in the level of payments to these pensioners have been made from time to time because it is realised that with the demands of living increasing it will be necessary to enable these persons, the old age pensioners, to cope with the problems of living and hence since 1961 there have been a number of increases in the level of pensions paid.

Just for the purposes of the Record let me state that in September or October, 1961 the pension was something like \$1.80, in April, 1962 there was an increase of the pension at the rate of \$2.40. Again in 1966 there was an increase from \$2.40 to \$3.00 and in December, 1969 from \$3.00 to \$5.00. In 1973 the pension was increased from \$5.00 to \$8.00 and in December, 1974 from \$8.00 to \$10.00 which is the current rate. I would like to state that I am giving consideration to a package of proposals relating to the old age pensioners with a view to making recommendations to the Cabinet on the services that are rendered to pensioners and the senior citizens who are definitely in need of increased services both in cash and kind, and I hope in the not too distant future to have these recommendations ready for the consideration of Cabinet.

In this regard I can say too that tomorrow I am meeting with the National Assistance Board to give consideration to the means test to see how this test can either be operated in a way which would bring greater benefits to our senior citizens or if the test should be removed

altogether. This is purely a matter for consideration. I will listen to the views which the National Assistance Board will be making on those matters and then I will be in a better position to make recommendations to the Cabinet on this particular matter.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this is a controversial matter and it is one which both sides of the House will readily give their support to and I therefore beg to move that Head 22(9) – Welfare Department – stand part.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think I can second this and at the same time make just one or two observations. Whereas as the Hon. Minister of Health has pointed out his vote which we are considering here today for \$144,000 relates mainly to old age pensioners it falls under the heading which deals with grants to individuals which take in a wider area, welfare grants, old age pensions, assistance in kind, educational assistance and after care for discharged patients.

I just want to express a concern which I have and a concern which a number of people whom I have had the privilege to assist not only from my constituency but also from other areas in Barbados, the kind of concern which has been expressed at the attitude and indeed the whole approach of a number of welfare officers whose responsibility it is to administer this grant. There has been a considerable number of complaints about the lack of system and the lack of method which are employed in a number of areas, particularly in the area of welfare grants and in the area of assistance in kind. It is a situation which I contend should not be left to the whims and fancies of any particular individual in this country and I would hope that the Minister would see to it that some fairly rigid guidelines are laid down because it may be a very difficult situation where sometimes people come to you and from the examination which you make of their case you come to the conclusion that there are in need of assistance, but when a recommendation or indeed when an approach is made to the Welfare Officer he does not consider that any assistance should be given, while at the same time you will find a person who might be in a better position than this person who is in need of assistance is getting assistance, and this is a situation which obtains in almost every area of this country and it is one which I would urge hon. members to pay some attention to because it leads to the feeling that the welfare services are not in truth and in fact operating for whom they are intended but are operating out of somebody's hip pocket and he or she just gives grants according to how he feels disposed to any particular individual.

One particular case in point I can give to this Chamber to demonstrate what I mean. There was a lady in St. Lucy who had made representation to the welfare officer for that area for assistance. She has about six children and because she must have been a little rough with the welfare officer his decision was that she should not get any assistance because she mistreated him.

5.15 p.m.

Now, I do not consider that this kind of approach should be adopted in a matter like this, and perhaps had it not been for my timely intervention, she would have been without the assistance that she deserves. I hope that the Minister would take note of the administration of this particular area and try to bring about some improvement.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the expressions made by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I too have received several complaints from my constituents about the treatment which they get from these Welfare Officers. It seems to me that the brighter your face is the poorer you are. Since welfare is for the poor, your face has to be bright and you have to be looking good to get assistance from the Welfare Department.

Poor people, because they may not be able to present a case as well as a more flashy type of person, because they may not be able to impress a particular Welfare Officer in the district, they go to sleep with 10 or 11 children starving on evenings; but people who are not qualified for welfare assistance get it. It makes me feel that we should resort to the old system in which there were people who were accustomed to poverty, officers who knew people in the area and who would make representations to the Councils for them. Since the change in the system there has been an increased amount of dissatisfaction.

The Council in the northern area did not pay as much as the Welfare Department is paying now, but the people who qualify for assistance now, as long as they do not lick the boots of the officers do not get it. My constituents complain all the time that what is happening is that it is left to the whims and fancies of one individual, and when you apply to the officer in a particular district and he does not like your head, as you put it in Barbadian terms, you can talk "flannel and fuzz" and you do not get it. You can appeal from Caesar to Caesar.

This is what is happening in St. Lucy, St. Peter and St. Andrew. Wherever you turn in the

northern area you get it. The whole point is that you need some sort of parochial committee in which people can appreciate the sufferings of the poor people down there. I saw today not very far from here someone who used to work in the Welfare Department and who did a good job in the area; but now you get these qualified people who do not know of the sufferings of the poor people and cannot appreciate it; and therefore, unless you look good and can wear a clean dress, despite the fact that you have 10 children for four or five different men, you cannot get assistance. Even if they tell the Welfare Officer that they are going to complain to their representatives, he does not care because whether the sun shines or the rain falls he will get his salary. He has a secure job; but at the same time he treats people as he likes. There is great dissatisfaction.

I would have hoped — I have no objection to the increase for the old age pensioners — but I would have hoped that the Minister would have come and said that he is aware of the problem and that now he has been able to ask about these officers or send them home and that he wanted more money to help these people because there is a lot of unemployment. (*Asides.*) I am not a hypocrite. I like to speak the truth. Poor people are starving. They will get work when the crop starts. If the women do not work they will get something from their husbands or from their boy friends. Therefore, they need this assistance.

When I saw this \$144,000 I had hoped that the Minister had got to the question of these Officers dealing with their friends and was looking at the entire area of assistance and trying to see that these people were dealt with in a more humane manner. I would urge the Minister to investigate my complaint and that of the hon. member for St. Lucy, because if it does not happen in his constituency, it certainly happens in St. Lucy and St. Andrew.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Since my colleague spoke against the Welfare Department, I must defend it. I am surprised to hear him say that Welfare Officers are looking after their friends and not after people who are in need. If he will tell me the names of those friends and the Welfare Officers concerned I would be glad to pass them on to the Minister.

We are trying to do a job with a limited amount of money. Since I have been in the Department I have been working with Social Welfare Officers for a long time. I know that their task is often very difficult considering the way in which they have to split up the money

and the Chief Welfare Officer cannot do the work in the way in which the dependant would like to do it.

Mr. EDWARDS: I have not mentioned anything about the Chief Welfare Officer. I have made a complaint to the Minister about what my constituents have brought to me. I will go on record as saying that they are not doing a satisfactory job in my constituency and the hon. member for St. Lucy has said the same thing.

Mrs. EASTMOND: The Chief Welfare Officer has a record of all these officers. They have to give a written record of all the people they deal with. If these things happened three years ago, nothing like that happens today. They are well trained officers, and I am prepared, if the member for St. Andrew will give the names of any such officers, that I will take it up.

I visit all the parishes and I get reports. They go into the Ministry and if there is anything that I cannot handle it goes to the Minister. I know that these Welfare Officers are doing a wonderful job, and they should be commended.

Hon. A. MORRISON: May I add for the record the frustrations which have been encountered day after day for the last four years in the constituency of Christ Church South Central. I am not in the habit of complaining, but when you look at the amount of applications which have been approved for old age pensioners you will find that one of the problems is that Christ Church is a parish in which there are poor people and people with big bungalows. I am conscious of the fact that poor people in my constituency are more or less penalised because of Christ Church being a mixture of big houses and small houses.

5.25 p.m.

I have known people, from the time I got a seat in this Chamber, who have been coming to me day by day complaining about the Welfare Officer for the Parish of Christ Church. I have taken people to the Chief Welfare Officer and he agreed with me that something is wrong. When he looked at the records to see what had been given to recent old age pensioners, he found that Christ Church was not included at all. The people who have been given old age pensions in Christ Church are those the Labour Officer had asked to come and get pensions. As a matter of fact, he told those who attempted to apply: "Do not worry to come because I do not have any pensions for you." The manner in which he treats those people up there is something ridiculous. There is no humane consideration shown by the Labour

Officer to some of those old people in Christ Church. That is a fact, Mr. Chairman, and I would like the Committee to know that I have risen to draw attention to the dissatisfaction and the humiliation suffered by the people in Christ Church in applying for welfare.

Mr. Chairman, there is a girl up there who has 14 children. She is 29 years old. She lives in my constituency; she has several fathers for those children and they have gone abroad. She has found great difficulty in obtaining welfare assistance for those children. I have been trying to get work for her now and again. When she is out of work, the Welfare Officer has been more or less adamant. The Welfare Officer in Christ Church operates..... (*Asides*)

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I cannot follow the hon. member because there is too much noise on the Government benches. I can hardly hear the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of order!

Hon. A. MORRISON: All I am saying, Sir, is that the Welfare Officer operating in the Parish of Christ Church is not conditioned to deal with the needs of poor people up there. Perhaps he might be fooled by the fact that it is a big Parish comprised of big shots and small shots. We have a mixture up there. We have the most developed areas in Christ Church, and we also have pockets of poor people. When we are not very rich in Christ Church we are very, very poor. We move from the top to the bottom – almost sometimes from the ridiculous to the sublime and back again, but the needs of the poor people in Christ Church who need welfare assistance are not taken care of by the Welfare Officer.

Mr. Chairman, I do not mind his not recommending them for assistance, but I am against the way how old people are being handled. I do not like the way they have been raced out of the office and told to go and let other people give them money. That is not fair to old people who have contributed to this country in their days of youth and who are, normally, eligible for that type of assistance. They are denied this kind of assistance because of the attitude of the Welfare Officer in the Parish of Christ Church. That is the point I want to make, Sir.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I was a bit shocked at hearing the Hon. Minister talk about a lady 29 years old with 14 children, and I wanted to inquire from him what

contribution he was making towards that, financial or otherwise. After listening carefully, I realised that a case can be made out for increasing the amount of money which was voted every year under this Head. I am well aware of a lot of the complaints which have been aired here this evening. I have heard similar complaints when I was in that Ministry, but I have to point out that Welfare Officers have a very difficult job to do.

Now, if the money is insufficient to cover every person who applies for welfare assistance, obviously some will have to be weeded out. One may not necessarily agree with the methods which are meted out, but at the same time one has to bear in mind that there are certain procedures or Regulations laid down which must be fulfilled before the welfare assistance is given. Likewise, the same thing applies to the giving of old age pensions. On previous occasions we have aired this subject here, up to last year when the Estimates were being debated, that the age should be the qualifying mark for granting old age pensions. It was my view then, and when I was in the Ministry I took the necessary action to ensure that in the near future all a person would be required to present is evidence that he or she has achieved the age of 68 years, and he or she would be given a pension.

When one is dealing with the question of welfare assistance, it is not easy to have a simple qualifying procedure to say that if you qualify by this method you can have welfare assistance, because the need for welfare assistance varies in circumstances and conditions from person to person and from area to area. After the problems we had emanating from the increase in oil, the energy crisis and inflation, several people who would never have thought of applying for welfare assistance found it necessary to do so. But at the same time one has to note that, while the number of applications for welfare assistance increased substantially, the amount of money which has been voted for this purpose has not increased. Therefore, it became a very difficult matter for the Welfare Officer to decide who should get or who should not get.

Now, the question of what is right and what is wrong is very pertinent. What is right or wrong for an individual, depending on the data presented to him, can be interpreted by another person to be different on examining the same data. It is quite likely that in a matter such as this where personal assessment comes very much into play, very often you will find that many people are displeased once they feel that they have been left out in preference to someone

whom, in their opinion, should not have been granted welfare assistance and is getting welfare assistance.

I feel that, rather than criticizing the Welfare Officer at this point, we should be coming out very strongly in recommending, or bearing in mind that when the Estimates are to be debated later this year, that we give very strong support to the Minister in getting an increase in this particular vote so that people who have to apply for welfare assistance in the future will not have these problems. As a matter of fact, I would like to suggest also that we bear in mind that we should come around to the concept that age should be the qualifying mark only for people seeking pension. A lot of the problems we now relate here will continue to go on as long as we use the other criteria for determining who should get and who should not get a pension. If these criteria are removed, and we come down to the adoption of simple criteria, many of these problems will disappear. The next time I do not think we would be in a position, or would want to be in a position, to be criticising the Welfare Officers who, under very harsh conditions and against great odds, are still doing a good job.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have much criticism to make about the Welfare Officers, because I have made criticism about them some time ago. I was very glad to hear the Ministers are saying that age should be the criteria. The only thing about it is that the Ministers are in a better position than we are. The Ministers have the power to bring things down here. If all of the Ministers agree that age is the criteria, then bring down the legislation. I agree that age should be the criteria, because in Barbados 68 years is a long innings to reach. You do not reach 68 years in Barbados from the point of view of these hardships you earn. When you reach 68 you have had a long, rough innings.

Let us be quite frank. Everybody who has reached the age of 68 — this is not Reverend Gobson's age that we were talking about when we first introduced it in 1936 or 1938. This is 1976. The people who are going to apply for old age pensions at 68 who do not need it are going to be marginal.

5.35 p.m.

I do not think you are going to get people who are well off going up and wrestling for this same kind of treatment that the Minister has been asked about. I do not think you will get Lady Hutson or somebody like that being pushed about to get an old age pension card. What you are going to get are old people.

Some hon. member said not to worry with the officers. Our people are funny with authority. You give some of our people authority and they get intoxicated. You put them behind a desk and when they see some of these poor people they get intoxicated and start acting and pushing about people. When people are not accustomed to authority and you give it to them, they start pushing around, especially old people. One of these old age people told me that she had a television which her son in America sent for her and she had to wrap it up and put it under the bed, because she said if the officer had seen it she would not get anything. I asked her how she was going to watch it, and she said she did not turn it on because she heard the man was coming. That is the sort of stupidity you get. You cannot rake off anything from the television and eat. Or you may get somebody living in a house which her son or somebody has helped her with, but she cannot scrape off the paint on mornings and say, let me drink a little of this paint. Somebody may tell you that you live in a nice house, but you do not eat any of the house; you do not chip off any of the wall and eat it. You may live in a house with electricity, but you do not eat light, you can only turn it on. Or you may have a water toilet, but you do not drink the water from the water toilet. These are the kind of peculiarities about life, where because a person has a water toilet he is not to get an old age pension.

This is something you have to be prepared to watch. If everybody wants to help the old people they will all have to help; so lick the stumps from behind everybody's wicket and put down this so that there would be no means test. I do not want to take away the thunder of the hon. member for St. John, but I would like to see the removal of the means test. The only exemption I would be prepared to make would be members of the House. Any man who was a former member of the House should not be eligible for old age pension, because if he cannot help himself when he leaves in here he should suffer. If you reach the stage of representing people you should be able to represent yourself. Do not look at me so, Mr. Chairman. I do not mean to deprive anybody of the pension to which he is entitled, but I refer to the State old age pension from which members of the House should be excluded, not the Clerks and officers of the House.

Quite seriously I feel you should remove the means test from old age pensioners because it was put there in the early days.

The other aspect which I think should be studied is that things are going to get harder because you had an inflationary period, and where you have more people out of employment you are going to find more people having to depend on social services. This is where you are going to get a problem. The hon. member spoke about a woman having children. This is one of the things I have said already. Our welfare people have to study our population, not like the National Organisation of Women who are worried about husbands who cannot come here, because this is a middleclass beat. We have to think in terms of women who are getting children whom you know do not have husbands. No woman with 29 children can have a husband; a husband cannot afford that luxury. One came to me on Saturday; she is only 35 years and she had five children from five different men, and she looked good too. She wanted a house but I had to advise her that she was not working, and she would find it difficult to get one with five children and no work. She told me she would get help which I acknowledged, but she was not getting help with the rent. I told her if she could get a job she would be doing something. This is the problem in Barbados. There are a number of women with four, five and six children who have not reached the age of 30 years yet. These are the ones at the breeding ages and this is where we have a social problem which is not diminishing unfortunately. It is increasing and it is here that the hon. member's Ministry is going to have a very big problem. This is where I say we have to be very careful because this problem is likely to overtake us, because they are going to breed faster than you can find jobs, and it is no problem you can look upon lightly. This is a problem that we all have to meet, not the Government alone. It is a national problem and we all have to meet it, because neither we on this side or you on that side are going to be safe where we are because the people whom they breed would not allow us to be safe in the next fifteen or twenty years, because they are the ones who when the whole turnover takes place will see those who have anything more than they as a threat and a danger. That is why we have to keep nearer to these people.

Mr. Chairman, I see social welfare and welfare even reaching out in areas even far beyond old age pensions. Fortunately you are safe with the old age pensioners who are women because you know they would not give you any more problems in so far as reproduction is concerned; but with the men you never know what will happen because they say they never stop until they die and they are still on the line. Not only that; maybe they could be wanderers and you never know where a wanderer is likely

to sleep at night. For that reason I am a believer that if you are going to help some of these people, you should help them early and quickly, and I would like to see when the Estimates come down that you knock clean from behind the stumps this means test business and shut people's mouths, and advise those who have to interview these people so that the old woman does not have to put the television and the radio and such things under the bed when these people visit, because these are the things that they have to be running helter skelter and hiding.

5.45 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, at one time I was under the impression that some of these welfare officers would spend this welfare money on a political Party basis, but now that I have heard complaints coming as they come today even from Ministers in their respective constituencies, from the Government benches, I feel it is stupid, it is almost wicked for anybody to be jumping to their feet in defence of any welfare officer or anything of the kind, because it brings us plainly to understand and to appreciate this, that if we are to hear how well trained they are, they could hardly be well trained to write reports to mislead the Chief Welfare Officer. That is all the training they would have, because it has been brought out clearly and sufficiently here today that we are certain now that some of these officers are people who do not understand the society in which we live and they definitely do not know how to deal with the type of people who from time to time have got to be making application for welfare.

Even the Government must accept some blame. Here you will find the Minister today, even in this estimate, the amount that he is asking for today, he is still making provision for less old age pensioners than we have at the moment; which means that when the welfare officer sets about dispensing what is now voted, you still leave no money to give 23 of them plus the others who have been added to the list since the Minister sought some in September or October or whenever it was last year. That is the type of thing that one has got to deal with. But I am of the view, Mr. Chairman, that a welfare Officer does not have any function of cutting and contriving where the applications of these people are concerned. Whatever money is voted, the officer's only duty is to be satisfied in his mind that the claim is a valid claim; and until it is processed I feel the officer ought to be told as from this date, as soon as application is made and he is satisfied that it is a case worth going before the Committee or the Board or whatever it is, that temporary relief must be given to every

applicant until the case is decided by the Board or Committee as the case might be. In other words, sufficient that a person leaves his or her home to go to the officer to make representation that he is hungry, his child or her children have nowhere to sleep, or have nothing to eat, that that person must not be sent away. The officer will not be able in every case to go on the spur of the moment, but he must be some sort of a psychologist; his training over the years in dealing with people ought to make him to be in a position to be able to arrive at a conclusion as to whether or not this person is a fake. As some hon. member has said, you only find half a dozen of those in the whole of the country. The people of Barbados have a certain amount of pride in themselves.

There are many genuine cases that have come to me, Mr. Chairman and as soon as I discuss with them the best way to approach this matter is to allow me to approach the Welfare Officer for them or with them, they say, 'no, I will come back and see you, do not go yet,' they do away hungry, their children starving, and as soon as they hear that representation has got to be made for welfare for them, some of our people would rather die than know that they live on welfare. That is the background against which our people make application, and that is the type of thing that our welfare officers ought to be sufficiently trained in; to be able to deal with these people and to relieve some of the pressures that are put on these people, as you must agree with me, unnecessarily.

Now if this is the situation, Mr. Chairman, one has got to understand that the duties of these welfare officers are not easy. We have got to appreciate the fact that some of the people who are making the application, among them you will find another type who knows that he is entitled to something but the way how he represents himself or she represents herself to the officer, the officer delays taking action; he would rather get another officer to go and investigate the case rather than he or she doing it, and that in itself can give way for generating a lot of unnecessary steam, and the applicant and his household who would have benefited stand to suffer for a much longer period than they normally would.

It is against situations such as these that we have got to examine the applications in the light in which they are made, and the means of processing the speed with which these applications are dealt; but nevertheless Mr. Chairman, we would like to see that Government show itself — any Government — show itself with a greater alertness

in dealing with the numerous cases that require welfare assistance of some sort.

There is no denying the fact, Mr. Chairman, that you and I know of numerous people who ought not to be left merely like that because when some of them come to get the welfare assistance, in truth and in fact the purchasing power of the assistance that they get represents little or nothing, but we have often had to content ourselves with saying that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all; but many of these people ought to be put in some institution where they could be better cared for. This in itself represents a situation with which the Government has found itself unable to keep pace with.

Our district hospitals are overcrowded. You will find that in some of these district hospitals they are now removing tables and such things from where they were for years, and trying to put bedsteads and make other provision to accommodate more people; but in the face of all of this you still find that there are numbers walking here, walking there, some dragging, some resting on a chair, in need of much more than the mere assistance. They need being cared for.

I want to admit, Sir, that there are the children of some of these old people who have abdicated their responsibility to their parents, their grand parents, and other relatives. Some of them are now too busy, too posh, driving a Datsun or some other car and they do not have time to look after their old relatives. All of these things throw an additional burden on any Government that may be in power. It places a responsibility upon the Government to do something for these people, when we have numerous people who will come forward voluntarily to render assistance to some of these people who are now seeking welfare and are now being denied it, even temporarily. However, we do not find today that people have time to give to this kind of work.

Whenever somebody comes forward, he wants a job; everybody now wants a job. If they are on a Board they are looking for payment. It is not a case, as the hon. member for St. Andrew has said, in the days when we had the Local Government system; do not mind it had its wrongs, I maintain, and I am one of those people who will be willing to support the idea that the degree of suffering today is far greater because the people seeking the assistance have much further to go before they can reach the assistance that would be meted out to them.

You will find officers who are posted in a district, and the officer does not know that in his

spare time he should try to familiarise himself with the conditions under which people live and from one thing to another. They just sit, and if nobody walks into the office, he has nothing to do but write reports, about what? About nothing taking place in his district whereas there are numerous people suffering; but the right officer would mix with the people, get to know the people so that when an application is made for some assistance there is not this delay in telling somebody you have to come back this time and I will come to your house that time, and all sorts of things.

5.55 p.m.

It is in those situations that people have been breaking down as hon. members have said, these people are subjected to cross-examination as if they are in court by some of these welfare officers who think themselves so well trained. I am saying that some of them are ill-mannered, and if anybody is so silly to defend them I would not know what to say. I do not think any hon. member would leave his constituency and come here and stand up before this Hon. House to say these things if they were not true. You find Hon. Ministers making complaints. Do you believe a Minister left home this morning to state any falsehood against any particular welfare officer? So anybody who defends these people is encouraging them to increase their wrongdoing.

I understand and I well appreciate that the day any Parliamentary Secretary or Minister goes out with a welfare officer, or with any other officer for that matter, that officer is going to give of his double best on that particular day. I well remember when the Parliamentary Secretary, the hon. member for St. Michael North East, went to a bakery with an inspector. They go seizing people's bags of flour without giving them a receipt or without giving them notice because a Parliamentary Secretary is with them and they feel they can kill and cure and that sort of thing.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, the baker did get a receipt for his flour.

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member who has just risen ought to have been honest enough to say that the baker got a receipt for his flour months after I made representation to the appropriate people.

Mrs. EASTMOND: On a point of order, there was rat urine and rat dung on the floor. As a matter of fact the inspector is part of the vital unit of the Ministry of Health and he was entitled to do that because the man could have used that flour and several people could have been sick with leptospirosis.

Mr. HINDS: The hon. member for St. Michael North East has risen a second time but the hon. member has not contradicted me that the baker got a receipt months after the date the flour was seized.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member has made a great point about a receipt. As I understand it, it is an officer of the Ministry of Health. Yesterday in Jamaica 12 children died because of contaminated flour. Is it important to stop the distribution of flour or to give a man a receipt?

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we appreciate what the hon. member for St. John has said but that is not the point at issue, it is what the law requires, that if you seize a man's flour or whatever it is you must give the man a receipt. In other words because it happened in Jamaica you must go about seizing everybody's flour in Barbados? It is nonsense what the Prime Minister has said. The Prime Minister must have the welfare officers to carry out the law, we are not suggesting that anybody should be allowed to distribute flour that is unfit for human consumption, we are not concerned with that.

Mr. Chairman, I too hope that the day will soon come when old age pensions particularly are granted to every person who reaches that old age figure of 68, or whether it is reduced to 65 or less, and I believe I am right in saying that if it were so already there are numerous people who are entitled to it that would not draw it. We have to bear in mind that those people who go to the welfare officers are a lot of diabetics, some of them TB patients, lazzaretto patients, people who require assistance, and we have to be able to consider an increase in the amount but we want to know that the welfare officers disburse these sums that are allotted to them in a sensible and reasonable manner with a view to alleviating the poverty stricken conditions under which many of our old and young people, unemployed people, those who are suffering, who cannot get a ticket to go to the doctor and all those things, live. When they go to the doctor sometimes they cannot get the medicine and we will appeal at this stage for the 5% tax to be removed from all these people who have to eke out an existence under present circumstances.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Finance I just want to put this discussion back on the right track. We have come in here with a supplementary estimate for \$144,000 to supplement the Estimates under Head 22(9) — Welfare Department — because there has been an increase in the number of old

age pensions from approximately — and I am speaking now from memory — 14,600 to about 15,030 or 15,017. There are positive sides to this equation. In the United Nations statistics Barbados is second only to Denmark in the longevity of its citizens. Whenever you speak of poverty and deprivation and everything else, people in Barbados, apart from the people living in a place, I think it is called Azerbaijan, somewhere in the Caucasus mountains, where it is alleged that they have lived to 140, but they have no birth certificates to prove it, they are the second longest living people in the whole world, and this can only be attributed to, (1) a good climate, or (2) that they must be getting a level of sustenance in this country and that people are not being deprived of the bare necessities of life which they suffer from in other countries, and (3) that the level of health care in Barbados is as good as or better than most industrialised societies.

There are three factors which cannot be ignored. For at least two of those the services provided by the taxpayers through the Government of this island must be largely responsible. Let us get back to the basic facts now. 1961 is a long time ago. In 1961 I do not think I had a grey hair in my head, I do not remember, it is so long ago, but it is a long time ago, but in 1961 despite the pleas made by the members of my Party — the hon. member for St. James is only a latter day apostle about this business of increasing old age pensions — but we were crying for an increase in old age pensions when it was \$1.20 a week, to no avail, and the Government which I have the honour to represent relentlessly increased the old age pension from \$1.20 a week to the present level, time after time, to where it is now, \$10.00 a week.

6.05 p.m.

The old age pension is a non contributory pension gratuitously given to all of those persons who have reached the age of 68 and who qualify by way of a means test which we did not introduce, but which we have considerably modified and extended and given instructions that it will not be rigidly applied.

Let us get the facts straight. The old age pension scheme is not a contributory scheme. It is not like unemployment insurance. It is something that you qualify for by virtue of obtaining the age of 68; and nearly every Barbadian who is not knocked down by a reckless driver or gets into an argument on Saturday night and has a knife pushed into him and is one of the homicide victims, you have the

normal expectancy in Barbados of reaching the age of 73 years and two months. Therefore, everyone in this country, if he does not have an accident will automatically qualify for old age pension, and therefore will not be entirely destitute in his old age; and it is a non-contributory scheme.

The fact that we are here today for a supplementary is an indication that more and more people are living longer. These are United Nations statistics. I think that when I assumed office we only had something like 10,000 old age pensioners or less on the roll. There are now over 15,000 — 15,070. Therefore, we have to provide more money for them. Those are basic facts.

Now, it is costing the country every year nearly \$10 million or over for old age pensioners alone. The Bill for the Public Service is something like \$25 million to pay the Civil Servants. The total income of Barbados in 1961 was \$91 million, but the Government's pay roll today is \$75 million and Barbados cannot qualify for the trust fund set up by the International Monetary Fund for those countries which are suffering balance of payments deposits as a result of the energy crisis; because our per capita income now is higher than a lot of the industrialised countries.

The per capita income of India which has atomic energy, a big army, and a big air force and navy, which has gold and coal and produces wheat and iron, and has steel foundaries, railways and everything else is \$50 per annum. In Barbados it is only \$1,100 per annum in US currency or special drawing rights.

Now, let us put the thing in its proper perspective. It is our revenues which the Government garners from the citizens of this country. We have a welfare state. We have a free medical service. Nobody in this country needs to go to sleep without a meal under his belt because we have national assistance. We have social security and national insurance with a minimum pension of \$15 a week which is on a contributory basis. Then we have the non contributory schemes of old age pensions and national assistance so that every single individual in this country is covered against destitution and want.

Now they say that we are to do this and that for the old age pensioners. I am going to make a disclosure here that is very interesting. There are certain concepts which our public officers and sociologists imbibed when they go overseas. They read about things in newspapers. A lot of these people in women's organisations

read about things like Citizens Advice Bureaux. They read about things like old people's homes and senior citizens homes.

Some of the people in our party said that we should set up homes for senior citizens. So, with the 15,000 old age pensioners that we have, we thought that we would be inundated with applications from people for these senior citizens homes which had T.V. sets, domestic servants, laundresses, matrons, living rooms, gardeners and all that kind of thing on one level so that you would not have to walk upstairs.

We built one at Pinelands. We had it opened for months and we could not find three people. These homes are not almshouses, they are not district hospitals. These are homes built for senior citizens at a very modest rent; and we had to go and recruit senior citizens to occupy these homes because there is nobody at that level who did not have somewhere to live or felt that he or she needed that kind of accommodation which is the kind of accommodation which I would wish for if I were a bachelor at a bachelor's apartment; but I am not a bachelor; or if I were one of a young married couple it would also be suitable, in my opinion, for a young married couple.

It was not possible to find people to occupy our senior citizens homes, and those are old age pensioners. Let us look at what old age pension is. It is not a payment to people who have worked for a pension in the ordinary sense of the term and who are compensated in their old age in order to provide themselves with the necessities of life. As I have said time and time again, old age pension is a contribution which is made to a person of that age who almost invariably is living either in his or her own dwelling, or more frequently than not, with some member of the family; because we have in the Caribbean the principle of the extended family where invariably grandmothers or great aunts are looking after the young children and they are actually an assistance to the younger members of the family who have to go out and work, both mothers and fathers.

A person is not really old at 68 in Barbados; but such a person unless he or she is indigent and infirm is an integral part of the economic system in Barbados; because such a person is an integral part of the family life in Barbados particularly in those homes where fathers may be away from the children and where the children may be brought up without having the benefit of the father's presence in the home.

It is an integral part of our economic life because that person of an advanced or senior age

is relieving a younger person with his niece, or daughter or grand daughter as the case may be to go out to work to provide for the younger children. So, the contributions we make to a person which is erroneously described as old age pension is a contribution to their self respect; but more often than not they are living with their families who can provide them with three square meals a day and all that kind of thing.

I want to say that in the first place the Government's resources are limited and therefore you do not give old age pensions to those large numbers of persons who may be deriving incomes from other sources or who are actually working over the age of 68. There may be some people over the age of 68 who may be in possession of private incomes in excess of \$150 a week.

6.15 p.m.

There are many Government pensioners who are deriving an income from their Government pensions of over \$300 or \$400 a month. It would be ridiculous to suggest that you should pay them, in addition to that, an old age pension as of right of \$10.00 a week, or any other sum, just because they have achieved the age of 68! This is the first reason. Then you would not be giving to each man according to his need at all, but you would be indiscriminately scattering Government funds on the basis that a person of 68 has some claim against the Treasury of this Island, whether the Treasury can afford to make that contribution, or additional contribution, to that person's wellbeing or not. The final point is that where you are finding that 5% or 6% of your total Government revenue is being expended on persons who are no longer productive in the pure economic sense of the term — I am not discussing the other socio or economic contributions they may be making in the way that I have described in so far as the family unit is concerned.

In pure economic terms, where you are spending 6% of your Government revenue on this sector, one must be very careful that one does not inordinately increase the burden, either by being expansive at a time when one feels the election will come and say: "Let us increase it by 300% and give everybody \$100.00 a month old age pension", or by bringing into the net an unnecessarily large number of people who (a) may not need it; secondly, would not expect it, and would be even surprised that you could consider that they deserve it. These are the criteria which we have to apply, so do not let us get emotional about it.

We have always heard a talk about old people. I wonder what is going to happen later

on? If we are a socialist society and we are working towards the elimination of want and need, we have, or we had, or we have almost reached that stage, I am saying that with the situation we have in Barbados with the non-contributory pensions, with the social security, with the other provisions which we have of National assistance, we have certainly eliminated a large element of want. We have not reached absolute prosperity because of the limitation of our resources. Our *per capita* income is high — high by any standards in the world, but when we reach the stage when we do have a higher level of prosperity, with the kind of distribution we have in this country, I wonder where they are going to get votes from. They are talking about poor people, and then the people say: "Who are poor? Are you talking about us? I do not know what poor you are talking about." When are you going to eliminate the poor? You have the concept in your mind that you must always have these poor people who you want to remain ignorant, who cannot think for themselves so that you can always have an area to which you can appeal.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry the member for St. John, the Prime Minister, did not come in here much earlier otherwise he would have been rather proud of his foot soldiers on the other side to see how they jumped on their feet this evening to castigate the Welfare Officers. Maybe this is Election year, and you are hearing a lot about poor people, Lennox Road not being repaired, Dean Village not being repaired, and so on. You cannot set about to condemn your civil servants, your Welfare Officers, or any Government servant when the Government itself needs condemning. If you have a bad Government, you are going to have bad Welfare Officers. It is as simple as that. They do not provide for these people the facilities to make it reasonable for them to carry out their duties as they should.

I heard the member for St. Andrew this evening making it abundantly clear here that he had problems in St. Andrew. Now, for all of these months and for all of these years we heard not one single thing about the problems with Welfare officers. I believe the hon. member for St. Andrew is really sincere. We had the attack on the civil servants, and then the defence by the Minister of Communications and Works and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health. You do not know where you are going. Some of the Government members have attacked the civil servants, and the Minister of Communications and Works and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health have defended the civil servants.

I would have thought, Sir, that all of this United Nations statistics and these billions of dollars a year, and the percentage, and all of these fancy words used by the Prime Minister — I thought he was going to tell us that he is prepared to bring down a Resolution in here providing for the old age pensioners in this country not less than \$20.00 per week. That is what I expected to hear, but I heard of the United Nations, second to Denmark, and all of these fancy things. He would not tell this House, or tell his Cabinet members, that an old age pensioner would have to live for 10 years to earn \$2,600.00. (*Asides.*) I beg your pardon, Sir. It would take an old age pensioner 5 years to receive \$2,600.00 at \$10.00 a week as against a Minister who does absolutely nothing in the country and works for \$2,800.00 a month. I have seen no supermarket marked "Minister" or "Old Age Pensioner". You will see Carlton's Supermarket and Gertz Supermarket, and the price for a tin of Corned Beef is the same for a Minister as for an old age pensioner, yet they are getting a measly \$10.00 a week. On the other hand, you are talking about a Socialist Government, longevity, and second to Denmark. Try and give the people some money.

These people made a contribution to this country whereby the Ministers today can draw \$2,400.00 a month and come to Parliament about 29 times in one year. The Government spent \$1,375 to bring Waldo Ramsay for three days, and an old age pensioner gets \$520.00 for a whole year! Do you see the sort of Socialist Government we have? They walk about and parade as Socialists in the day and Capitalists at night. (*Asides.*) That is how they operate. You only have to look about the hotels and in people's homes and you will see them butting about at night. I know them good, Sir. (*Asides.*) I know them because it is my duty to drive about behind people like you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask all hon. members to adhere to Standing Order 33(6).

Mr. CRAIG: I drive about behind M 50 and 1756. That is my job.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will contain himself, and carry on with the Resolution.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, they are saying that the Social Welfare Officer will not carry out his functions. Go to Folkestone, St. James, and you will see that Denny is working in an office which looks like a bar in the rum shop of the member for St. George South. It looks dingy, it

has no sanitation and so on. (*Asides.*) This is the sort of behaviour we are getting, Sir, and yet they are talking about Welfare Officers not carrying out their duties. How do you expect the same Welfare Officer to approach the home of an old age pensioner when she is not in a position to keep her home tidy? It is human nature for him to keep away. The homes are dirty; the people's faces are hard, and they are suffering. All of those things have been brought upon them by this Government. Now you go and ask the old-timers you were talking about this evening how they are getting along. They will tell you: "We only got \$1.20 in 1961, but it was not as bad as it is now." That is what I have heard them say, unless they are fooling me.

Sir, they came into power in 1961. The Resolution in 1962 called for something like \$25 million, and they gave the old age pensioners \$1.80 a week.

6.25 p.m.

In 1962 when the Revenue was \$25,835,200 old age pensions received \$1.80 per week. In the 1975-76 Estimates you have a revenue of \$170,548,000 and all you have given these old people between 1962 and 1975 is \$7.20 more. That is all you have done over a period of fourteen years, and you talk about being a socialist Government and about the sufferings of people, and when you should be castigating yourself you are condemning the Welfare Officers. Do you believe the Welfare Officers are going to take money from their own pockets? Ask Denny if he is going to pull money out of his pocket and buy food for an old age pensioner. You cannot even find Denny, and the reason is that the physical conditions under which he has to work do not afford him to remain in the office. If you doubt me you go to Folkestone or take a drive to Greens at the Bath of the hon. member for St. George South and you will see there is hardly any difference between Folkestone where the Welfare Officer is working and the bath. The difference there is that you do not have anybody singing; you have some old people crying in the wilderness and not a single person to come to their rescue. And you talk about being a socialist Government. Do you know why you have no kindness in your heart for the old age pensioners? They are now social lepers. They cannot walk about and tout and pimp and vote for you, so they have become social lepers. The day that Coloured becomes 69 or 70 years and you are still in power, you can rest assured you do not want any part of Coloured. That is how you operate. You will have no use for Waldo Ramsay now and you will soon have no use for Carlton Brathwaite and that gang

because they cannot do the dirty things for you. You are a bad Government, governed by a bad man with bad Ministers.

Mr. Chairman, here you have a former Minister of Agriculture who represented agriculture for some fourteen years this evening talking about old people. I should have heard this long ago. The present Minister of Agriculture talks about a woman with fourteen children. Have you heard about children yet? You had better walk about with Denny if you want to hear about children. There is an admission by the Minister of Agriculture that there is poverty in Barbados and there is unemployment as high as you can possibly think about. Yet the Prime Minister promised this country that by 1976 there was going to be full employment. I am going to throw out this challenge to him. If he can produce any document in here between now and the elections that there is full employment in Barbados, I shall not contest the elections in St. James. He bluffs his way through all the time and that is the problem you have in here. (A VOICE: George Moe still can't get in.) You are always on a wrong wicket. George Moe and Craig were never any company. I am accustomed beating lawyers and he is one. Never allow that man's name to go down in the records in here even in an asides as long as I am alive it can't happen.

Mr. Chairman, I could never sit down here this evening and castigate the Welfare Officers. I always set about to condemn the Ministry under which the Welfare Officers operate. You have a former teacher of Harrison College who was getting \$600 a month and is now getting \$2,400 now. Well you know that Minister will cut your throat for his Government to remain in power. The Private Aide to the Prime Minister got \$800. He will never be able to understand the problems of the poor because he was not brought up that way. The Leader of the House would tell you that he would be middle-class. You have a lot of hungry people talking about middle-class! What middle-class are you talking about? You are talking about middle income. You have either the poor or the rich and this country is loaded with poor people. You have on the streets of Bridgetown today professional beggars in boys and girls because they cannot get anything to do, and you have a Government bluffing them morning, noon and night. Come election time you are going to find money being spent about here. Sometimes I cry deep within my heart to understand whether the people of this country,

with all this secondary and University education, are going to remain in a state of corned beef and rum politics. I hope not. Wake up, Black man. Black man, get up; what time is it? It is time for a change in this country one way or another. The people of Barbados must get up from sleeping and ask what time is it! It is time for a change in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the Prime Minister say just now that fourteen years is a long, long time to be either in the Opposition or in the Government. He also reminded the Speaker long before he was out of that Chair that the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh. I am also aware of the fact that the guilty also fleeth when no one pursueth, and I saw over there this evening almost a war between members on the Government side not knowing where they are going, bolting to discuss a Resolution. Not one single member from that side got up and said that the old age pensioners' position is such that they would recommend to Cabinet that they get not less than \$20 a week. Instead you heard that the Welfare Officer does not do his duty, somebody has fourteen children, and a lot of nonsense when people are dealing with bread and butter. I do not see any A. S. Bryden's or Manning, Wilkinson & Challenors about here hungry. However you look around it is the people of this colour, and it is the people of this colour that run the country, therefore you are responsible and have to be condemned, and probably it will be sooner than you expect.

Mr. Chairman, I have to support this Resolution because it sets about to make some provision for the poor of this country, but I say it is with deep feeling and I am rather surprised not to hear a single voice from the other side call for an additional dollar for the same pensioners of this country. When you talk about a means test, you have to go through the housing areas where you will see big able-bodied men who can afford to pay \$60 and \$80 per week living in the houses, but outside you find the old lady paying \$5.00 a week and \$2.00 land rent out of the \$10 she receives as pension, and she still has to eat food and depend on the people next door. This is not the type of State I would like to live in. I know I came out of very poor people and I am here with a message from them. You will have to take my blood if you continue your stupidity. Sir, with those few remarks I am going to support the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reply briefly to this debate.

When you remove the emotionalism from the discussion, I would say that two main points have been made during the debate and they fall into the categories of (a) criticism of the operations of the Welfare Department and the way in which certain Welfare Officers carry out their functions, and (b) the plea that there should be some upward revision in the grants and payments made to old age pensioners.

In respect of the first type of criticism made, namely the criticism of the Welfare Officers in the execution of their duties, I would like to state that these officers operate under an Act known as the National Assistance Act, and under that Act there is a clear statement in Clause 9 that "any applicant for national assistance who is aggrieved by any decision of the Chief Welfare Officer, a Welfare Officer or of any public officer delegated by the Chief Welfare Officer to perform any of his duties under sub-section (2) of Section 8 or sub-section (2) of Section 14 shall have the right to appeal to an appropriate Appeal Committee."

In other words, if any person has made application to the National Assistance Board or to the Chief Welfare Officer for the grant of any payment under these particular provisions, and they have been given a bad hearing, no hearing or the Welfare Officer has been rude, this Act makes provision for the applicant to appeal to the Appeal Committee under the National Assistance Board. So there is machinery for complaints against a public officer in the Welfare Department to be heard, 6.35 p.m.

So there is machinery if there are complaints against public officers in the Welfare Department. There is machinery laid down under the Act for those complaints to be heard, and I would like to tell hon. members on both sides of this House, we are lawmakers; let us abide by the law as it is, namely, if in making representation on behalf of their constituents they come across cases of bad manners, lack of humane concern on the part of the officers, follow the procedures as laid down in the Act. There is provision for it.

I would like to say that it is not to join with those members who made the statement; it is not an easy thing when you are operating a means test, to determine each particular case. There are going to be problems. Some people will not be pleased by the decision taken and when you are not pleased it is quite easy to go from that stage towards criticisms of the officers. They have a very difficult task. I am not by any means condoning bad manners on the part of the officers. What I am saying is, if there are cases of

bad conduct on the part of the officers, the Act makes provision for dealing with that situation or for any complaints.

I do not think I have to say anything more about that. As far as the matter is concerned, I will draw this also to the attention of the Chief Welfare Officer so that he can speak with his staff on these particular matters.

As far as the other arguments are concerned about the level of payments, I made it quite clear while dealing with this particular Head, that I was giving consideration to the whole question of payment in cash and coin to old pensioners, and when I have completed that particular review I will be in a position to make recommendations on the matter. I made this quite clear.

I said further, that tomorrow I will be meeting with the National Assistance Board, and under the Act to which I made reference, the National Assistance Board has a statutory responsibility in this particular area, to give advice and to make recommendations, and I am talking to them tomorrow on the matters of the means test. They have some advice to tender on this particular matter, and I will be listening to what they have to say and evaluate what they have to say.

There is no doubt at all that there are persons in this country, particularly old, who find difficulty in meeting the needs of living, and that is what we are concerned about in this country and what we have been concerned about ever since this Government came into power in 1961. It is no point reeling out information to the effect that the increase would only be \$7 or \$8.10 by this particular Government. I would like to hear a comparative statistic for the period 1950 to 1961 to see what the increases were for old age pensioners. (*Aside*) Now this is the problem. You can say it has been increased from 1961, and I listed each particular increase. In fact when we took it up, in 1961 I believe it was \$2.15. We took it from \$2.15. There was an increase, I believe, just before the elections in 1961 — from \$1.80 — October, 1961, I believe, \$1.80 to \$2.15. So you can work out by whatever mathematical process you can, what it would have been raised from 1950 until 1961. The election was in December and that was raised in October, but that is that.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, the member must also draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, that I gave him a breakdown that between 1961 and 1974 the revenue was \$25 million as against \$170 million now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Right, Mr. Chairman, I am finished. I said there are two points; I have dealt with the first one about any complaints against how the welfare officers carry out their functions. There is a machinery for dealing with those matters and we are looking at the whole question of the remuneration of payment made to old age pensioners.

I agree with the member for St. James – temporarily for St. James – when he said there is time for a change. He will be changed.

*The question that Head 22(9) Welfare Department – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS, LABOUR AND NATIONAL INSURANCE

#### HEAD 25(2) – LANDS AND SURVEYS DEPARTMENT

*Head 25(2) Lands and Surveys Department – was called.*

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 25(2) – Lands and Surveys Department – stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 \$202,514 do now pass.

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

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

#### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1975–76 No. 31

Hon. C. E. TALMA: In moving the passing of Head 20(2) – Primary, Adult and Special Education, Item 3 – Communications, supplementary provision is made here for four main reasons. First, the reduction in the original Draft Estimates, (2) installation of telephone services to additional schools, (3) the expansion of the school feeding programme and (4) the

under-estimation of amount included in the Estimates.

6.45 p.m.

As far as Head 20(2) – Item 3 is concerned, the amount which was provided in the Estimates was \$50,000. Expenditure up to now is \$48,625.50 and a balance of \$1,374.50 is left. The position is that the expansion programme for servicing all schools with the installation of telephones in accordance with the Cabinet decision of 10th February, 1972 the Barbados Telephone Company was advised to instal telephones in primary schools, and this is a continuation of this programme, so that the Telephone Company initially installed telephones in many schools. In the parish of St. Andrew, Bawden's Mixed, St. Andrew's Boys', St. Andrew's Girls', St. Saviour's Mixed, St. Simon's Mixed, Turner's Hall Primary; in the parish of St. George, St. Luke's; in the parish of St. Joseph, St. Elizabeth's Mixed; in St. Peter, Boscobel Boys', Boscobel Girls'; in St. Thomas, Hillaby Mixed; and St. Lucy, St. Clement's Junior, St. Clement's Infants, St. Lucy's Primary, St. Swithin's Primary and Selah Primary, so it is a question of carrying out a rapid programme and extending the telephone service in accordance with the Cabinet decision.

The installation of the services to these schools will complete the expansion of the service to all existing primary schools and it is estimated that a further sum of \$3,392 will be required to meet the monthly service charges for these schools. That is the explanation of that particular Item, Sir.

As far as Head 20(2) – Item 4 is concerned, the amount provided was \$60,000. Expenditure to date is \$46,967.11, commitments \$542.88, making a total of \$47,509.99. The balance is \$12,490.01. The original amount which was included in the Estimates for this amount was \$90,000 but the amount was reduced to \$60,000 in accordance with the instructions at the time. This money is needed inasmuch as the reductions had to take place owing to the financial conditions at the time.

I beg to move that Head 20(2) stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, this is something that I had been agitating for a very long time and we are indeed glad to hear from the Minister that all of this intended expansion now resulted from a Cabinet decision of 10th February, 1972. We are very near to the 10th February, 1976, but

what I would like the Minister to pay very special attention to is that there are several schools where the telephones have been installed at the expense of the heads and staff of those schools.

I want to refer specifically to cases since 10th February, 1972 because I believe since it was a Cabinet decision of that date — and I do not want to doubt the Minister — if this Cabinet decision was not communicated to the heads of schools and the like, but the necessity arose where these teachers saw that they required a telephone, and we know this, that at these schools some teachers like at any other school or any other institution will use the telephone for their personal business from time to time. It must be so, but we also know that the telephone has been used by the Ministry of Education calling up the schools using the telephones installed by the staff of these schools to transact the Ministry's business. I would ask the Cabinet to consider reimbursing those teachers for the installation fees in respect of those telephones installed at schools since 10th February, 1972. The Minister must know that they were installed and that the staff of these schools at the end of each month had to make their contributions to the upkeep of the telephone service. This has not been done purely for the benefit of the heads and staff, the Ministry of Education has been making use of such telephones, and again I must stress that the Ministry must consider schools where there is no telephone and as a result the heads of schools have to get in their motor cars and drive to the nearest plantation where they can get a telephone to transact school business. They have to leave the schools and drive to the Ministry to transact business for the school and have got no compensation with the price of gasoline what it is now.

I have heard the Minister of Education telling this House that there is provision whereby the teachers providing such services for the benefit of their schools can be compensated but yet there is not a school teacher who has been compensated. Whenever the question arises that teacher is considered as seeking what others do not ask for. One has got to take into consideration the teacher having to drive from St. Lucy, St. Peter, St. Andrew, to come in for a couple of books or something like this or necessary boxes of chalk or whatever supplies for the school. These are things that the Ministry must take into consideration.

We are glad that they have now decided to have telephones installed at all these primary schools but I want to know, because I remember money has been voted in respect of the parish of

St. Peter to erect a public market at Speightstown for many a year and year and year and year and all the people who used the market have almost died out now, and I want to find that in respect of Boscobel Boys' and Boscobel Girls' Schools that we come here and vote money, because this is a Cabinet decision from 10th February, 1972 and we understand what the date is. We do not want to know that the money is voted and in another five or ten years we come back to find that the telephones have not been installed.

6.55 p.m.

We hope that the Minister has taken into consideration everything and that he will try to get in touch with the Telephone Company, let them know that the money has been voted and let them execute the work with despatch. This is technical work, and we are not saying that the Telephone Company, can hitch up all these schools in a week or a month; but let us see that something appreciable is being done in the process of time.

We are glad to see and to know that consideration at last is being given to connecting these schools up because there have been situations arising from time to time where a child is sick and requires the services of a doctor, and the Head Teacher or some teacher has to take the child to the doctor who may not be there.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would give way — the Standing Orders have not been suspended and I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

*On Resumption:—*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Sitting is resumed.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with the Resolution of which I gave notice today. It is a Resolution to guarantee a loan being made by USAID to the University of the West Indies.

Sir, as the Addendum sets out:—

“This resolution seeks the approval of Parliament for the guarantee by the Government of a loan in the sum of US \$1,360,000 (Bds. \$2,720,000) to be made by USAID to the University of the West Indies, for the purpose of enabling the latter to improve the physical infrastructure (buildings and equipment) in the area of agriculture and related subjects, Communication including work in language and linguistic and essential support facilities — libraries etc., and technical assistance training.

“The loan is repayable over a period of 40 years including a ten year grace period on principal with interest at the rate of 2% per annum during the grace period and 3% per annum thereafter.

“This loan is part of a sum of US \$8.5 Million to be made by USAID to the University of the West Indies. US \$3.270 M. to be guaranteed by the Government of Jamaica, US \$3.870 M. to be guaranteed by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago and US \$1.360 M. to be guaranteed by the Government of Barbados.”

The University Grants Committee at a meeting held on 5th December, 1975 approved in principle the University's Loan application for (US) \$8.5 million to USAID, and the purposes of the loan are as follows:— (a) physical infrastructure, buildings and equipment in the areas of agriculture and related subjects, communications including work in language and linguistics and all essential support facilities, libraries etc. (b) scholarship programmes for students of the LDCs and (c) technical assistance training.

As I have mentioned already, the terms and conditions of the loan are (a) the loan to be executed by the Council of the University should not exceed (US) \$8.5 million, and will be repayable over 40 years. (b) prior to any disbursement of the issuants of any commitment document under the loan an agreement and guarantee subscribed to by each of the Governments, Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago and Barbados wherein each of the said Governments unconditionally assigns and pledges itself that in the events of a default by the borrower each shall pay to AID in the US a proportionate share as

agreed upon by the said Government the total loan disbursed which remains unpaid and also the unpaid accrued interest.

Approval was given to this application on the understanding that the guarantee to be undertaken by these Governments, Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago and Barbados, would be limited except for the non capital element of scholarships and technical assistance expenditure to the amount to be spent in the respective territories. A guarantee has been given by each Government — Jamaica, (US) \$3.270 million, and the campus which is responsible is Mona. 8.05 p.m.

Trinidad and Tobago \$3,870,000 (US) and the Campus which is responsible is St. Augustine. Barbados \$1,380,000 (US), Cave Hill Campus, making a total of \$8,500,000 (US). Those are the facts, Sir. There is a lot of background information which can hardly be necessary, because this matter was started since 1969 when the University's Appraisal Committee carried out extensive analyses leading to this plan for the development and expansion of the University based on the expressed needs of the contributing Governments. I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate. In case there is any further explanation, I will try to give it.

It is urgent that we get this matter done today, Sir, because the document has to be signed tomorrow, according to what I have read and in accordance with the points raised in here. Barbados has to try to keep in line with the other countries which are all passing similar Resolutions to approve the guaranteed loan in order to expedite the loan for the benefit of improving certain infrastructure in the University of the West Indies.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

*The question that the Resolution be now approved 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 resume in Committee of Supply.

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 resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. LOWE in the Chair.*

*The resumption of Head 20(2) – Primary, Adult and Special Education was called.*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When progress was reported, the hon. member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair who, I observe, is not here.

*The question that Head 20(2) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 20 (14) – Youth Affairs – was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 20 (14) – Youth Affairs – in the sum of \$101.00 stand part.

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

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

*Ministry of Agriculture, Science and Technology – Head 18(1) – General Administration – was called.*

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(1) – General Administration – stand part.

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

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

*Head 18(2) – Technical Division – was called.*

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(2) – Technical Division – stand part.

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

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

*Head 18(3) – Markets – was called.*

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(3) – Markets – stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can tell us who has the contract for supplies of uniforms for Market Supervisors that has occasioned this increase?

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I have been told by the Accountant that the uniforms are ordered through the Central Purchasing Department. I will undertake to get the information for the hon. member.

*The question that Head 18(3) – Markets – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

*Head 18(6) – Fisheries – was called.*

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18 (6) – Fisheries – stand part.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, one of the most undeveloped parishes in Barbados – this may be due to its representation for the last 18 years – is the parish of St. John. I consider that St. John is one of the most beautiful parishes in this Island, the only thing wrong with it is the way that it votes. St. John has exceptional coastal facilities. It has the great historic site of Codrington College to which this item refers; it has inland sites of very great beauty which it shares with St. Philip and the College Savannah Pasture; it has, incidentally, the people who are not interested in these things; it has the relics of the steepest railway line ever built in the world, that is in My Lady Cutting, Sir, running from Conset Bay to St. Mark; and it has a great potential, in my opinion, for tourist development. I think that many of the parts of St. John owned by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel – (Asides.) I think that in those parts, perhaps, the development of the tourist's potential is concentrated.

Now, Sir, I would say that I am not one who believes in turning Codrington College into a hotel, or even building a hotel to spoil that good climb. Within Barbados you can get tourism, too. Barbadians can be tourists from St. Michael to St. John as they were in the days of the railway. Indeed, I would say that the coastal part of St. John has declined since there is no railway. When we had a railway 40 years ago, the coastal parts of St. John occupied a greater importance in the general development of Barbados than they occupy now. Conset Bay, which is embraced in this Resolution, Bath, Martins Bay, and so on.  
8.15 p.m.

Our party proposed in 1966, although I do not recall whether we repeated it in 1971, that the East Coast Road should be extended through St. John, down the coast and through the

property owned by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. I would like to say that I have always believed this a first class project and one well worthwhile. Indeed I am not so sure that the part of the East Coast Road or the East Coast area that lies between Bathsheba and College Savannah has not got a greater potential for recreational development than the part that lies between Bathsheba and Belleplaine which has been developed. Certainly the parts of the coast line that have fallen into the sea, both those owned by the Society and others, would be benefitted at the present time by a little seacoast protection, and we in this House are fortunate in that we can enter into fairly regular intercourse with one of the Clerks at the Table who is interested as President of the Caribbean Environmental Association or whatever it is called, in the preservation of this sort of beautiful area. But the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel does not only own some very attractive properties on the sea in St. John; it also owns Codrington College, and I would suggest that time has been marked for too long in the development of Codrington College and the bringing it back into the main stream of higher education in this Island.

This Government, Mr. Chairman, takes months, years and in some cases we have seen even decades to make up its mind about things that individuals with a greater sense of urgency and a greater sense perhaps of fallibility and mortality would ever be able to allow themselves.

Codrington College was an institute of higher education. Many Barbadians received a University education there, but for years it has been merely a centre for theological training, when its traditions, the land area around it, the extensive properties owned by the Society and so on, all suggest that a much greater use could be made of the potentialities of the area.

I know that a Court Order was made some years ago and indeed the present Mr. Speaker is the first indirect beneficiary of that Court Order, because it was a result of the proceedings that led up to the making of the Order when the part played by the hon. member for Christ Church West and Senator St. John was so grossly and wickedly and falsely misrepresented by the Democrat Newspaper — I wish to goodness they would start another newspaper and let the Minister of Information edit it — that the former Mr. Speaker Maxwell had his feet set on the downward path to financial ruin which he helped pave and broaden by his depredations after that unfortunate event. Anyhow, be that as it may, there was never any intention on the part of the

hon. member or Senator St. John to cause an interpretation of the will to be such as would allow Codrington College to be turned into a hotel, but both the Court's Order and commonsense coincide in directing us that we should make Codrington College a useful institution with a part to play in Barbados and the West Indies of the Seventies and Eighties, and I would look forward to seeing the enterprise of those interested in Codrington College and the enterprise of the Government very soon to bring forth ideas which will provide some reasonable and suitable use of the properties of the Society and of Codrington College in the years to come.

You have had it there for a very long time. I point out to people that Codrington College, the buildings and indeed perhaps even the foundation, are considerably older than most of the buildings at the great universities of Oxford and Cambridge, not to speak of perhaps as equally great but not so venerable in age as the Universities of Harvard, Yale and Princeton. You have got a tradition and I believe that we can try to make it meaningful at the present time.

This business of the rent; I do not even know what this rent is for. Probably it is for the Waterworks shed by the pond at Codrington. Is that what it is for? (*Aside*) Oh, it is for the fish shed at Conset Bay. These little petty enterprises! Conset Bay has a nice jetty and a fish shed. It has another fish shed that you cannot reach because it seems to me there has been a land slip in between the two. I do not know if you are paying rent for both fish sheds or what, but it has those things. Conset Bay can be developed as a recreational area as well as a fishing centre.

I do not want to expose our party's ideas too much, but we believe that there are fishery potentials on the whole St. John coast line from St. Margaret's Bay right down to Conset Bay which are only being partly realised at the present time. I have heard the hon. member for St. Joseph in another place point out that off the same Conset Bay, off the same properties belonging to the Society, there are areas where for example you can sink old motor cars, because these have been proved very useful in other shores where the people are perhaps more enterprising and imaginative than us, in attracting lobsters and other shell fish. Apparently the bodies of old motor cars when you drop them in the sea are very, very attractive to shell fish. I do not know why. But there is no trouble in doing that. That could have been done long ago just like that, even if you had to sail one of the barges from the carenage round. That is a matter

of taking a decision in the morning and by the end of the week something like that could be done. Nobody could be harmed by that. I believe there is potential for lobster fishery all along that coast, although it will take many years to develop. I have canvassed this matter in here before; so I am not saying anything that is new.

I believe I have canvassed this matter in here a sufficient number of years ago that if the idea had been taken then, we would be eating lobsters now because a lobster fishery has to be left for five to seven years before it is wise to start harvesting them from the areas off the St. John coast line where you have gently shelving reefs which provide a movement of water but not so great a wash of water as to make it uncomfortable for lobsters. I went down there in 1967 with an American expert on these matters and I seem to recall that I spoke about it in the House soon after, but imagination has never been a strong point of successive Ministers of Agriculture and Fisheries in here and the idea was ignored. These are ideas which a proper representative for St. John would see and have done.

I know that if St. Thomas had a coastline and this sort of potential was present I would have pressed for it just as when I came back from Bermuda on a C.P.A. visit in 1970 I pressed for development of the caves in St. Thomas, which development is now starting to come about. Read the records; the records of the House are there, however much hon. members of the House may giggle. This is what representatives are sent to the House of Assembly for. Read the debates of 1970; it would be easier reading than the material with which you misled the Ministry of Education for so long. I am addressing my remark to the aside of the former Minister of Education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There can be no asides in here. We are dealing with a Resolution, and St. Thomas does not have any coast line.

Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I believe they have blind fish in the river in Coles cave. I am not suggesting that the Minister of Agriculture should follow the Minister of Information on his hands and knees into the river but even if we do not have a coast line, I have heard that we still have fish.

Mr. FORDE: Very briefly, I wonder if the Minister could help me on what proposals the Government has for assisting fishermen who drift abroad in recovering their boats and tackle. It has been drawn to my attention clearly in one case which I am specific about and in one mentioned to me, that boats have been drifting

and sometimes left in other territorial waters; and these people have great difficulty in getting the assistance of our External Affairs Division and Fisheries — not with they themselves being returned to Barbados but certainly in getting their boats back to this Island. As usual it is the small man who is at a great disadvantage in this respect.

8.25 p.m.

Usually, and as usual, it is the small man who is at great disadvantage in this respect, and it seems to me that the Department of Fisheries should have some proper vote, or lending scheme, to assist parties who are at a disadvantage in this respect.

I do not know whether the Minister has made any representations on this matter in the upcoming Estimates which we may or may not discuss in March depending on what happens in the next few weeks, but I would like to think that it is a point borne in mind either by him or by his successor.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I note the point made by the hon. member and I would like to assure him that we actually have provision in the Estimates for recovery of fishing boats. In the event if those funds are exhausted, we have other means whereby we can provide assistance.

*The question that Head 18(6) — Fisheries — stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING HEAD 9(6) LAND VALUATION

*Head 9(6) — Land Valuation — was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving the passing of Head 9(6), the amount of \$2,000 is broken down this way: (a) the repairs and servicing of two Land Rovers, that is \$400; (b) the purchasing of gasoline and oil for the Land Rovers \$900; (c) the maintenance, repairs and servicing of typewriters, adding and duplicating machines \$250 and (d) the repairs and servicing of four electrical machines \$450, making a total of \$2,000.

I beg to move that Head 9(6) — Land Valuation — stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 \$468,665 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 Your Honour do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

Hon. A. MORRISON: 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 separate motions of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. A. MORRISON, the three Resolutions were read a first and second time and passed.*

#### RESOLUTION RE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT DUNLOW LANE, ST. MICHAEL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Item on the Order Paper with which the Government proposes dealing stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Dunlow Lane, St. Michael for the purposes of road improvement. It is Item No. 4 on the Order Paper.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker accompanying this Resolution, is five Schedules setting out five parcels of land which it is proposed to acquire from various owners for the purpose of carrying out road improvements, or perhaps road building, I believe the representative for St. Michael South would say, in the Dunlow Lane area. I understand the area is a fairly depressed area. Road works in that part are long overdue. I believe some work has already begun in areas in which work could have begun, and in order to complete the work we are setting about to acquire this land.

It is being done in this way, Sir, in order that the Government might get a proper title to the properties.

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

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to second that. Mr. Speaker, I rise to second this, and in so doing merely wish to state that there is need for the development and improvement of that area. As the Minister has stated, road work has already commenced in the area, and the acquisition of these parcels of land will assist in the full implementation of the road programme in that particular area.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if I wanted one sign that the election was near at hand, it would be this Resolution. I am told by the residents of Dunlow Lane, that for successive years and successive Parliaments they had been promised improvement to the area in the matter of road works; and further too, that on each occasion a representative from all of the political parties canvassing would come and take a list of the names of residents in the area and promised that they undertake that before the next election, the road should be done.

I am glad at last to see that that area is going to get some real relief. I am serious about it, Sir. Hon. members must know that Dunlow Lane comes off to Bay Street road and really should bring us back into Henry's Lane. It hides some of the most gorgeous wooded lands in Barbados, and some of our really architecturally interesting old houses, but it also happens in the same time to contain people who are living in some very congested circumstances, and although so near to town and so near to outstanding and architectural piece of work as the St. Patricks Cathedral, yet they are living in congested and really, I think, very underprivileged circumstances.

I do not know how many members of the House take opportunities to go out into other constituencies than their own. Unfortunately or fortunately I always have a very close association with the constituency of St. Michael South and have some of the most delightful women folk in Barbados, tremendous warmth, character and I have had on numerous occasions to visit many people in that area in need of assistance and help in Dunlow Lane. (*Asides*) In case hon. members think otherwise, professionally, Sir; but seriously, Sir, I am hoping that the Government had a consistent development scheme for the whole of the Dunlow Lane, Henry's Lane, St. Paul's Avenue Area, and I should wish for instance to see that we acquire, if possible, further lands from other land owners in that area to widen the entrances and the exits on to Bay Street properly.

I think that is very very necessary in the future, and I know that the Minister of Lands is only talking about the acquisition of land in that area for the purpose of road widening, and I want him to consider very carefully the necessity in that area for the alignment of houses and if so, massive assistance to people in the area to improve all of the other amenities. I am not the representative for the area. The hon. member for St. Michael South represents the Constituency, and he has already joined in the Resolution, but I say this because it is an area that I think is capable of being one of the scenic and attractive parts of Barbados, and I think it is an area ideally suited, having regard to the surrounding houses as I said — the houses, the schools, the clinic and what not — it is an area ideally suited for a park and recreation area as well, and I believe there are enough lands in that area, that the Government should bear this in mind in the development of that area.

8.35 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, I want to be a little parochial about this too, because I imagine I visit Dunlow Lane even more than the hon. member for Christ Church West. In fact a day does not pass when I do not pass that way, except for a few Sundays, every morning and nearly all Saturday I visit Dunlow Lane. If I was canvassing I could hardly do more, Sir, but the hon. member for St. Michael South must not assume that I am not canvassing.

What I would like to know is exactly where these road works are going. The part which I believe is called Dr. Scott's Tenantry appears to have had some road works recently carried out on it. I notice that no part of Woodside's ancient wall seems to be acquired, I do not know if in fact this is being sold without the necessity for acquisition or not, but I would be glad to know, because Dunlow Lane is a very difficult road to widen without some desecration of Woodside or some inconvenience to persons who have put down quite substantial dwellings on the other side. You either have to move the Spencer's mahogany tree or knock down somebody's paling further down or knock down Dr. Scott's wall, and I would be glad for some indication as to how the approach is going to be made. You have the pasture, you have the entrance to St. Gabriel's, and I hope that the Government while they are doing all this will also recognise the contribution that St. Gabriel's School makes to education — the former Minister of Education should be sensitive on this — and assist St. Gabriel's by doing its roads and not making it any more difficult for children to be taken in and out of the school. I hope so, but I am sure that the

Minister of Education will use such influence as is available in this respect.

I understand they are going across the pasture. It is quite a good connection, but it is a problem that recurs in other parts of Bridgetown. How do you deal with it? How do you develop road surfaces in a place where the road is built to be only ten feet wide? Parts of Dunlow Lane I do not believe could be ten feet wide, probably eight feet wide, where there is a bulge in one wall and another whole wall on the other side. Dunlow Lane is one example, but there are other roads in inner Bridgetown which also, I think, need the benefit of a view by the Minister of Lands.

While assisting the future M.P. for the City, Miss Billie Miller, in her canvassing recently I went through some roads at the back of Roebuck Moravian Church and Boys' School. I did not know a motor car could go down those roads, and goodness gracious, as I drove Miss Miller down I found out I was right, that a motor car could not go down there, not to remain a comfortable motor car afterwards. There are roads in the position of Dunlow Lane but perhaps not occupied by such well off people in parts of Bridgetown that very few of us know about. That is an example of one which I give to the Minister. He will find that there is a thick population behind there, but of not such vocal persons. Behind there needs drainage, it needs a better road system. The back of Roebuck Street is one place, I think it is time that a look is taken at the back of Reed Street, although there is a lot of clearing away down there, behind St. Mary's anyhow, Sir, that general district, parts between Chapman Lane and St. Mary's — I may not have got my geography precisely right descriptively — and Reed Street that will not be acquired in the Chapman Lane scheme.

The same way you can deal with Dunlow Lane you ought to be dealing with parts of the City of Bridgetown. All of them suffer from the same problem, very narrow roads laid down a long time ago, and therefore they do not appear worth developing, but if they are looked at carefully you will realise that something must be done for the people in them. You either accommodate them where they want to be accommodated or you do something about the very narrow, unsurfaced roads. When I spoke of the back of Roebuck Street Boys' School I was speaking of unsurfaced roads. These are also urgencies which I will press on the Hon. Minister.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE OF THE  
COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF  
LAND AT WELCHMAN HALL,  
ST. THOMAS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Item is Item 5 which stands in the name of the same Minister of Housing and Lands, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Welchman Hall, St. Thomas, for purposes of development of Harrison Cave.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: This, as in the previous Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is another example of my Ministry having to deal with a matter for which it has not got responsibility. I say this because some advice was issued to me by the hon. member who spoke just now in areas where I have no responsibility, but this is another example where I require several parcels of land amounting to just over six acres for the purpose of facilitating the development of Harrison's Cave, St. Thomas, to provide roads, parking areas and whatever buildings are necessary.

I move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions when speaking on acquisition recommended to the Government that when it comes to the small peasant holders, as happens in this case, that the parties concerned should be offered the opportunity of exchanging their lands for other areas of Government land. The reason for this is that even with the best will in the world when Government pays what it considers to be a fair price for the land the person concerned finds that he has to pay a higher price to obtain a substitute parcel of land of the same area and probably not with the same amenities, and certainly not with the same sentimental qualities as that which he originally had.

I wonder whether the Minister of Lands has yet explored this possibility in any of the instances in which he is considering compulsory acquisition or indeed reaching agreement with other persons. Particularly in the Welchman Hall area you will note that most of these six acres comprise parcels of land owned by small persons, 5,163 square feet in one case, 9,052 square feet in another case, 22,000 square feet, 29,000 square feet and 18,000 square feet and that sort of thing.  
8.45 p.m.

In other words, if it is a question of between a quarter acre and a half acre, we are

not talking about people who are significant land owners in the country.

The hon. member for St. Thomas has already spoken very strongly of the necessity to develop the Harrison Cave area in St. Thomas, but I must strongly urge in this instance that the persons whose lands are being acquired should be paid properly for the benefit which will be conferred on the Cave Authority.

Mr. Speaker, you know that they will not be fortunate to be honoured by the chairmanship, or get, for instance, an opportunity to preach at the anniversary service on Independence Day. So they have to be remunerated for the sacrifice that they are genuinely making in the public interest.

I like making these points. This is the sort of sacrifice that they are really making in the public interest, and I would like to see them given some due recognition and not only other people who might be band hoppers and who will get notice in other respects.

The hon. member for St. Thomas has made his views known since 1970 about caves. Indeed, since I have been in this House I have heard him during Estimates time speak at large on the development of Coles Cave which has not yet been noticed by the Government. It seems that there are no immediate plans for the development of Coles Cave.

In fact I once listened to a very interesting debate in the House — the House not having a lot of work to do on that afternoon, and members were in what I would like to think, a very friendly mood, and indeed they were exchanging ideas. One of the most interesting debates that I have ever heard in this House was between the hon. member for St. Thomas and the hon. member for St. Michael North West, the Hon. George Fergusson, on the question of the development of gullies and their potentiality for Barbados, and linking it to the development of the subterranean areas of Barbados. Hon. members might well recall that debate. I learn a lot indeed from the two hon. members who were speaking. They spoke at large on these subjects and also on the potential which they held.

So, Sir, we will join in the Resolution, but subject to the Minister bearing in mind the points we have made about adequate compensation for the persons in this area of St. Thomas.

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

BILL TO AMEND THE ELECTRICAL  
WIREMEN (LICENSING) ACT, 1974

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item which the Government proposes to deal with is a Bill to amend the Electrical Wiremen (Licensing) Act, 1974 (Act 1974-4) for which leave has been granted to be dealt with in all of its stages today. It stands in the name of the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologise first for the way in which this Bill was brought before the House. It was the desire of the Ministry to have this Bill introduced last Tuesday, but unfortunately, due to some errors which were detected at the last minute, it was not introduced last Tuesday.

The purpose of this amendment is to enable a committee to be set up to grant provisional licences for people who are at present working but who would not be eligible for the full licence. It is not the intention of the Ministry to prevent people from working and to create any hardship by so doing. So for a year the Committee will be empowered to grant a provisional licence to these people; and during that year, while holding the provisional licence, the holders will be expected to apply for the examination whereby on the successful completion of this examination, they will be granted a licence.

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

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

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

*Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed.*

*On the motion of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES the Chairman reported the passing of one Bill in Committee. Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE each seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES the Bill was read a third time and passed and cited as the ELECTRICAL WIREMEN (LICENSING) (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1976.*

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 3rd February, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

*The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly at 8.50 p.m.*