

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION OF 1971-76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22nd June, 1976.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.05 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); Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW, B.Sc., (Econ.) LL.D., (Prime Minister); 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. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Minister of Education, Youth Affairs, Community Development and Sport); 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); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M., (Lond.) and Miss B. A. MILLER.

Prayers were read.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of Tuesday, 8th June, 1976 and Wednesday, 9th June, 1976, have been circulated and are before you for your confirmation. (*A Pause*) There being no amendments I deem these Minutes to be duly confirmed.

RE MISS B. A. MILLER'S NOMINATION TO THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. SPEAKER: The vacancy created on the Public Accounts Committee will be filled by the Hon. Member for the City of Bridgetown.

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Prime Minister I am commanded to lay the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order 1976.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, 1976.

Also a Resolution to grant the sum of \$487,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 5, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to grant the sum of \$10,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 6, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to grant the sum of \$1,328,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 7, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to grant the sum of \$2,500,000 from the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part 1 - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 8, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a

Resolution to amend the Note to Head 113 - Ministry of Education, Item 5 - Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, of the Capital Estimates 1976-77.

BILL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Prime Minister I beg to give notice of a

Bill to provide for the exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados for the purpose of being used exclusively in connection with the expansion and improvement of the Deep Water Harbour.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICE

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking leave to give notice of the Resolution.

Whereas a vast number of parishioners of St. Philip work and go to school at places outside the said parish;

And Whereas many of them have to walk in order to reach their schools or work places;

And Whereas the private bus concessionaires have provided the best service for the parishioners within the scope of their limited financial means;

And Whereas the said parish is still improperly and/or inadequately served by public transport, (the foregoing notwithstanding);

And Whereas the recent implementation of a standard bus fare and the promised acquisition of additional buses together demand a reorganisation and complete rationalisation of bus routes and services in the said parish;

Be It Resolved That this House requests the Minister of Communications and Works to take such steps as are necessary to establish the following new and/or additional bus services for the people of Saint Philip:

1. A service leaving Wiltshires at 6.00 a.m. and 7.00 a.m. proceeding via Bayfield, Blades Hill, Parish Land, Church Village, Six Cross Roads, Four Roads, St. Martin, Seawell terminating at Newton.

2. A similar service leaving Wiltshires at 8.00 a.m. proceeding as aforesaid and terminating at Christ Church High School.

3. A Service leaving Christ Church High School at 3.00 p.m. and 4.00 p.m. and proceeding via Newton to Wiltshires along the route specified in (1) hereof.

4. A service leaving Newton at 6.00 p.m. and proceeding via the districts aforesaid at (1) hereof, terminating at Wiltshire.

5. A service for Ebenezer and Brereton via Seawell terminating at Newton.

6. A route from Bayfield to Newton via Marley Vale, East Point, Merricks, Long Bay, Bel Air, Crane, Seawell with buses departing Bayfield at 6.30 a.m. and 7.30 a.m. and returning from Newton at 4.00 p.m., 5.00 p.m., and 6.00 p.m. via the aforesaid districts.

7. A service leaving Bridgetown at 11.00 p.m. terminating at Bayfield and using the existing route.

8. The provision of an additional service on Sundays on Route 10 at 7.00 a.m. from Bayfield to Bridgetown and from Bridgetown to Bayfield at 10.00 a.m.

9. An extension of the terminus of the present Route 12 from Long Bay to Ragged Point.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that (1) the public standpipes at Marshall Gap and Emmerton Land in the City of Bridgetown are difficult and often impossible to approach because the immediate surrounds are waterlogged; (2) residents in the said areas experience daily difficulty in obtaining water especially when the rain falls?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to immediately put and end to this inconvenience and health hazard?

Also, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Is the Minister aware that (1) there is an unsealed and scantily covered well at Wharton Gap in the City of Bridgetown; (2) the few rusty sheets of galvanised iron covering the said well pose a dangerous hazard to the people of the said area, especially the children?

Will the Minister take the necessary steps to put an immediate end to this public hazard?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Communications & Works:

Will the Minister as a matter of urgency lay a large main in the Sunbury Tenantry area to serve the needs of the inhabitants of this area or, alternatively, state what are Government's plans for laying such a main in the said area?

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

Is the Minister aware that the road from Vineyard through Perry Tenantry, St. Philip has been in need of paving for over fifteen (15) years?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister state what are Government's plans for paving the said road and providing the inhabitants of the area with a proper road, and in any event will the Minister treat this matter as one of extreme urgency especially having regard to the impending rainy season, and the fact that the Minister together with the member for St. Philip South visited the said area and were photographed thereat prior to the By-election in St. Philip North?

12.15 p.m.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Trade:

1. What licences have been granted during 1976 to date for the import of edible oil into Barbados from other than CARICOM sources; to whom have they been granted, for what amounts and at what landed prices; and have any remissions of customs dues or other imports been granted the importers?

2. What applications for import licences have been refused during 1976 relating to the import of edible oil into Barbados, and, if any, from whom were the applications received?

To ask the Minister responsible for Sport:

1. Is the Minister aware that a local Playing Field Committee has been formed in Welchman Hall, St. Thomas to facilitate co-operative management of the new playing field located at Holy Innocents in the parish of St. Thomas; and will the Minister give an assurance that he will recognise and co-operate with this committee in the proper development of the playing field?

2. Will the minister also give an assurance that facilities will be provided at the playing field for netball and volley ball and that the sporting interest of the young women of Welchman Hall and adjacent districts of St. Thomas be recognised in the consideration of any future facilities to be provided?

To ask the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that a great many gambling machines known as "fruit machines" and "one armed bandits" have been installed in licensed and other premises in Baxters Road, Cheapside and other parts of the City of Bridgetown and Barbados?

2. Is the Minister aware that such machines have been held to be illegal in Great Britain under gambling laws and legislation similar to those in force in Barbados?

3. Is the Minister aware that many of these machines return to the persons who place coins in them amounts representing only 10% to 20% of the total value of the coins inserted; and is he further aware that in parts of the United States where the use of such machines is not illegal the machines pay out a return of up to 90% of the value of the coins inserted?

4. Is it the policy of the Government to pass legislation or otherwise to permit the use of such machines in Barbados and if so will the Government insure that they are installed and used in conditions where there is a fair return to the punter; and if it is not the policy of the Government so to permit the use of such machines will the Minister draw to the attention of the Commissioner of Police that these machines are in existence and request that the Commissioner collect the information on their use and forward it to the Director of Public Prosecutions for possible action under sections 7 & 8 of the Gambling Act, Chapter 135 of the Laws of Barbados?

FIRST READING OF BILL

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to provide for the exemption from the payment of duties or taxes on certain articles imported into Barbados for the purpose of being used exclusively in connection with the expansion and improvement of the Deep Water Harbour be now read a first time.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I thought you would have caught my eye, because I wrote you a letter.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order, please take your seat. We are going through the Order of Business.

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on 9th June, 1976, during a meeting of the House of Assembly, the Honourable Member of Parliament for St. Joseph, stated that during the recent Bye-Elections I walked in and out of the Polling Stations at will.

In reply to this allegation, I would like to set the record straight by pointing out that during the St. Philip By-Election I did not enter one single Polling Station during the hours when the stations were open.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: In the City Bye-Election I was a Polling Agent at the St. Ambrose Polling Station, where I remained from before 6 a.m. until after 6 p.m. on Polling Day.

GRANT OF LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO MRS. G. L. EASTMOND

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Speaker, I am kindly requesting overseas leave of absence from this Hon. House as from 29th June until 27th July, 1976 inclusive.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, leave is granted to the hon. Member.
12.25 p.m.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Hon. Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice that Oral Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 77, asked by the hon. member for St. Thomas, is ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 79, asked by the hon. member for St. Lucy, is now ready.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr Speaker, I beg to give notice that replies to Parliamentary Questions Nos. 86 and 90, asked by the hon. member for St. Philip North, are ready.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a Parliamentary Question which was outstanding from the last sitting of the House. There was a reply to Parliamentary Question No. 97, asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North East, which was not given on that occasion. I do not think it was laid in her absence, and it is now ready.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which I would like to raise. Since the matter which I would like to raise before this Chamber takes precedence over all Government Business, I think I am right in rising on this occasion. I wrote you a letter on the 18th June, 1976.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, stop, please. Your letter was well received on a point of privilege.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I wrote you a letter of privilege. To which of the letters are you referring?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat! The hon. member for St. James spoke about a letter on privilege. I have received one letter from the hon. member for St. James, and it was received on the 21st June, 1976, at 10.40 a.m. by hand. The matter pertaining to that letter is closed. Because of its contents, further information would have to be given. I have received only one letter.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I wrote you more than one letter. You said you have received only one letter. You have received a letter dated 18th June. I wrote you more than one letter on the 18th June, but you said that you received one letter from me on a matter of privilege dated June 18 on the 21st June. You now boldly state that the matter is closed. What matter is closed? It is said that the rustle of Speaker Gully's robes alone quelled all problems in the House. I would like to adhere to your rulings and so, but I want to draw to your attention a matter with reference to a newspaper report.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are out of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I am not dealing with anything on June 18.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am telling you that you are out of order. To raise that matter you will have to get permission from me. Please take your seat!

Mr. CRAIG: Shouting does not bother me, Sir. Ask me to take my seat in a very quiet and mild manner and I will do that. If you shout at me, I will be shouting back at you in no uncertain terms.

Mr. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, before you proceed to Orders of the Day, when will I have some information, or when will you reply to my matter of privilege? I am entitled to a reply by you, Mr. Speaker, either from your Chair, or by way of writing. You cannot merely say that the matter is closed. Must I write you on the matter? Am I not to ask any question of you? What do you mean by saying that the matter is closed? I am not a Sunday School child that you can tell to sit down because the matter is closed. I wrote you a letter, and I expect a reply from the Chair, or some degree of respect as a member of this Chamber. Do not tell me that the matter is closed. What is closed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has stated emphatically that he has written me a letter of privilege.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I said that I wrote you two letters.

Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the hon. member to take his seat! I am dealing with this letter of privilege to which you have just referred. I will say that further information, based on those comments, will have to be received before your matter of privilege can be entertained.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, before moving that the Standing Orders be suspended, I just want to make it clear that I sent on two occasions to seek the concurrence of the members of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition is not in his place at the moment. In view of the fact that I have heard nothing from them, and in view of the fact that we have a very heavy Order Paper before us, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43, 44, be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting on the usual assurance, that is given and kept, that if the Opposition have any business that is urgent, pressing, or of importance, we will see that they have an opportunity of dealing with it.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the very heavy Order Paper which we have before this House today. I am also seeking an assurance from the Leader of the House that, when we agree that the Standing Orders be suspended, we will have our rights. We are hopeful that he will not guggle with anything in here today as is usual when ever Standing Orders are suspended in here. That is all we are seeking from him. We want to have our lunch break, and we want to do our Private Members' Business. The position is that the Prime Minister will come in here when he feels like, and then he will keep the Clerks at the Table and the staff here until three or four o'clock according to his whims and fancies. We are asking the Leader of the House to let us have the assurances we are accustomed having.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is getting on already. Let me just say this. On several occasions the Opposition have had no Private Members' Business to deal with, and that has happened over and over again. If there is anything important, by all means they should have an opportunity to deal with it.

The Question that the relevant Standing Orders be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77, No. 3

The Resolution in the sum of \$232,000 was called.

12.35 p.m.

HEAD 13 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION (4)
TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL

Head 13 – Ministry of Education (4) Technical and Vocational – was called.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this Head is for the sum of \$20,000. I will read the Addendum because it explains what the purpose of this money is.

A project for the registration of unemployed young persons was carried out by the Ministry of Education, Youth Affairs section early in April this year. The registration was done by persons selected from among the unemployed youth in the several districts and was a step towards the establishment of Youth Training Programmes to complement work being done in the Secondary Schools and at the Samuel Jackman Polytechnic.

The total estimated cost of the project, including payment to the persons who carried out the survey, is \$20,000, and this Resolution seeks such provision.

Mr. Chairman, the Government is not unaware of the problems among the youth of this country. As a matter of fact, unemployment is a world-wide problem, it is not peculiar to Barbados, and in all the countries of the world, industrialised as well as developing, the problem is more acute among school leavers. I do not want anybody to get the impression that Barbados is peculiar either in unemployment or in having unemployment among young people. This is a problem which all Governments, developing as

well as developed, are trying to tackle within their economic competence in order to motivate and to employ young people, and so when this survey was established it was established in order mainly, not to provide employment, but to find out from the young people of this country exactly what they want to do, because however well meaning a Government is, however well meaning the Ministry, it is the young people themselves who have got to indicate to us what training they want or what particular skills they want to learn, so that the Ministry of Education which is responsible for the training of the young people in this country can alter, adjust and re-assign its limited forces to meet the needs of the young people.

Mr. Chairman, my survey was intended to discover from the young people what particular skills and what particular ambitions they possessed, so that at the earliest possible time I could use the Polytechnic, the Community College and the Primary Schools that have the facilities for training these young people. From the survey, Sir, 5,394 young people were registered; in the age group 14 to 18 there were 1,404 males and 1,518 females; in the 18 to 21 age group there were 776 males and 1,696 females, making a total of 5,394. I am sorry I cannot come to the House at this point because the actual assortment is not completed but the Ministry is actively going through the replies from the registration forms to discover the particular trades, the particular skills that those persons who have registered have indicated they want to learn, and I do hope within another two weeks or so to have the specific statistics in order to use the facilities existing as well as I have already approached international bodies with a view to obtaining equipment necessary for the furtherance of the teaching of these young persons.

I endeavoured in the actual registration to use some of those very unemployed young persons to register the persons who wanted to register. I am not pretending that the statistics of 5,394 is an accurate figure of those young persons who wanted to register or who wanted a particular skill. If I had asked them to register, I can only go by those who show interest enough to register; so I cannot say whether the number is 6,000 or 8,000, I am talking about the number of persons who showed enough interest to indicate to the Ministry what their particular desires and intentions are. So I think this money is well spent. This is not a political gimmick. This is a genuine desire by the Ministry of Education to discover from the young people of this country what skills they want to learn, so that the

Ministry having the statistics can deploy its forces to try in some measure to meet the needs of these young people.

Already we have endeavoured and are planning to put on at the Polytechnic additional courses. We are attempting to use the facilities of the primary schools so that we can do more evening classes. I think it is well known that in furtherance of this desire of the Government to involve young people, we got Mr. Vin Lawrence, an international authority on Youth Training Centres and Youth Camps to come to Barbados to write a report for the Ministry, and as a result of that we are trying to get Mr. Lawrence down as soon as possible, preferably the end of August and September, to have the first youth centre going, and in that case we hope to involve the young people, at least a certain number in that exercise in order to use their skills.

There can be no doubt that the question of young people and employment is a pressing problem, and it is a matter of concern to the Government to devise ways and means not only of providing employment but of providing training for these young people to be gainfully employed. So the purpose of this Resolution is to pay those persons who did the registering, and I am sorry they have had to wait so long for this little amount of money, but the circumstances could not have been avoided because there was no money in this budget for this exercise. The Estimates were passed and came into effect on 1st April, and this is the first time that an opportunity has been given to this House to vote this money. I cannot see that there can be any objection to this and I have every reason to believe that this Resolution will meet with unanimous approval.

I beg to move that Head 13 — Ministry of Education (4) Technical and Vocational, stand part.

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

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by saying that this attempt at registering the unemployed youth and the procedure adopted, in my view is a scandal of the first magnitude. We on this side of the House, Mr. Chairman are fully aware that it is through the neglect of the Ministry of Education that we find ourselves being asked today to vote this \$20,000.

12.45 p.m.

Let it be clearly understood that we offer no objection whatever to any employee under

this programme. This is costing us \$20,000, but we want to know that the employee is doing something for the benefit of this country and for the benefit of themselves. The Ministry of Education had these people within the walls of our schools in the 1950s. We introduced a pupil record card system, but this Government, when it came into being, was prepared to destroy, drag down, tumble up side down even what was good. The only thing they were not prepared to tear down was time but now people are prepared to turn 15 years down side up.

You will find that this pupil record card was a system introduced by the Ministry of Education whereby a parent could learn anything they wanted to know about their child, for instance transfers from one school to another, the teachers having discussion with the children from time to time and the counselling they could give. All of this would have been obtained through the pupils record card, and we also had career counsellors in our schools. That is all that would have been necessary in that context; but the Government apparently felt that there was no glamour in pursuing that course.

They preferred to have these 14 year olds roaming the streets, some of them searching in the dust bins or around bakeries. This is election year, and you now find the Minister saying that they are taking interest in these 14 to 18 year olds. They carried out a survey. A survey to do what? The Ministry has come to us now for \$20,000. For what? I would like to hear how many were employed in this exercise and if the figure of 5,394 represents anything near the true situation.

They are many people who have become so frustrated, so fed up, so disgusted with the present Government, that they are not prepared to become part and parcel of any measure introduced by the Government. You will find that these 5,394 people were led to believe by pronouncements made by the Minister that jobs would have been found for them; but up to now the Minister cannot say that he has found a job for anyone.

I am telling you, Sir, that this Government came and found the Evening Institute functioning; and all that they needed to do was to further expand the Evening Institute so that people of 18 to 19 years could attend classes at Richmond or elsewhere so as to accommodate a larger number. Let the Minister tell us if he has any evidence that the branch of the Evening Institute functioning in Speightstown, St. Peter,

does not bear ample testimony to the teaching amenities and the willingness of pupils to learn.

Why is it that the Government did not continue this type of programme? It was too good. How long is too long? Alas, what do you find at this stage? You find that 5,394 young people have been fooled by the Government again. These people have been looking to where they could find a job. Every afternoon they have been looking for news coming from the exercise which they have been engaged in.

The actions of the present Ministry of Education are intended to add to the dismay of the young people of this country. It is time to stop toying with the future of the young people of this country. All we are hearing is youth, youth, youth. What are we doing for them? What do you find the Young Democrats doing? It is a branch of the Democratic Labour Party which is being sponsored through money voted by this Honourable House for the Ministry of Education and particularly the Extra Mural Department at the Pine, and money voted by this House was used to prepare placards and have the Young Democrats masquerading along Bay Street.

This is what our Ministry of Education is spending money on. To take the money voted for the Ministry of Education, for the university, not to promote the just society for which the university was founded — (*Aside: Take note of those allegations*) take note of what allegations? What do you find? Let us take note of these allegations and let Dr. Bradley Niles say that he did not take money voted for the university and threaten people with their jobs.

When we on this side vote money for the university, we vote it so that it can be used on behalf of the community. I sincerely hope to see Dr. Bradley Niles beaten with many stripes. Mr. Chairman, when money is voted for a particular purpose and it is used in this way, I believe, that the attention of the Police should be called to it or the matter referred to the Director of Public Prosecutions.

What we want to warn the Government about is that the future of these 5,394 rests firmly and squarely in the hands of the Government. We on this side accept full responsibility for the future of all the others who are not registered with the Government. In doing so, we are just setting the record straight that we will never let the youth of this country down.

I think that time is against me, but we are asking the Government to try in its last days to familiarise itself with the true needs and the fullest opportunities of youth who are looking in some way to what is now familiarly known in local circles as earning some "bread". Will the Minister pay attention to this as soon as possible?
12.55 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, as one of the young people in this House of Assembly I will have to support this Resolution in principle. I will have to express my critical support for this Resolution because I am not given to say that I just am satisfied with the requirements of the hon. member for St. John or anybody else so I have to examine and analyse this Resolution in the light of events which have taken place in Barbados since the 26th February, 1976.

During the by-election in St. Philip North it became evident to both sides that the young people in St. Philip North who were only a small portion of the total youth in this country were in fact nearing frustration as were the youth in general of this country. They were frustrated in that having got free secondary education, and free school meals for a limited ten cents, and so on, under the Democratic Labour Party Government, the avenues of employment were blocked to them through no fault of their own, and so when economic depression hit the world at large in 1973 and there was a gradual slowing down throughout the world, the young people in Barbados had to bear some of the brunt that was in the backwash of economic international development.

Sir, this Resolution only serves to tell us a lot about Government and its policies. During the by-election in St. Philip North, at the very first meeting at which I spoke I went through the registration lists of each polling district and analysed the number of persons who were recorded on the lists as being unemployed, and I tried to work them out in terms of percentages, and it ended up with 27% on the lists as they then stood. That did not take into any account those people who were under the age of 18 and who were not entitled to be registered on the lists. So that the percentage of unemployed as reflected in St. Philip North was clearly seen by the fact that there was a number between 13 and 18 who could have been unemployed but who by reason of their minority were not eligible to be registered.

Nowhere in that campaign, on no occasion did any member of the Government party tell the constituents in St. Philip North — and if they

told them, by reason of the large numbers who attended the meetings from all over the Island — the national populace — no one ever told us that the Government had it in hand to institute a programme of registration of young people to see what were their needs.

We came in here and during the debate on the Estimates the Minister of Education at no time said that he intended to introduce such a programme to understand the needs of the unemployed young people in this country. It is only since Mr. Lawrence was here sometime in April, I believe, that we have found the Government taking steps to research the needs of these young people.

Now in 1971 the Barbados Labour Party in its Manifesto had as part of his platform the implementation of a manpower research unit to investigate the needs of the young people and others — the employment needs — of the community and to keep a consistent system of monitoring of unemployment in this country. We never heard anything from the Government along those lines, until now; after the by-election in St. Philip North the Government has come with this as a sort of gimmick, Sir. Despite what the Minister of Education may say, it is a gimmick. It is not part of Government's plan and programme. It is not any part of the Government's philosophy; and this is led by the hon. member for St. John masquerading as a socialist without even understanding that one of the first principles of socialism is proper planning; and if this had been planned as part of the programme for youth, as an extension of its policy — if there is a policy in the Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs, this would have been implemented; and the Minister has got to tell us why only now he has come with this.

Now they talk about 5,394 people being registered; not being offered jobs. We want to know what sort of work they want. This Government, Sir, came into power in 1961 on a platform of nationalism providing work for people. We were told that there would be full employment by 1976, and I have in my hand the Central Bank Report and Financial Statement of Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1975. I will deal with this later on today, but under the Head of 'Employment for the year 1975' the Central Bank reports that in the manufacturing sector there was net employment of 340 persons who were employed in the manufacturing section as new employees. I could go on. "The low level of consumption activities resulted in the loss of a number of jobs, and in

the public sector there was retrenchment in the casual labour force. Approximately 200 new jobs were created during 1975 by the opening of eight manufacturing enterprises and 200 expansions. Another 240 persons were re-employed by existing companies.

1.05 p.m.

"The additional employment was partially offset by the loss of 300 jobs due to the closure of four companies." Now a Government coming into power as part of its programme on the basis of manufacturing industry providing employment for people can only employ 340 persons in 1975, catch themselves in 1976 with the young people turning against them to such an extent that on the 12th March their candidate for St. Philip North at Blades Hill told the people — you can admit it because I have it on tape — that they have a problem with the people between 25 and 35. They now realise in 1976 that there is a problem, but the public of this country should not wonder, Mr. Chairman, when the member for St. Michael North East left them and had her first meeting in Bush Hall Yard Gap and told the people that the Party of which she was a member had run out of ideas. They should not wonder when Mr. Cameron Tudor could say that they have sat down for four and a half years and basked in the sunshine of 18 seats and are now trying to catch a little fire to try to do something for the people of this country, when they had four and a half years to do it.

It is not good enough for Government to operate on the basis of an *ad hoc* implementation of measures. It looks like a gimmick even if it is not, and the people are aware of it and that is why they say "no tricks at all in '76". All I am asking the Government to do, Mr. Chairman, is to have in their policies a planned programme over a five year period or a ten year period, whatever they want to do, but not a programme over two months. It is the same thing with the bus fares. We are now hearing about the 25 cents bus fare, we never heard anything about it during the City by-election. It could not have been a planned programme otherwise they would have told the people. Even though we would want to support the effort, the bare attempt made by the Minister of Education — and a drowning man will catch at anything — while we want to support the attempt to do something for the young people, we would have liked to have seen this as part of the Government's policy over the last five years, and steps made over the last five years to find out the needs of the young people and make proper preparation by extending Polytechnics and things like this for the young people.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, this Bill goes to show that Government has a very heavy task before it whether it knows this or not, and from what I can see it is a pity that some of them do not take time off to more or less analyse the situations and see what is happening in the country. They can go around and ask some questions and then they would come up with the right answers.

This registration of unemployed people, although they may think that it was a good gesture or that it was the right move, to them it might appear this way but what the young people really want right now is not just registration and promises, the young people are full of energy, they want to give vent to their energy, they want to work and if they cannot work they will find something bad to do. These people need jobs. Some of them have left school for several years and are still unemployed, there are many others who will be coming out in the near future and they too will be needing jobs. Where are the jobs? The Government should first look at what they have to do to create these jobs, and the only way they can create these jobs is by stimulating the economy of this country. Has Government really seriously started to do this? I realise that any Government at this time has a difficult task because this is election year but they must look at this seriously. This is just like what the hon. member for St. Philip North said, that Government has now seen fit to decide that they will have registration of unemployed youths. They lost the by-election in St. Philip and the one in the City, and the young people more or less are nearly in the majority and these young people are the ones who in future will be telling us what they want, where they want to go and the time that it should take.

If Government had thought seriously after the by-election in St. Philip North, especially hearing about the number of unemployed youths that the member for St. Philip North had attended to, and had seen fit to register them, the Minister that thought it a good idea to register unemployed youth should have decided against it. No matter what they do, especially with something like this, it must look as though it is a gimmick. What is the point of registering the people? The people don't want to be registered, they want work, they want money and they want food, and the first important thing Government must think about is the people of the country. We cannot think about putting just \$10,000 in somebody's hand to register these people, the people want to know where the jobs are coming from.

Before I left Government there were several people unemployed in my constituency. When I was campaigning for the same Government it was the young unemployed people who threatened me. Is this something that is going to give them a promise that within a month's time they are going to have jobs? Who knows how long this will take. These people cannot wait. From what I see Government is digging its own grave, nobody is digging the grave for them, because if they will do some serious planning for the people of this country, not only planning to see what big schemes they can implement so that they will get praises, and planning to see how many things they can give away, but serious planning so that all persons will be involved, planning for the lives of the people of this country that they can have spending power, that they can spend as much as they want, planning so that they can give incentives to business people, private concessionaires, people in their own private enterprise and personal individuals. There are many ways where Government can open areas of employment to people, because if they decide to give tax concessions to married people if they employ maids, more people will do maids' jobs, and there are several other ways they can think about to ease the unemployment situation.

1.15 p.m.

It appears as though they are buying votes. The young people today are not going to be bought like before. This Scheme about free higher education up to University level is costing the Government a lot of money. They should take some of the money they are spending on higher education and spend it on other things. Some people are prepared to pay for higher education. People do not want to say that they have attained higher education and then sit down doing nothing. After they have attained the education and they cannot get jobs, what can they do? The young people want to be married, they want to have cars, they want the luxuries and the same things that we have. They do not want to come and steal from me or from any other business person. They want to be above that sort of thing. Is the Government seriously considering the young unemployed people in this country? They must be considered.

I am not ashamed to say that the Government are running out of ideas. I have said it already and I will say it again, because they do not want the ideas of a woman. They think, as men, that they have all the ideas. They know it all, so let them keep it all. I do not have to be in politics. I am in politics because I love people. I know what it is to work hard, and I would like

to see many of these young persons working hard. I have ideas so that some of them would be able to have jobs. They cannot leave the country and go to North America, England, or any other part of the world and ask for a job. They have to remain here and they live here. I am a Barbadian, and I am among them. This is a serious situation, and when the licks come flying the Government will have to thank themselves for what is happening to them.

I am prepared to give assistance to any Government, whether the Labour Party over here is the Government, or the Party over there is the Government. I love my country and that is all I am interested in. I have to fight for this country and the people of this country. We cannot go on looking at what other people are doing. We have to look seriously at the people we have in this country. Someone said just now that I may be out when they call the elections. As far as I am concerned, I do not care. I do not know what the people want, and they must know what they want. It is time to stop all of these hand-outs and all of these freenesses, and for us to decide what we are going to do with the young people. Are you going to promise them this and that and then they cannot get it? That does not make sense. The young people do not want to know that. The young people want to know where they can get a job. This morning I went to my business place and found 10 persons up there asking for jobs. Every day you will find people all over the place asking for jobs. I am not the only person that they ask for jobs. This survey is not evidence of the true number of young people unemployed, because there are several young people who are not going to register. A lot of them are saying: "Why should we go and register? Why wait until now?" Why has the Government waited until now to ask them to register?

The Government and the Ministry that are responsible for the young people should know what is taking place. They should be moving around getting statistics and trying to find out how many young people were unemployed. They should be able to tell the Prime Minister to stimulate the economy and let things move forward. The Government should do something so that the people can get work. The Government do not want to win the next elections. The Government could get money if they knew how to get it in order that the people could get work. The Government had 10 years of good work and, just as a cow, they kick the bucket of milk down. They do not want it now because they are too big. Sometimes it is good to let big

people fall, and then they will realise their mistakes.

As far as I am concerned, the \$20,000 is something to do with the young people. I do not know what will come out of it, and I am waiting to see what will come out of it. I hope and pray to God Almighty that something good will come out of it. Even if it does something good for 1,000 people, I hope that something good will come out of it. I will vote for it, but this money could be spent for a better purpose instead of telling them to let us register you. The people want jobs. There are business people and others who are not business people in this community who are prepared to give Government some of their ideas and to go forward to help the youth of this country. When the youth of this country are unemployed many people have to fear the breaking of houses, threats to kill, and anything can happen. We will sit back and say: "This can never happen here, we are a peaceful people." When a person is hungry, you will never know what will happen.

I have never seen so many people begging for money and asking for help, and saying that they want this and that within the last few months. Barbadians never used to go around to houses asking you for hand-outs. They were even above asking you for old clothes. Today people are asking you if you have anything old to give them. What you have in your handbag you can give me. Why is this happening today? The little boys want to wash your car in order that they can get a dollar. All of these things they are trying to do. They want to know that they have a weekly salary coming in.

I am prepared, if the opportunity is given to me by my North East constituents — they have done a lot for me and they are still giving me their support. I have been among the people; I have worked with them, and they have given me the confidence in myself that I never had before, especially within the last few weeks. I am going to develop to the point where, if I cannot serve them in Parliament, then wherever I am I am going to serve them because I am a Barbadian. My time is up, Sir, Thank you.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I never really thought that a simple Resolution like this could generate so much political heat and lead to so much false allegations. First, let me deal with the member for St. Philip North. I have the Government file here, and he can see that the first minute on this particular file from the Youth Vocation Officer is dated the 11th

February, 1976, before any by-election in St. Philip. He can have a look at it and see where the idea of registering youths took place before any by-election. I do not mind it is a Government file, I will pass it to him.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir. I do not mind seeing it, but the writ was issued on the 2nd February.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It will show you where the Officer replied to my minute long before that a registration must be given with all of her recommendations long before any by-election in St. Philip was talked about. There is no doubt about that. There is no political gimmick. I do not know what they are talking about. I have always and this is where the member for St. Peter is not being accurate, made it clear on radio and on T.V. that this was not a job-placement exercise. If you go back and read the *Advocate*, or listen to the tapes, or any of the media, you will find that I made it abundantly clear that I was not registering anybody for any job. I was endeavouring to find out from the young people what they wanted to do. You may have misled the young people to believe that this was a job-registering exercise, but that is your business. 1.25 p.m.

If you say they are waiting for the postman, you may have led them to believe that, but I did not, and I repeated that at no time was the Ministry of Education providing jobs for young people. But it seems in this community that we have a mentality that certain people must always be drawers of water and hewers of wood.

This Government has always endeavoured to update education. Do you want the young people leaving school without any training at all to get work and be labourers until they reach 65 years? That is not my concept. My concept is using the total potential of every single person as given by God, but you want them to run and get work without any skills so that for the balance of their lives they must be labourers digging post holes or foundations. That is not my concept. My concept is that if they want to be electricians or even if they want to be masons, they must be competent; so when you get in here and say that young people want jobs, I am talking about unskilled boys without any training whatsoever and who unless I do something for them are doomed until death calls to be labourers and post hole and foundation diggers. That is not my concept of what the Ministry of Education is, nor Government's

concept, but that seems to be the concept of every person over there who now comes in telling you that they want jobs. Don't you realise that you are dooming these fellows perpetually to be labourers? If that is your concept and your plans, tell them so. That is not my concept and my plan, and my registration of them is to enable them if they say they want to be electricians to put on a course at the Polytechnic that they can be trained as electricians, with more money in their pockets, a higher status and more social mobility. If they want to do electronics to repair refrigerators and televisions, we will put on a course; but you want them to go and work as labourers. If that is the concept of the Barbados Labour Party and those are the promises you have for the future, tell them so.

Mr. HINDS: To elucidate a point, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Education, if he wants to be honest.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must withdraw that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not if he wants to be honest. I expect all hon. members in this Parliament are honest.

Mr. HINDS: I have not said yet that he is dishonest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want you to say it either.

Mr. HINDS: I have explained to the Minister that he had these pupils in school and he found a system of pupil record cards and knows what is career guidance, but they were tumbled out of school when he need not have tumbled them out. He had them in school and could have carried them from one grade to another; so these post hole diggers he does not want to vote for him, I want some to vote for me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: One basic thing they do not understand. In your family you have children who sometimes when a child reaches the age of sixteen does not know what he wants to do. You ask at 13 years what he wants to do; today he wants to be a fireman, the next day a constable, the next day an engineer and next day he wants to be a lawyer. They have stopped keeping the cards because teachers wrote on them schizophrenic and things they were not competent to write, so that even those cards were not a true indication of what that child wanted to do.

I want to read from a document for the benefit of the hon. member for the city an interview she gave to The Bajan. I will make it a document of the House.

"What do you think Barbados is going to be like in the next twenty years or so?"

"I honestly don't know. I can't see anything in my mind for twenty years away from now. I am very worried about the type of young person that we have in Barbados. I was really very upset to find that the young people in the City did not vote although they showed a great interest. The unemployment is certainly our major problem now. I do not know how we are going to begin to cope with it. I think the struggle in the next five to ten years is for Barbados not to regress, because I think we're on the brink of that. Of stepping back."

That is what the member for the City is saying. They have all these plans for young people, yet in the Bajan for June the member for the City is saying she does not know how we are going to cope with it. (Mr. SIMMONS: Do you want me to tell you?) You should have told her. The member for the City in an interview does not know how she is going to tackle the unemployment problem.

Let us face facts, Mr. Chairman. Barbados in my life time, and I have lived under different Governments, has never had full employment. The member for St. Michael North Central when he left school could not get a job. Mr. Cox the magistrate had a whole year walking around without a job. When I grew up people could not get jobs in those days. The Banks would not have you; you were restricted to the Civil Service or teaching, and that is why I joined the Army in 1940. There were no jobs going for anybody. In this country with an economy based on sugar and tourism which was not developed as it is now under this Government, they getting on as if you had jobs waiting for people. The Banks would not employ you, the firms in town would not employ you. There was unemployment then, and therefore Barbados has always had an unemployment problem.

What did this Government do when unemployment even in the sugar industry became chronic? The Prime Minister himself passed legislation demanding that the plantations give the workers five days a week. We passed it to

compel plantations to give workers a five day week when the negotiations in 1968 were in danger of breaking down on out of crop wages, and you can accuse this Government of not being interested in providing employment.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, I wonder if the Minister remembers that the same Government promised the people they would get five days' pay whether or not they worked for the five days.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that this Government passed the necessary legislation to provide that agricultural workers in this country were guaranteed a certain amount of employment; but you hear that Barbados must suddenly find employment for everybody which it has not done in its 300 years of existence. Our economy is based on sugar which is a seasonal crop. Our economy is based on tourism which is seasonal. Our population is about the 10th largest per square mile in the world, or third or fourth. You are talking about a country with a population of 250,000 with over 50% under twenty-one. These are the circumstances under which we are operating in this society, and this Government has certainly endeavoured to provide employment, and we have endeavoured to upgrade education in this community. That is why we are having the problem, because we have provided education in order to enable people to move from the area of just being the labourer and hewers of wood and drawers of water to a position today where it is being decried that people with "O" levels are driving buses. Instead of people being proud to see the society reach a certain stage of educational sophistication, you will hear "look who is driving a bus, a fellow with three "O" levels or two "A's". You can't win. But if the young people are foolish enough to believe that you all have plans for them, they are going to be sadly disillusioned because if you can tell anybody in this country in a campaign that you can find jobs for 5,394 young people the morning after they vote for you, for a lot of them the second state will be worse than the first.

I at no time pretended it was finding them jobs. I was endeavouring, as I know child psychology and that up to the age of 16 children in better circumstances at Harrison College cannot tell you what they want to do, to find out from the young people what they want to do, not find any jobs for them; but to adjust my

educational system in order to give them some basic skill so that for ever more as the Opposition would wish they would not be just pot hole, foundation diggers, but if they want a job now and they have no skill, how are they going to move on? If I can educate them to acquire a skill, six of them can form together and do electricity, six of them can form a mechanic shop, and in their own right can earn a living and could in due course acquire what they want, and they cannot acquire it unless they have skills.

Let us face facts. In our population overcrowded as we are, we have got to invest in people; we have got to educate people and that is why over the years Barbados has always had a reputation not only in Barbados but abroad, and even if we educate our people, the developing countries are only taking people with skills.

1.35 p.m.

Even today developing countries are only taking people with skills. Canada does not want labourers. Canada does not want a man who does not have a skill. America does not want; so all we can do as a Government is to invest in our people by providing them with education. I do not know if you heard T.V. the other night. When the hon. member for St. John was giving a Press Conference a gentleman of the Press indicated that of the 750,000 school leavers in Great Britain nearly 250,000 were unemployed. That is great Britain, an industrialised country and a member of the Common Market which has these problems. Germany has these problems. Canada has these problems.

Do not get up and fool the young people that this Government is so wicked that we are not providing employment for them, because it is not true. The member for St. Philip North knows that in 1973 all of the economies of the world met with the oil crisis, and that the monetary situation in the world started to waver. You are trying to fool people that this Government is responsible for the whole situation of young people wanting jobs.

We have \$63 million in loans and we are hoping to provide jobs. So do not tell the young people that you will give all of them jobs tomorrow if you get in because the ones who believe that would be the most disillusioned persons in the world. They are assuming that the young people do not read about these things, that the young people do not understand what is going on in the outside world.

St. Philip is a microcosm of Barbados and Barbados is a microcosm of the whole world. In

New York you find firemen being laid off. You find sanitation workers, policemen and hundreds of others being laid off. What are they telling the people of Barbados? I will not be much longer. They cannot vote against it. I just wanted to correct some misconceptions and some wrong ideas. I never said that it was a job creating exercise. It was to enable the Government through the Ministry of Education to provide for the young people in whom we have absolute and supreme confidence at all stages, and for whom no other Government in the history of Barbados has ever done more for education and training than the Government of the Democratic Labour Party. If history is written honestly, it must be said that no other Government has ever invested in its young people to the extent, Mr. Chairman, that we have done.

The question that Head 13(4) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF TOURISM, INFORMATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

Head 17(3) Tourism, Item 2 (New) Training, was called.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, all of us have got to depend upon Tourism whether we have mountain resorts, lakes or big cities like London, Rome and Paris or whether we have islands with mainly the sun, the sea and sand. All have peak seasons and low seasons. From the time that tourism started in Barbados the month of May and June and the month of September and October have always been low seasons. Needless to say, the high seasons have been between Christmas and Easter, and the month of July and August being somewhere in the middle.

That is so despite the efforts of the Barbados Board of Tourism which has increased the summer season business considerably, and almost without exception each and every month of every year has been better than the corresponding month of the previous year. That was so at least until last year when things began to flag a little bit because of the world situation.

That, needless to say, is no responsibility of ours. It is quite easy to persuade people to come from countries like North America and northern Europe when the weather is miserable in the winter. It is much more difficult when the weather is pleasant as it generally is in May and June and in September and October in those countries.

Right now in England you have the test match at Lords and the Wimbledon Tournament going on, you have the Regatta; and for those people who like horse racing there is racing every day. There is a tremendous amount to do at the present time, and people are not inclined to go away. It is the same in North America.

If we are to be faced with a situation every year, one that is continuing, even if we get more and more people, we are also building more and more hotels to cater to the winter season, and this means that occupancy in the hotels in the summer is bound to be much less than it is in the winter; and I am afraid that it will always be likely in the summer season that people will have to be laid off or put on part time as some hotels arrange it with their workers. If this is to be so, we should try to take advantage of this situation; and the proposal therefore before this House is that we are being asked to provide money for this training scheme so that we can take advantage of the situation by upgrading the standards of our tourism staff in respect of service, in respect of knowledge of the people with whom they deal as visitors and in respect of efficiency.

It goes without saying that in all kinds of work there is always room for improvement; and although we have a very good reputation in Barbados for service, for pleasantness and for efficiency, none the less we must take the opportunity to upgrade when the opportunity affords us to.

There are other ways in which we can improve the knowledge of our service personnel at all levels. One of these, for example, is being able to take some of the front desk people, receptionists, waiters, maids and others to see places of interest in Barbados which they may not have had an opportunity to see — places like Welchman Hall Gully and the Bird Park in St. John. Even many young people, I am sorry to say, have not even visited the very fine museum which we have. If we can get them interested and show them these things they will be in a better position to be able to speak to visitors with some first hand knowledge and authority about these things.

Another aspect with which we would like to make a start with our service personnel is the question of languages. We have a number of young people who speak languages very well and there is a demand for such people who work in tourism generally, not only in the Hotel Industry, but in other aspects of tourism. We do not have

enough people who can speak Spanish, French and German, and because we will be catering to more people from continental Europe and visitors from South America and other parts of the Caribbean where they do not speak English, it is going to be more and more important that at least some people in this business should have a basic knowledge of how to answer questions, how to deal with matters that come up in their daily work with people who cannot speak much English.

One does not necessarily have to have a higher education. Some people have a knack for languages. Other people do not. We have to find young people who work in tourism and who have the ability to learn languages, and we can train them. I feel that this is a tremendously important part of this business. I would like to acknowledge the thanks of the Government to the various organisations which have almost entirely voluntarily offered assistance with this programme — people from the UWI, the Labour College, the Research Centre, the Hotel Association and others. Obviously there have been many Government Departments involved such as the Ministry of Trade and the Ministry of Education; but they have all been most helpful in getting the programme off the ground.

1.45 p.m.

I would like to stress that this is very much in the experimental stage. If we can make this thing work and we can learn some lessons from what we are doing this year, I hope that next year we will be able to do a more comprehensive kind of programme, perhaps in other directions which we have not even thought of yet. So we will use this year to base the programme on. We hope to learn from our own experience and we hope to have possibly even an institutionalised summer season training programme. This I would hope in the future would not only be for hotel employees but for the people who are concerned with the tourist industry and happen to be doing slightly different things such as taxi drivers, airline personnel and so forth.

What I would like to mention here is the Government's contribution toward wages and salaries of the people who will be attending the courses. It is believed that the Government will pay part of the wages and salaries of the people attending the courses, and the hotels where the people work will pay a part. It is understood also that where people are fully employed and the hotel manager or others concerned decide that this is the best young man or woman who is most able to benefit from the course — they will

take on a person who has been laid off and so help relieve unemployment in this way.

Sir, as regards this money, \$195,000 of the \$212,000 is devoted to the salaries and wages of people who will be attending the courses, and the balance of \$17,000 has been publicised for the administration of the programme, such as Secretarial Services and so forth. I must say that I hope the Committee will approve this this year so that we will be able this year 1976 to develop a programme which can be built upon in future years.

I beg to move that Head 17(3) stand part.

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

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be living in the year 1976. It will certainly go down in the memories of all Parliamentarians, all Barbadians, as a year in which things which could not have been done for a number of years could be done in one year. Long before you came into this Chamber, I think some fifteen years ago, we had the Hotels Aids Act which provided for Barbados a publicity Committee which it was then known as, away back in the early 1950s, Sir. Then came along the present Government and, like the Technical Institute and the Evening Institute and the Housecraft Centre they put a new name to it and named it the Barbados Tourist Board. The hon. member who spoke not too long ago gave us a run-down of what is going to happen in a few months, which did not happen several years ago; but this is what is fascinating to me; that Barbadians are going to learn Greek, German, French, Spanish, Dutch, and even the dead language Latin, Sir, all in three months. These people in the hotels are going to be taught all those languages, all within three months. I can only conclude, Mr. Chairman, that this country is saddled with people who are prepared to make sport at other people whenever they get a chance, for I would even ask any university Ph.D in languages if he can get into the Coral Reef or Colony Club and get a maid or a labourer — which is another very distasteful thing — if that person can be taught any of these languages between now and the beginning of the present tourist season.

Now to my mind that is what we call a statement that should be expunged from the records of this House, because one can only conclude that this is a wicked, vicious approach upon the taxpayers of Barbados. I do not believe that this type of training would serve the hotel workers in any great measure. What I think the Minister should have done is not to send the

hotel workers on classes now, but to send the owners of the hotel, like himself, and set up those classes whereby they will not ill-treat the workers who work at the same hotels. That is the first thing he should do; but to walk in here with this type of resolution talking about teaching people languages, letting them know where the Museum is, telling them about the Animal Flower Cave is something which I believe these people would have been taught when they were at school and I believe many of them know about it. I do not want to use that term which is now loosely used by the general public about 'gimmicks' because there is a thing called overtelling yourself and overplaying your hand. I do not want to use that term at all but I cannot really believe that the Minister would come in here today and claim that part of this money is going to be used for the purpose of teaching some of the people in the hotels, languages, and I am going to challenge the Minister on this now, that not one single cent is going to come from the hotel as part payment for the workers. Not a single cent.

What the hotels set out to do is to put at the disposal of the Government of this particular scheme the expertise which they have in the hotels. That is what they are prepared to do; but not one single red cent is coming from the hotels. That is not the problem though. I have before me, Sir such an instance as this, of a barman working in a westcoast hotel for the past twenty-three years and his last three pay cheques — a senior barman for twenty-three years — all put together totalled something like \$11,000 over a period of three years.
1.55 p.m.

That is what the man earned, this does not include the 10%, because as far as I am concerned this 10% is a real joke. I am not prepared to say all of them are dishonest, but I would like to know what records are kept where the Shop Stewards or the hotel workers themselves can go and determine how much money is paid in there by way of the 10% and if it is equally divided among the staff. That is what I would like to find out, and that is why I said earlier the people whom they should be sending on these classes are not the workers yet, the owners of the hotels who year after year can close the hotels for four or five months, put on extensions to them, go to Canada and build homes with Robertson and Ward — and I know what I am talking about — out of the same hotel workers in this country, and a man doing 23 years as a barman at a large west coast hotel can only earn \$11,000 in three years. You know, Mr. Chairman, that \$11,000 over a period of three

years is something like what you earn in one year, and we heard the Minister just now talking about trying to find out what a boy would like to do. Do you believe a boy would stop what he is doing to go and work for \$11,000 in three years? The boy would not do that when a Minister works for \$2,800 a month and does not think it is enough.

It is not what you want to do, they should have known that long in advance, and now in the year 1976 you have a Resolution before you seeking money for the purpose of sending hotel workers to school during the summer season so as to put money into their pockets. Now, I am no actuary, I am no economist, I am no financier, the member for the City was criticised for saying she did not know what she would do as an individual. I take it that she was saying things are so bad that she cannot even give a thought to where she would start from. This is the problem facing this country, that even the socialist Government, if by some act of God should be returned to power they would not know where to start from to put the country's economy into a proper position, and I believe that I am going to live long enough to see this scheme when it is implemented withdrawn immediately. I would have thought that when people go to the polytechnic — and you have courses at the same polytechnic — so I do not understand this. You have a training school, the polytechnic, where you send boys and girls for the purpose of hotel training. They leave school, register at the polytechnic, they decide they would like to go into the hotel business, they determine there at that time what they are going to do. Some of the girls are trained as receptionists, cooks, waitresses, all these things, but in 1976 you are coming back to Parliament to ask for additional money to retrain the same people you have already trained.

What I think the Minister is referring to is that he is setting out to have a refresher course. This is what I believe this Resolution is all about, but to talk about training people in the summer for the purpose of putting money into their pockets when the tourist trade is at its lowest ebb is a joke. What they should be doing is to make sure that during the tourist season the people get a good wage so that even if they have to go on holiday for three months any part of the world they would be in a position to do it, but when they are turned off during the summer season and they have to work two weeks on and two weeks off that is where the difficulty arises, because the amount of money which they had drawn during the time they were working is insufficient. The Minister comes in here today

with this Resolution seeking money and asking that it goes through, and we know it has to go through because of numbers, number one, and secondly, Sir, anything that would put money in the workers' pockets I am there with them, but I know that the workers know that this type of Resolution is not a "true true" Resolution, this is what you call a "dog eared" Resolution for a specific year.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we have before the House that this large vote of \$212,000 for summer courses is yet another gimmick in the year of gimmicks. We are told by the Minister that the hotel owners are going to be financing by one half the cost of these summer courses. The Minister full well knows that the hotel owners have no intention of financing one half or any part of this finance and no amount of victimisation of hotel owners by the withdrawal of work permits or anything of that kind is going to make them do it, or is going to make it successful. This is another project of the Minister of Tourism that is going to dry up, and wither up and blow away like a lot of other projects, like the Pride and Industry Association that dried up and blew away, like Crop-Over that is in the process of drying up and will soon blow away.

The Minister announced his plan for this summer programme even before he had properly consulted with the hotel owners who, it is alleged, are going to pay one half of the cost of this programme. As I understand it, the hotel owners are going to co-operate and be accommodating and give their workers time off and arrange their business so that workers can take full advantage of this, but when it comes to handing out dollar bills that is not what the hotel owners are intending to do.

I want to know what is wrong with the hotel school. This is in fact a supplementary vote and I want to know why it is that the hotel school could not have accommodated the project that is set out here before us. The Minister says that the summer business has increased, at the same time out of the same mouth he is saying that May, June, September and October are low peak months in the tourist industry. I want to know where the summer trade is. It is a known fact, common knowledge, that several of the large hotels are closed, guest house owners are at their wit's end, and this is June. This has been true since March and April in this year, 1976, and I am sick and tired of hearing the same rubbish every year before the tourist season starts about the bonanza year it is going to be and the thousands of tourists that are going to be coming in here.

2.05 p.m.

You hear about tourists who are going to come in here in numbers larger than even the population of this country. Every year in February and in March, which is supposed to be the high peak of the tourist season, you hear the same complaints from the hotels that things are not so good. When they can blame it on the energy crisis — of course, the Prime Minister said that there was no energy crisis in Barbados. The Minister of Education is going to contradict the Prime Minister on that today. When they cannot blame it on that, then they are going to blame it on airlines strikes; they are going to blame it on fighting between Governments over who will get landing rights for what, where and when. You will get a lot of excuses.

The Crop-Over Festival, which is another of the Minister's wonderful ideas, was supposed to be drumming up a lot of the tourist trade. I understood, and we were all made in Barbados to understand, that this was one of the major purposes of the Crop-Over Festival — to drum up the tourist trade in the summer. We were told that they would come here in droves in the month of June to enjoy the Crop-Over Festival. Where is this trade? What is there to be said about the Crop-Over Festival? It started off all well and good like all of his ideas, but it is in the process of withering up. I want to know where all of the money goes from the Crop-Over Festival.

You have to pay \$4.00 to go to a concert where people are singing out of tune, and where somebody starts to sing a song and his voice gives out before he can get to the end of it. That is the level of entertainment that is served out to people like me. I want to know what happens to the \$8.00 that you have to pay to go to Culloden Farm to see a Crop-Over Queen Show where a Crop-Over Queen is selected who does not know when the crop season is in Barbados. I want to know where all the dollar bills are going from a Fancy Dress Ball at Sandy Lane. I want to know where the money from Crop-Over Festival is going. Those are the questions that I want answered in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I do not mind the hon. member asking questions about functions when I was not in the Island. The Minister of Tourism will answer them, but, as she is new in here, I think you should draw her attention to the fact that it is against the Rules of the House to read speeches. Would she put away the prepared document, obviously done by her Leader for her, and speak extemporaneous as all of us have to speak? It is against the Standing Orders of this House to read speeches.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir. If the hon. member will give way, the time is now 2.15 p.m. I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m.

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

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

On Resumption — —

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

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

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the period of interruption, the hon. member for the City was speaking. If she so desires, she may continue for five minutes.

Miss MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I proceed with what I was saying, I would simply like to say to the Prime Minister, in answer to his interruption of what I was saying, that his treatment of women in his Party and in his Government is one thing, but he must not try to treat women of this Party and this Opposition in the way that he would treat the one who sat over there. If he is speaking about speeches made by a Leader, he must speak for himself and not for the Leader of the Opposition. No speech was written for me and will ever be written for

me. I made some notes when the Minister was speaking. They stand here before me, and I am entitled to do that. I have my copy of the Standing Orders, and I am fully aware of what I am permitted and what I am not permitted to do in here.

Now, to continue with what I was saying, I was wondering about the Crop Over Festival and what became of the money made from the Crop Over Festival. What became of the trade which the Crop-Over Festival is supposed to drum up. I am concerned at the dramatic decline in the level of entertainment one sees at the Crop-Over Festival. The majority of the Crop-Over Festival events are for people who are not working Barbadian sugar workers or any other kind of Barbadian workers. The events do not attract the tourists. The Fairs are the only events which can be said to attract workers, simply because they are put and held in a venue where the workers will have access to them. The level of entertainment there is low also. A lot of free singing and free groups playing; no games, no traditional stalls. It leaves a great deal to be desired, and this is supposed to drum up the summer trade!

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the summer Courses, the Minister stressed the fact that the teaching of foreign languages was an important aspect and an important subject in this Programme. I find it difficult to believe that hotel workers, during a Summer Programme, could learn a foreign language. I reckon it would take more than 15 or 20 years, during July and August, for a barman or a hotel maid to learn to speak Spanish, German, or French. The whole business smacks, as I said, of a gimmick. That does not surprise us because, of course, this is the year of the gimmick. I will vote for it because it is my hope that somewhere along the line one or two persons, at this terrific expense, will gain some benefit from the Programme if it gets off the ground, and then the vote must, to some extent, be justified.

Mr. Chairman, there is very little more that I have to say. My five minutes is not a very long time. Other speakers before me have said most of what has to be said under this Head. I do not believe in speaking simply for the sake of speaking, or playing to the Gallery. That is for other people to do.

3.20 p.m.

I deplore the attempts which have been made in here today by two persons on the other

side of the House to denigrate what I have said or what I have been saying. What the other person said I shall not bother myself with at all. I do not count that person as anybody or anything that he says as anything, so what he says is as if I did not hear it.

Mr. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, sometimes I wonder whether the Minister who introduced this Resolution ever stops to think that the people in Barbados or the members of this Assembly including those on the other side have got any kind of brains in their heads that they can sit and think and discover the wool which he is constantly trying to pull over the eyes of the people in this country. From the time he has been Minister of Information and Tourism, the hon. member has come to this Chamber and boasted about the number of tourist ships that will visit Barbados, he has boasted about the new hotels that will be erected to accommodate more than 250,000 people that will visit this country, and never has his boast been fulfilled or come near the mark. He has been the instigator and has instituted a private document which was circulated to only D.L.P. members about the British Airways building a hotel at the Garrison; the Holiday Inn was to build an extension in Christ Church; there was to be another airport hotel and all these groups were to come to Barbados. Taximen were to get more than enough work, so you had to introduce a separate minibus system, but nothing has ever come to light. Now you hear about a summer school for hotel workers to improve the hotel workers and they are talk about a foreign language. I know the first place they are going to refer to is Geneva, but what they must tell the people in this country is that in places like Geneva it is natural for every boy, girl, old man or old woman to speak three or four languages. They do not go to school to learn three or four languages because those countries are so made up with people of so many different categories, that they normally come along speaking three or four languages; so when you find somebody in a hotel speaking those languages, you know he had it from the beginning. It is just like the St. Lucians. Every St. Lucian will talk patois and English because it is part of his culture to speak two languages, but in Barbados the Minister will tell you that he is going to teach foreign languages. I would like to see this happen. I would like to see that the Barbadian can pick up a foreign language in three months, because when the Prime Minister leaves here and goes to Germany all he has to do is to pass by a hotel on the way to the airport and pick up a bell boy to be his interpreter. When the Minister is going

to Venezuela or Mexico he can pass by the hotel in St. Lawrence and pick up one of his bell boys and say "come and go with me, you will be my interpreter because you have learnt it in three months." You will live until you reach the age of Methuselah and not one of these coming out of the school will ever speak another language that anybody can understand. If it is so, why is it that in all the Universities around the world you establish language laboratories for pupils who are studying a language for a degree. They have got to spend three years in there in order to speak a language fluently that persons from a mother country speaking that tongue can understand. You and I have been to school and from the time you get into the second form they teach you a little French, Latin or Spanish, and after the Fifth form, even if you get a G.C.E. in Latin or French and you miss and go any place and say you are speaking it, nobody would understand what you are saying. (A VOICE: He learnt it in two weeks.) You see what I have told you! They are so stupid that he has got them convinced...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member saying that the Chair is stupid? And they who? I see no other member on his feet except the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Mr. BOLDEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The fools are also there on the other side. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what the hotel industry in Barbados wants. It does not want any gimmick course by telling the hotel workers that they will be put in there for three months. In each hotel in the world you speak to the head waiter and if he does not understand he refers to one or two persons in the hotel who speak the language and they interpret it; but those two persons are paid to do a job at a salary commensurate to the education and training they have had; but what you are going to do here is fool the hotel workers and tell them that you are training them to speak a language and you cannot pay him any more money. It is just another way of keeping down the average hotel worker by making a half-educated worker.

What the hotel industry in this country wants is bringing down the discrimination which still exists, and that is what the Minister should try to do. I will say this now and I do not know if my Party will like it or not. Do you know how the hotel industry operates in places like Malta? They keep the hotel going in summer because if they have five days in winter, the Government joins forces with the hotel association and decides that the hotels can charge a low rate, and the hoteliers themselves have decided that they will

make the equivalent of £1 profit on a room so as to keep the hotel workers employed year round. You keep his efficiency up and he in turn learns to appreciate not only the foreigners, but learns to appreciate his own people. He gives them the same service as he would give any tourist coming from abroad. Let the Minister stand up and tell you or anybody in Barbados which one of the large hotels in this country will open its doors so that the very workers, the parents, fathers, mothers or sisters, when they get holidays, will be able to book in at Sandy Lane or Coral Reef and spend the three weeks and be served like any tourist. The hotels in Barbados are content to operate from October to March or April, close their doors from April to October again and then tell you they cannot make any money. If they close their doors they must have some operating expenses. The hotels that operate with three or four workers do not want you and I sitting down next to Mr. X from England because it is not their policy, or when you go there and the worker turns to serve you, you see the Manager standing at the door with his hands folded and staring you in the eye, enough to tell you that these are not whom you are to serve in here. When you teach our workers to appreciate our own, they do not want any languages.

We have the University up there that is turning out graduates in languages; those are the persons you should put in the hotels and pay them a decent wage; but the hotels are not going to pay anybody of that standard. They will run back to England. You will remember the debate in here a few Estimates ago when the member for St. James complained about the number of expatriates who held high positions in the hotels in St. James and the very Minister ran outside and came back after lunch with a piece of paper and said he had checked it out and they were only four. He will do like that today. Last week when I attacked him on the elections, he did not have the guts to stand up and answer me, but he waits to come back with a personal statement because he knows you cannot interrupt a personal statement; but let me answer his personal statement now. I say he is untruthful to us in his personal statement. He cannot tell the truth even if God was outside.

3.30 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must withdraw the statement that the hon. member cannot speak the truth.

Mr. BOLDEN: I withdraw the statement and I say that when he makes a statement and God is near him, God will not understand what he says

because he will not be speaking what God loves. He came here and made a personal explanation which was not a personal explanation. In the same way that he seeks to bend the rules of this House, he tries to bend everything in Barbados.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No one can bend the rules of this Chamber. The Speaker accepted it, and therefore it cannot be challenged.

Mr. BOLDEN: The Speaker can tell me to sit down, but that does not mean I accept his ruling. It arose out of a delay. He had an opportunity to answer and did not answer. He waited until two weeks later and then came in and said that he was making a personal explanation.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are discussing a Resolution under Tourism for training. The hon. member is debating a statement made by the hon. member for Christ Church. I think that this should be struck from the record.

Mr. BOLDEN: How many Chairman do we have in here? I will get back to the Resolution. At the end of the three month period of training you will come back and hear the Minister with some excuse why it has not come to fruition.

If you look at the list of supposed lecturers, you will have to ask yourself what exactly can they tell anybody, even high school graduates in three months. How many hours will they be opening? Will the students have time to prepare papers? They go on trying to fool the people. The people of this country have their eyes opened. The hotel workers will say that if you are doing this they will go along. What are you going to teach them? How can you teach anyone a foreign language in three months?

The hotel workers themselves are laughing at this scheme. The hoteliers are saying that the Government never consulted them on the matter. They want to fool the people that they are doing something. We were told that this would be a bounty month for tourist coming down here before the Olympics. Hotels are closing down daily, and the Minister is telling us that you will get this and that. When we were talking about buses at Seawell he spoke about the big groups coming here who did not want to travel by taxis, but in coaches together. Where are the groups now? He will come with another gimmick. I remember talking to a hotelier at a licensing session. I told him that things would be good for

him. He said that he did not think that I would be so foolish as to accept all that propaganda.

Ask those on the South Coast how they are faring. You will hear now that the fuel crisis has stopped it, that the Olympic games have stopped it. Some are laughing and at the same time the masses are suffering under the depression. I thank you.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, I cannot criticise this Resolution because it is something for workers; and I would like to compliment the Minister of Tourism on bringing this before the House. I understand that it has been discussed with the management of hotels. It says that it is proposed to institute a Tourism Off-season Employment and Training Project to relieve the impact of seasonal unemployment and loss of earning among workers in the tourism industry and to upgrade their skills.

That is what we need to see in this country, the Government and employers working hand in hand; but if the Minister has not discussed it with hotel managers, that is a different kettle of fish; but these people need to be trained because tourism is vital to the economy of this country, and there is no point in a business woman standing here and criticising this Resolution just for the sake of criticising it.

I love my people and I love my country. What I do not understand is that when people who are working in the tourism system, when they leave school they should be able to take up jobs. We want to see these people employed in hotels get training, and it is necessary for the Government and hotel employers to put their heads together and let this country go forward. As far as hoteliers are concerned, they are business people, and people go into business to make money. During the summer season which is a slow season some may be able to open their doors at a lower rate, but in so doing they will have to lay off some of their workers. Instead of laying them off and sending them home without knowing where their bread will come from, at least we will be able to train them while they are still being paid. I am really and truly very grateful to see something like this. This is not the 25 cents bus fare for which the Government has to find money. It helps the poor.

3.40 p.m.

We must get people working and let people be able to support themselves, and when things are slow for them we who are in business must

be able to help them; and if Government can make the first step we should link hands with the Government and help them.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary and it is time that some degree of reason be brought to bear on a Resolution of this nature. This is a Resolution which is dealing with training within the hotel industry. The question to which we must address ourselves is whether or not the necessity exists for training within the industry. I would say that in any kind of occupation and in any area of occupation it is necessary from time to time for people to upgrade their skills and to be exposed to some methods under a training programme. If this is accepted, then one cannot see how one could be critical of genuine attempts to expose workers in the hotel industry to further training because what this will mean, Mr. Chairman, is that the workers who are employed in the industry will be better able hopefully to do their jobs.

The more exposure one gets he would be in a better position to understand very clearly the role which they play and which they should play within the industry.

Now there has been a lot of emotionalism which has been injected in this debate by a number of speakers, but I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to be realistic and we have got to really take a hard look at the industry and see where we can assist from the point of view of creating greater opportunities within the industry for workers to play a more meaningful role within the industry; and I am contending, Mr. Chairman, that a scheme of this nature — it is true that it is a short one — and I do not think that one by any of the wildest dreams would expect that the objectives which are set by this scheme can be achieved with just one attempt at training during the summer.

If I remember correctly, I think the hon. Minister of Tourism when he introduced this Resolution stated in no uncertain terms that this year was an experimental year and through the lesson which would be learnt from the introduction of this scheme, the scheme would be improved in years ahead. Now I do not see how one could really say that this is not a step in the right direction. It is really shameful to sit and listen to some of the criticisms which are levelled at attempts to create greater opportunities for people.

Now we know that within the hotel industry we are dealing with a number of people who, to

a large extent, are extremely unscrupulous, and who would use any method and any means at their disposal to keep the workers in a particular situation and at the same time, to ensure that whatever profits exist in the industry, that they get as much of this as possible into their pockets. Yet you find that hoteliers complain about the relative lack of skill among a number of the workers, complain about the general attitude of workers within the industry; and if we have an attempt being made to improve the skills by exposing the workers who are involved in the industry to retraining and also give them an opportunity to improve whatever skills they have, and at the same time to give them an appreciation of the important role which tourism plays within this country, and we find that the attitude which is displayed by the hoteliers is one which is not a cooperative one, then one must say that something is wrong.

It is amazing, Mr. Chairman, to hear from those speeches from the Opposition to the effect that the hoteliers do not intend to support this scheme financially. In the final analysis this scheme will not only be a benefit to the workers in the industry, it will not only be a benefit to the country, but I dare say it will be a tremendous benefit to the owners of the industry; and it is for this reason and this reason alone that people who own the hotels in the industry should be making a financial contribution towards this kind of training; and this is something we have to be aware of, Mr. Chairman.

I recall some years ago when we were discussing the revision of the apprenticeship scheme and the whole question of training I made the point that the Government should set up a fund in which all employers in the country should be made, by legislation, to pay on the basis of the number of workers who are employed by them, into a fund so that this would go towards the training of the workers in any particular field in which they are involved; and I think that this is coming to light more and more in that if they are making a genuine attempt to provide opportunities for people to upgrade their skills and to be retrained, and we get this kind of attitude coming from the employers — an attitude of non-co-operation — then I dare say that the time is now when we should establish a fund to force employers to make their contribution, because when a worker is trained the contribution which he would make to the economic enterprise in which he is involved will not only be bringing financial benefits and bringing personal satisfaction to the

worker but it would also mean something to the country and it would also, most importantly mean something to that particular employer.

So this is something that we have to be aware about and I think this is something which has got to be emphasized, and something which has got to be impressed on everybody who is involved in this, and on the entire public of Barbados because I think it is a fundamental and we must right here and now indicate in no uncertain terms what is the position.

Now we have heard a lot of talk, Mr. Chairman, about foreign languages, and the fact that nobody can learn a foreign language in the period which has been allocated for this programme. Of course a lot depends, Mr. Chairman, on whether or not there are people in the industry who already have some understanding and some idea of the language. It might very well be that there are people who are working in the industry, and I do not know whether members on the other side are aware of whether they are many people in the industry who already have some working knowledge of a foreign language or foreign languages and whether or not the programme which is going to be designed would be a programme to sharpen whatsoever skills they have in this particular field; but be that as it may, let me say that we have got to start somewhere and I am not as pessimistic as some of the members of the Opposition, and I would not be as pessimistic as to say that nobody in the hotel industry could learn a foreign language under fifteen years, twenty years or fifty years, whatever period has been indicated that people would require in order to acquire a knowledge of the language.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that a lot has been said on this particular question of the foreign language, and a lot of misrepresentation and indeed a lot of bad information and wrong information has been put out. Those of us who have had the opportunity to travel outside of Barbados would know that in a lot of hotels, particularly in the hotels in Europe you would find workers, waiters, bellboys — workers in every category in a hotel speaking more than one language, and it is not true, Mr. Chairman, to say that you will find in these hotels one person who would have had an exposure to education, to learn a language at a university, whose job and whose responsibility it is to learn that language and to interpret the language for the hotel and for the workers at the hotel.

3.50 p.m.

That simply is not true and I would like to set the record straight, because what I would like to see in this country is that more and more we move towards the situation where people become conversant with more than one language. I think that we are really in an extremely difficult position in Barbados, because we have not had the opportunity to be exposed and to become conversant with a language other than English, and I think it is something which we must pay attention to, and any attempt therefore which is made to expose people, whether it is in the university, whether it is in school, whether it is by summer courses or by any kind of opportunity for training which is provided for workers or for any person in this community to learn another language, I think that this is a step in the right direction.

We have to be aware of the fact, Mr. Chairman, that in learning a language sometimes a lot depends on a person's will to learn the language, a person's keenness and the whole involvement of the person within the language, and one does not have to be a student of a secondary school or to be a graduate of a university to learn a language other than English. After all, how does a child learn a language? If we think about Barbados, most of us in here were born in Barbados, but we were not born speaking a language, we learnt to speak a language in a relatively short space of time as children, without any knowledge of language, words or anything like this, but the point is that in the same way a child in growing up can become conversant with a language without having to go to a secondary school or to be a graduate of a university, as is being suggested, then it is my contention that workers and people generally can become conversant with a language other than the mother tongue, provided the opportunity exists. A lot will depend on the content of the programme, the way in which the programme is approached, and I would hope that particularly in this area of language training, that the kind of approach which is used or which used to be used in secondary schools when I was at school, about trying to make us conversant with another language would not be used, because if that is the approach which will be used I do not think we could get very far with that, but I am sure that some new methods and techniques will be involved and will be utilised in this training programme.

I would like to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I think that this kind of exercise is a useful exercise, an exercise which if taken seriously and if treated seriously will redound not only to the

benefit of Barbados and all the hoteliers, but would also redound to the benefit of the workers and those people who will be involved in this training session.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, one can understand why members on the other side will be critical of this training programme which we are starting for this summer, and one can understand it because we only have to look back in history and see that from 1958 the hoteliers were calling on the Government under the Barbados Labour Party to establish a hotel training school. They were put out of power by the people of this country and they never even attempted to establish a training school for hotel workers, so it is understandable that today, several years after, they will still be thinking in the same way. We have established a hotel training school since 1964, and we are proud of the product of that school. We have people trained in that school who are performing duties in this Island that only expatriates performed under the Barbados Labour Party, so they would like us to go back, that is why they are criticising this scheme, to pre-1964 days when they refused to establish a hotel training school.

You heard a lot of nonsense about short courses, that people cannot benefit from this training scheme, etc. We have our universities, we have our secondary schools, the civil servants come through the secondary schools, they go to universities and do their training in administration, etc., but even in this day we have a training centre established in Barbados that provides in-service training for the 15,000 civil servants we have in this country, from time to time. Is the Opposition telling us that it is all right to train the civil servants and provide in-service training for them and not to provide in-service training for the hotel workers? Are they telling us that this is a party that took up tourism when it was only bringing into this country less than \$20 million a year when they were running the country, last year tourism brought into Barbados \$165 million, and they come here criticising the present Minister of Tourism. When he took over tourism the tourist industry was yielding this country \$89 million and the present Minister of Tourism has seen to it that the receipts from tourism have increased by \$75 million, from \$89 million in 1971 to \$165 million in 1975.

I think the person who gave a reasonable address on the other side was the hon. member for St. Michael North East, because all of us should be standing here saluting the Minister of

Tourism for the sterling effort he has made in improving tourism in this country, and we should be behind him rather than criticising him in this effort. We hear a lot about the Crop-Over Festival, but that is only a red herring; we hear a lot about election gimmicks. What is happening in this House today and in this country, everything that is done by the Government in this year is said to be an election gimmick, but do you know something? If we sat down and did nothing we would hear "Oh, they have done nothing in 1976." I want to ask a question. When we introduced school meals in this country was it an election gimmick? When we introduced free secondary education was it an election gimmick? When we introduced Radio Barbados and CBC-TV, although they criticised it, was it an election gimmick? Were you told that it would only last for a year as they are saying now? They are saying that the training here introduced by the Minister is going to last for a year. They are saying that the bus fares will last for a year, but they forgot that we established universities where the people of this country — some of the very teachers sitting here today — have been able to benefit from free university education. Did it only last for a year? The school meals have lasted all along. We have introduced national insurance in this country, did it only last for a year? Everything we have done they will have to find some excuse to criticise it.

In 1976 if we sat back and did nothing they would say we have done nothing, but now we have done something, now we have done what they cannot do because if they were in Government for fifteen years, at the end of five they would have run bankrupt of ideas, but because of the ideas which we have and we can implement proposals in the interest of the people of this country, even after fifteen years, and Mr. Chairman, we will implement them after 25 years because they will not get us out of power, not them.

4.00 p.m.

On this Resolution on the tourist industry, the tourist industry will grow from strength to strength under the Democratic Labour Party and, particularly, under the present Minister that I refer to as Mr. Tourism. They talk about where he came from, but he is the man who did the most in this country for the development of the tourist industry. All of us should salute him in that regard rather than trying to criticize him. We should encourage him to go ahead and carry the tourist industry from strength to strength.

Look at Jamaica after the energy crisis, and see what has happened to the tourist industry

there. Under the Barbados Labour Party, because of the vengeance they are preaching, and because of the fact that they are encouraging people to resort to violence in this country they will not be able to.....

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for St. Andrew has just stated that the members of the Barbados Labour Party are encouraging people with violence in this country. I am a member of the Barbados Labour Party, and I take exception to this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Fortunately for me, I have not heard the hon. member mention any hon. member in this House. Since the name of any member in this House has not been called, the Barbados Labour Party even belongs to me; so, therefore, he means me, too, and I cannot entertain it. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I can repeat what I said. I said that members of the Barbados Labour Party are inciting people of this country to resort to violence.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Members of the Government Party are.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of order, and I ask that it be expunged from the record. The hon. member cannot get up in here and think he can challenge the Chair. It was not a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, are you saying that I have challenged the Chair?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I said that the matter was closed.

Mr. HINDS: You said what matter was closed, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When you got up on a point of order.

Mr. HINDS: When I rose, did you tell me that the matter was closed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Did you not hear it?

Mr. HINDS: I cannot argue with the Chair, Sir. The Gallery and everybody in the House will know the position.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is right.

Mr. EDWARDS: The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, was that Jamaica was ahead of all of the other Caribbean countries in tourism. The tourist industry is dying in Jamaica today because of the violence over there. If we are not careful, especially if we allow the reins of Government to fall into the hands of people who have been advocating violence, we will have no tourist industry in Barbados and the tourist industry will die in the same way as it has died in Jamaica.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Some people might advocate it and others commit it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order!

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, no point of interruption will prevent me from saying what I have to say here this evening, because the people who advocate usually do not commit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has five minutes longer to say what he has to say.

Mr. EDWARDS: Did you take into consideration the interruptions? The hon. member for St. James talked about a waiter who worked for \$11,000 in three years. He did not say how many weeks this man worked during the year. He did not say what were his additional perks. He tried to say that the Minister should be seeing that these people worked for more money. What the Minister is currently doing is exactly what he is asking the Minister to do. That same barman or waiter who worked for \$11,000 in three years and was turned off from time to time, what the Minister is doing now is seeing that that man be not turned off and even if he is turned off he is given in-service training with his usual pay. In that case his salary would, normally, increase by the time he would have been home sitting down working for nothing and the time he is going to be in training and receiving benefits not only academic but financial from training.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think we could want it better. I would like to compliment the Minister, and wish that his Programme would be as successful as his sterling efforts in promoting the tourist industry in this country where, in four years, he brought up the earnings in the tourist industry from \$89 million to \$165 million.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I get the impression that if any of us on this side found a 95-year old lady on Broad Street blind and incapacitated, and tried to help her across

the road, it would be called an election gimmick. One gets tired of these election gimmick things; I would acknowledge right away that I had only thought of the Scheme this year. I wish I had thought of it earlier, but nobody else has thought of it at all. Nobody else in Barbados, and nobody else in the Caribbean. There is no Scheme of training such as this Out-of-Season Scheme of Training in any other Caribbean Island; so if it has come at this time, it has come about simply because it happened when it was thought of. It has been started at this time because this year happens to be a good year to start it before things get picking up rapidly next year.

Let us look at some of the criticisms that have been made, Mr. Chairman. I can understand the problem with the hon. member for St. James who is the Shadow Minister for Tourism. He has a terrible problem, and I sympathise with him. His problem is that, as soon as any subject comes up and he wants to look back and see what he is going to say on it, he turns up his Guyanese blueprint. Most unfortunately, they do not have too much tourism in Guyana and, therefore, he has nothing to which to refer and he has to stand up and talk a lot of nonsense. What else is the poor man going to do, Mr. Chairman? His blueprint carries no information about tourism!

It was said that I did not consult the hoteliers before I announced this Scheme. That is totally untrue. It was said that the hoteliers are not contributing anything towards this Scheme, and are not going to contribute anything towards this Scheme. That is totally untrue. Not only are the hoteliers contributing towards the wages of their staff who are there, but I am able to inform the hon. member for St. James that in his constituency a hotel has 12 people attending that Course. They are not paying 50% of the wages of those 12 people, but they are paying 100% of the wages of those people.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I hope the Minister will be kind enough to state on the floor of the House the name of the hotel.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Miramar Hotel. I could tell him a lot about his constituency but then, perhaps, he should ask George Moe who could tell him better.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of information, Sir. I wonder if the Minister can tell me whether that is the Miramar in Georgetown, or whether it is in St. Peter.

Mr. CRAIG: No, Sir. It is in the Bahamas!

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I asked the Minister a question, Sir.

Mr. CRAIG: In the Bahamas.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what has the hon. member risen?

Mr. CRAIG: On the Bahamas. The something he was on. On a point of information, because I have never heard of a point of information in here yet. You allowed him to get up, so I am on a point of information, too. It is in the Bahamas where you own hotels. There is no point of information in here. If he is on one, I am on one also. He and Chickey Brancker own all the hotels in the Bahamas.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: The hotel referred to is the one in the constituency of the hon. member for St. James, the Shadow Minister of Tourism. I am just giving him a little information about what happens in his constituency. (*Asides.*) You do not have to believe me, but it is a fact. I will tell you why it is a fact. It was said that the hotel employees were laughing at this Scheme.
4.10 p.m.

I am going to tell you that I opened this programme officially this morning at the Caribbee Hotel and there were over 100 hotel employees attending the opening of the course. That scheme is going to succeed. I have stated at the beginning that this is an experimental year, we have a lot to learn as to how best to administer it, but it is going to work, and it is going to work for the benefit of the hotel employees. There has been a lot of talk of how it is impossible in three months to learn a language.

I am very sad to know that the hon. members on the other side, at least three who spoke, have such little confidence in the ability and the skills of the hotel workers of this Island that they say that in three months they cannot make themselves proficient to the extent that I described at the beginning. No one is talking about the ridiculous suggestion of the hon. member for St. Joseph about the Prime Minister picking up a translator when he is going to Geneva or something like this. There was never any such suggestion as that. I explained at the beginning that one endeavours to try to give people an opportunity to learn something of the practicalities of the language in the department in which they work. Maybe a barman will be able to converse and give the time of the day to a person. He would not be fluent in any language; he could not possibly be in that time and

everybody knows that; but a barman or a maid or a waiter could learn the sort of question that they get asked all the time, even what time of the day it may be. You have to start somewhere, and if you do not start giving people the opportunity first to learn, you would not know their capabilities, and as the hon. member for St. Lucy pointed out, they seem to think that these people are totally uneducated. We have educated, fine people in the tourist industry and in the hotel business and many of them have certainly a knowledge of one or two languages perhaps to some extent already.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is to create an opportunity for them to improve themselves, and if they cannot by the end of three months reach a certain standard, perhaps there will be arrangements where they can go to night school or something like that and continue on a longer course next year. If you do not make a start on something like this you are not going to get anywhere. I do not under-estimate these people in the way the members of the Opposition seem to under-estimate the intelligence and ability of the ordinary hotel worker and right away through the ranks up to supervisor level. They have the ability, and as I said in the beginning it is not everyone who will learn a language. Even among lawyers, though highly educated people, not everyone has the ability to learn even one language, but another may have the ability to learn two or three. There is a certain knack to it, a facility that people have to have, and we are trying to provide an opportunity to learn languages for those youngsters who are in the tourist industry and who have the ability and the knack and the facility for learning some of the languages.

Mr. Chairman, many Barbadians living abroad learn languages. Why should these intelligent young people not be able to learn languages? Some of them will make it and some will not, but it is the same with languages as with any level of education; some people can make it and some cannot.

We have heard a good deal of talk about crop over. I am not sure how crop over got into this, and I would like to say this about the crop over thing. With regard to the tourists, where are they? They are supposed to be flocking here for crop over. It has been made clear from the beginning when we started this three years ago that we are trying to develop a festival of events primarily for Barbadian people. It has never in the first two years been advertised or publicised abroad at all, and this is the first year that a

certain amount of advertising and publicity was done. This is a bad year for that kind of thing because of the Bicentenary in the United States and other things; but nonetheless events are taking place. I think the hon. member for St. Thomas was at Vaucluse on Saturday. I was there earlier and he was there later, but certainly when I was there the C.B.C. radio team were going around and they asked me whether I was pleased to see so many tourists there at Vaucluse. They were there enjoying themselves with the people.

It is said that there are not things for the people in the ordinary sense and they do not have the opportunity to participate. I should like to mention that tonight there is a variety show at Bagatelle. Why we are spoiling these St. Thomas people I do not know, but the hon. member for St. Thomas must obviously be very pleased about the fact that at Bagatelle Pavilion there is a talent show tonight. In case he had not noticed it, I am sure he would not want to miss it. There is tomorrow night another of the barge shows here in the city. It is a free show put on in the city for the entertainment of not only the people from the city, but anyone who wants to go and enjoy these shows.

Mr. Chairman, there are all kinds of different things going on in different places, but what I do rather resent is the implication behind "where has the money gone" when they collect these \$8 from somewhere; who has got it? I would like, Mr. Chairman, to make it plain that this idea is helped in every way by the Ministry of Tourism and the Board, but there is a group of people in this community who are giving their own time to organise the Crop Over on behalf of all the people in this community, and it is a sad thing when people are volunteering their time and you get these nasty insinuations that someone has gone with the money. I would like to read out a list of the people who are voluntarily serving on this Crop Over Committee on behalf of the people of this country: Mr. Martin Donawa is the Chairman, and the previous Chairman who is still on the Committee is Mr. Emile Straker of the Merrymen; Mr. Eggie Clerke who is well known in this community in acting in particular; Mr. Ronnie Carrington, photographer; Mr. Sam Taitt. I do not need to tell anybody who he is. Mr. Neville Edwards of M.C.W.; Miss Daphne Joseph-Hackett; Mr. Orlando Marville; Mr. Howard Palmer who is also of M.C.W. but represents the Cruising Club; Mr. Frank Pardo; Mr. Winston Holder of the Jaycees; Mr. Don Grant, Manager of Parks and Beaches Commission; Mr. Garry Duesbury of Rediffusion; young Mr. Roy Ward; Mr. John Wickham — I do

not need to tell anybody who he is; Superintendent Yearwood of the Royal Barbados Police Force; a lady called Mrs. Sue Yellin who represents the Jazz Club – I have to confess I do not know her; Mr. Gordon Walters from Community Development; Mr. Bob Taylor from the Arts Council; Mrs. Joan Husbands from Housecraft; Mr. Brian Springer from the B.M.C.; Mr. Ulric Rice, Sunday Editor of the Advocate-News, and Mr. Maurice Jones.

These are people who are giving their time and effort to try and help to create a festival in this community on behalf of everyone so that they might enjoy it. I really am sad to hear the question "where has the money gone" when you have people like that who are working hard at no recompense.

I heard it said that in Barbados several large hotels were closed. I do not know if they are. Eastry House has always closed in the summer; there may be others that I do not know of, but certainly some do close for a month or so for either refurbishing or staff holidays or something like that.

4.20 p.m.

When we talk about the closing of hotels, let us have a look around the Caribbean and see where hotels have financially closed, and that Governments have had to buy several hotels while others have just gone out of business. This has happened in Jamaica and the Bahamas. Even before the present troubles the Government had taken over 10 or 11 hotels simply because they had to financially keep them up so that people would not lose their work. None of these things has happened in Barbados. It has happened in Puerto Rico, in St. Thomas, in Antigua and in Curacao. In every one of these countries the Government has been obliged either to lend money to these hotels at a very low rate of interest to keep them afloat, or to take them over completely in order to keep them open so that they would not have people out of work. This has not happened in Barbados at all.

We have gone through very tough times for a couple of years, but it has not happened in Barbados, and I do not think for a moment that it will happen; but it has not been easy for many of the hotels, as it has not been easy for many other businesses and many individuals in the past few years.

I thank the hon. member for St. Michael North East for the support that she has given to the programme and I assure her that it is going to

be made to work. I assure here that all of the fears that she has expressed are needless. I appreciate the remarks of the member for St. Lucy. I think that the idea of a training fund is a very good one. That is something that will have to be done next year when not only those enlightened hoteliers pay their share to see that some of their employees get the benefit of this opportunity for upgrading and retraining and the learning of new things, but when all of them in some proportion pay their share.

As far as the hon. member for St. Joseph is concerned, I do not know why he always likes to lambast me and be personally rude. I am not the person in here who brought in the embarrassing situation of the Barbados Development Bank. I never said a word about the Barbados Development Bank, and I would not dream of saying a word about the Barbados Development Bank.

Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of animals introduced into this Chamber in recent times. We have had monkeys, we have had rabbits and all kinds of animals. I prevailed upon my colleagues and begged them not to mention ducks in here. It would be hurtful in front of the shadow Minister of Agriculture to talk about ducks.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the Hon. Minister to keep to the Resolution and Tourism and leave out ducks.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Is it any more in order to mention ducks than to mention the ceiling termites that an American travel agency wrote about falling on the beds of the St. Lawrence Hotel shortly before it was burnt down? If you can mention ducks, you can mention termites too. Somebody said that it was the worst hotel of the 263 that he had ever been in, and it was burnt down the following night.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: Is the hon. member denying that an American travel writer wrote about the St. Lawrence Hotel that when he slept in the bed the termites were so active that in the morning the wood grains were on top of him in the bed? Would he deny that?

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both members will take their seats. That matter is now closed. I will hear absolutely nothing more about ducks, termites in hotels or else.

Hon. P. G. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have concluded what I had to say. I can assure the Committee that the training scheme is going forward. It will progress, and next year we shall come back to this House to ask again for funds to support this scheme and I will report at that time on the success which this scheme would have had.

The question that Head 17(3) for the sum of \$212,000 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Resolution for the sum of \$232,000 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 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. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) ORDER, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next Order which the Government proposes to deal with is Order No. 13 which stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976. I am asking for leave to deal with this as the next Order of the Day.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

ORDER NO. 13 WAS CALLED

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, on the 11th June, 1976, in my capacity as Minister in charge of Establishments, and in accordance with the law, I signed a series of Civil Establishment Orders which need an affirmative resolution of this House to give them the full force of law.

The background to these Orders is that it has been the practice of the Government on a triennial basis to review the salaries and conditions of employment of members of the public service ever since, I think, about 1964. The last review which we had was in 1973.
4.30 p.m.

I should like to go back a little. Before, there was a practice that from time to time, and not necessarily at any regular intervals of time, the Government would appoint a Commissioner, usually from the United Kingdom, to come down to Barbados and to look at the Civil Service structure and to make recommendations on the salaries and emoluments of members of the public service of this Island. I cannot remember the names of all the Commissioners who came here from 1951 when I first entered this House, but there were certainly at least three Commissioners during my term of office in here — as a member of the House, that is — who visited the country and spend a couple of months here, interviewed such persons as they thought fit, not necessarily representatives of the workers as such. They interviewed senior members of the public service, they looked at the work which previous commissioners had done and they super-imposed on whatever structure prevailed at that time, what they considered would be reasonable increases of salaries and conditions for the public service of this Island.

What I find extremely interesting is that in those days many members of the public service were employed by the Government of this Island, and I have never heard of a single occasion on which the members of the public service demonstrated against the English commissioners who came down here, or against the Government who implemented the proposals which were put forward by those expatriate salaries commissioners who visited for a fleeting time, this Island, neither have I had any report — and I have met two of the commissioners because one of them did come around about the time I came into office, I cannot remember the precise year — that any member of the public service was ever truculent or rude, or came into his presence in a state of inebriation, fortifying himself in order to be belligerent and antagonistic towards the salaries commissioner.

This is one of the pathetic things about colonialism in that it infused in the subject people a sense of service and a philosophy of acceptance about what is done to them; but ever since we have become independent this Government instituted, in accordance with its

general policy, a system of recognition of representatives of workers; trade unions were not recognised — when I say trade unions I am not speaking now of the industrial unions alone or the agricultural unions or the one large body which we have substantially recognized as representing the generality of workers in this country. I mean people who represented classes and categories of workers were not given the right of audience. There was a civil service association who through their senior officials sometimes made representations, but trade union activity as such in so far as the Government was concerned, did not exist; did not simply exist.

Therefore the concept of collective bargaining between the Government and the representatives of the workers was one which was instituted during my tenure of office as Minister of Finance and as Prime Minister of this Island. I think we have to bear this in mind. In other words, we have abolished the whole concept of someone descending upon us like Moses with the Decalogue from Mount Sinai and telling the people of this Island what the Government should pay to its public officers. What we have tried to do in this country is to encourage the workers in the various branches of the public service — various categories of workers — to either amalgamate in one union or in as many unions as they consider feasible and necessary in order to discuss their conditions of service and bargain for their collective rights from time to time. The last time we carried out this exercise on a collective basis was in 1973, and in 1973 as a result of collective bargaining we arrived at increases of salaries varying from about 40% at the bottom of the scale to 20% at the top for the higher echelons — these are approximate figures — of the public service.

Naturally there will be variations in various categories; some may have got 42% and some may have got 19% or 18% or even 17%, but taking the overall average, I wish to bring this point home very firmly, that there was an increase granted to the public officers of this Island of a 40% increase at the bottom and 20% at the top.

Now in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, in order to anticipate any normal — and I underline 'normal' — escalation in the index of commodity prices, the cost of living index and whatever you choose to call it, we built into the revision not only an interim payment right at the beginning but for the second and third years of the triennium during which the agreement was expected to subsist, a five percent increase in all

public officers' wages and salaries in addition to the normal increments which those who happened to be on the incremental scale would enjoy during the said period.

So what we had in 1973 was, first, an interim payment, then we had the settlement of approximately a 40% increase at the tapering to 20% at the top, and then in addition to that a 5% annual increase in the financial year 1974-75 and 1975-76. This has got to be borne in mind.

I will give an idea of the situation which has developed since 1961. We have many statements made about the cost of living. I want to say right here now that this is the very first time that the representative of the employees have stressed the cost of living index and the increase in consumer prices on which the index is based as a fulcrum by which they should lever at the wages of the persons whom they represent. They might have other reasons but I am saying that if you take the cost of living index — the index of consumer prices — over a period of time — I am going to give you some actual figures.

4.40 p.m.

If you take the ten year period, 1966-1976, you will find that the increases in the salaries and wages in the public sector over that period of time, including, let us say, to 31st March, 1976 have exceeded the increases in the index of retail prices. I am saying that categorically. If we go back and look at some absolute figures, this is what we find. We find that in 1961 — and that is a good bench mark from which I should start, because that is the first time that the island had a Minister of Finance, I don't mean a "true-true" Minister of Finance, I mean a Minister of Finance at all, there used to be a Financial Secretary who was an expatriate. Everything that he said was accepted by the public service, as far as I know, now we have a Minister of Finance who is a Barbadian — but in 1961 a Maid in the public service worked for \$15.20 a week. As a result of the recommendation which I put to the Cabinet, and which I am asking the House to endorse, a Maid will be working at the bottom for \$62 a week, and next year for \$70 a week. A Police Constable was getting between \$91 and \$100 a month; as a result of the increases which I am recommending today, a Police Constable will be moving from \$311 per month at the bottom to \$412 per month. At the top of the Constable's scale he will be getting something in excess of \$800 a month, but when he comes out of the Police Training School, without any increments for 'O' Levels or 'A' Levels, his basic salary will be \$412 a month. A Staff Nurse who was getting

\$156 a month moves to \$527 a month and \$574 next year; a Nursing Assistant from \$206 a month in 1961 to \$827 a month this year; a Clerical Officer who entered the service at \$100 per month will now receive \$355 a month; unqualified teachers would be the same thing, from \$94 for females and \$100 for males to \$355; trained teachers from \$148 for males and \$124 for females to \$527; and Head Teachers who were getting \$301 a month and females \$265 will be moving to \$1,012 a month, and a Grade I Head Teacher from \$288 and \$325 to \$1,217 a month. A Magistrate who was on a salary when I assumed office at \$394 a month will now be on a fixed salary of \$1,524 a month from 1st March and \$1,625 a month from next year.

That is the general background. We can talk about increases in the index of retail prices, but at the same time we must look at the way in which the first people to benefit from the development of this country, the growth of this country, have been the people in the public service of Barbados. Mr. William Demas who is the President of the Caribbean Development Bank, I think is one of the most eminent practical economists that we have in the Caribbean today, has observed in one of his publications that one of the problems we have in the Caribbean is that every time we make some kind of gain in the public sector and we get savings on current account, these are immediately absorbed by demands from the public service for increases in salaries in order to allow them to maintain a life style to which the majority of the people in the countries in which we live have aspired. Now, we are very fortunate in Barbados. We have a per capita income of, I believe, over \$1,100 U.S. per annum. In the great sub-continent of India, with an Army, an Air Force, a Navy and the atomic bomb, as far as I know, with rich Maharajahs possessing wealth beyond the imaginations of anybody here in the Caribbean, the per capita income is less than \$50 per annum. In Israel there are no Cabinet Ministers working for more than \$400 U.S. per annum, but here in the Caribbean we, as I have said before — and somebody attributed it to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, but I made that statement in here — we have a lot of champagne tastes with mauby pockets, and this is particularly true of the people who live off the public purse. I do not want to criticise them here today, this is the way that they have been encouraged to live, unfortunately, and it is very difficult nowadays to change the life styles of the people in this

country to make them understand what an economic crisis in the world is, or what the realities of life are in a developing country such as ours.

That is the background against which I wish to introduce this Resolution today, so that we understand that as far as I am concerned that I would very much like to be in the position of my four colleagues, because in Trinidad and Tobago there are four Ministers of Finance, not one, I have to do the job myself here, I would like to be in the position of my four colleagues in Trinidad and Tobago, the four Ministers of Finance, including the Prime Minister, where they can have a surplus on current account of over \$863 million, that is after hiding away about \$297 million in various projects which have not been clearly divulged in the budget statement made by the Prime Minister when he delivered it a few months ago. The point is that in Barbados we started off this financial year with a deficit on current account of over \$20 million. It is the largest deficit that we have ever been confronted with since I have been Minister of Finance, that is, from 1961, and this deficit we have arrived at after doing a lot of pruning and arises out of a submission of estimates of revenue and expenditure which have been based on inevitable increases in Government revenue such as increments in salaries and so on, and not in any increase in non-recurrent expenditure which tends to inflate your estimates of expenditure. We have cut the estimates of non-recurrent expenditure down to the bone, and in spite of that the inevitable increases, the inescapable increases in Government expenditure which are built into the system because of the Civil Establishments Act cause us to have a deficit of over \$20 million on current account as I disclosed to the House at the time and the House approved when the Estimates were passed.

We were under an obligation to negotiate with the representatives of the various categories of workers in the public service, because we had entered into a three-year agreement in 1973, so there is no point in saying that we are not going to negotiate or anything like that, because it was not like in the old days whenever the Government felt, you know, that they could do something they invited somebody from England and there was no stated time or interval of time within which these visitations should take place. It was a very whimsical kind of exercise on the part of the Government, and there was no protest from the public service in this respect, but by the terms of our agreement in 1973 we had to start

negotiating with the public service representatives, and as far as I can remember, some 18 different meetings were held between the officials of the Ministry of Finance and the Establishments Division of my Ministry and the representatives of the various categories of workers in the public service. Now I say this because there has been a lot of propaganda in the newspapers that the whole system of collective bargaining has been abrogated by the Prime Minister, and that I have repudiated the principles of collective bargaining by bringing legislation to the House.

4.50 p.m.

Now, let us start at the end and go back to the beginning. If I do not bring legislation to the House, according to the Financial Administration and Audit Act of 1964 and 1970, they cannot get any money. It is as simple as that. If they do not want me to bring the legislation to the House, I do not have to bring it. There is nothing in it for me; there is nothing in it for the Leader of the Opposition; there is nothing in it for the Leader of the House, there is nothing in it for you, Sir, because I said in here six months ago that no Parliamentarian and no Government Minister can except any salary increase as long as I am Minister of Finance until 1st April, 1978, and then only if I am satisfied, as Minister of Finance, that the state of the economy justifies it.

Now, start tightening your belt right now, Sir. I do not have to come to the House; so if they do not want me to come to the House, they will have to account to their families, their wives, and the people who are their dependants on the 15th July when I am ready to pay out the back money, and on the 24th June when I am ready to pay out the increased salaries of 35% and 12½%. If they do not want me to come to the House, then let us go home now, Sir. Cricket, unfortunately, is over and we cannot listen to that. I understand that there is a draw, but I am not playing for a draw; I am playing for a win.

With regard to this nonsense about short-circuiting procedures, 18 meetings were held between the officials of the Ministry of Finance and the Establishment Division of my Ministry. I had two meetings with all of the alleged representatives of the various categories of workers: the Barbados Workers' Union, the Secondary Teachers' Association, the other Teachers' Association or whatever they call themselves, I am never quite sure, and the National Union of Public Workers.

Now, let us examine the whole business and dispose of this once and for all. First, I want to say that no money can be paid out unless the Order which I signed on the 11th June is approved affirmatively by this Chamber. That is fundamental. They told me when I last met with them, the National Union of Public Workers, that they rejected the Government's offer. I have made provision that any member of the Public Service, who does not want to accept the money when the Accountant General is willing to pay it out, does not have to take the money; so, our consciences are clear.

Collective bargaining means this: not that one side has to accept unequivocally what is demanded by the other side; not that the employer has a gun held to his head by the representatives of the workers, and when the workers say, "We want 100% increase" the employer agrees and they sign an agreement. Collective bargaining usually means that both sides sit around a table and reason with each other.

Now, there comes a stage when you reach what is called an impasse. You can get no further because both sides have dug their heels in. The workers' representatives on one side say, "We must have 60% increase", as they did on this occasion, and the employers' representatives on the other side say, "We cannot afford to pay more than so and so; may be 30% or 35%." From my experience of collective bargaining, the workers usually start off with a high figure because they know that they are going to be beaten down. The employer start off with a low figure because they know they are going to be beaten up. That is what collective bargaining means.

It is a great pity that in industrial relations two sides do not have the confidence in each other that they can put the books on the table. The Government has nothing to hide, of course, but I am talking about industry now. There should be some formula whereby a percentage of the takings of a firm are allocated to labour and the rest is allocated to profits and taxes, but it is not so. It is not done that way. They start off by making usually inordinate demands, and they end up by trying to effect some sort of compromise. There are many occasions in which the negotiations break down, and in industrial relations the workers then resort to what the law allows them to do, that is, either strike action by withholding their labour from the employer, or by picketing at or near where the employer resides, or has his place of work, and not on, as they did today not in or on but at or near. After all, I put that down on the Statute Book when it

was opposed by the other people on the other side. I refer to the right to peaceful picketing. All of these are the mechanics of industrial warfare whereby one side tries to focus, or to generate a certain amount of sympathy for their side against the other side. It is usually the workers' organisations who are out to create this atmosphere of sympathy in order to get the general public which might be inconvenienced by the cessation of work. For instance, a transport strike would inconvenience a large number of people in the community who depend upon transportation to get to work and, therefore, by withholding their labour they can make a direct impact on the consciousness of the travelling public that the employers are holding out against them, and then an inquiry is usually sought, or some kind of intervention is made at Government level.

Here we have a situation in which the Government, the legitimate and freely elected Government of this country on behalf of the people, the taxpayers of this country happen to be the employer. The Government are not an industry which is exploiting the workers and making inordinate profits which they are salting away. The Government have to derive their main income from taxation of the total population who may be working, or who may not be working, because once you are eating you have to pay some kind of tax.

Now, when the situation arises in the private sector that there is an impasse between the employers and the workers, as I said before, two things can happen. You either have some kind of withholding of labour, which is a strike, or the workers' representatives resort to one of the other devices of industrial warfare in order to reduce the employer to a feeling of christian understanding — let me put it that way — as to their point of view. That cannot apply in the case of the Government. I would also like to remind you of this because it is very important. You will remember, Sir, that somewhere around 1968 — I should like to remind the representatives of the various categories of workers in the Public Service that, as far as I can remember it was 1968, there was a dispute in the major industry in this Island, the sugar industry, in which the workers side would not budge, and the employers were recalcitrant. There was a complete breakdown in the machinery of collective bargaining as there frequently is. There is nothing sacrosanct about collective bargaining. It is a pious expression that you can arrive at some agreement, or consensus, by arguing the merits and demerits of cases around a bargaining table.

5 p.m.

Frequently in the field of industrial relations the offices of the Labour Commissioner have to be invited as arbitrator or conciliator because the whole process of collective bargaining breaks down more frequently than it operates in a peaceful and tranquil way, I say this from what I have experienced. Maybe the Barbados Workers' Union has been able to steam roller through certain things from time to time, but frequently it breaks down. Let me put it this way. It has not been unknown for it to break down frequently.

What I have to say here applies to everybody. In this matter I do not have any favourites. I have been Minister of Finance and Minister in charge of Establishment with responsibility to the public of Barbados. My constituency has not been the 15,000 people in the Civil Service; my constituency is the 250,000 people who reside in Barbados and who pay taxes in this Island. I want my position clear. My constituency is not a narrow one of 2,000 or 3,000 specially selected people; my constituency is a very catholic and all embracing constituency in my capacity as Minister of Finance, and I am saying that the machinery of collective bargaining frequently breaks down, and it broke down in 1968.

I have nothing to do with the Barbados Workers' Union. I have no official position, neither do I have any position in the Barbados Sugar Producers' Federation. I have no status, but in 1968, I came to this House after going on the radio and on television and announcing that I intended coming to the House to enact legislation to fix the wages in the sugar industry and introduce a guaranteed week for agricultural workers without any further consultation between me and them on either side of the dispute, either the Workers' Union or the Sugar Producers' Federation. So said, so done. I came into this House and introduced a Bill and I went on a blackboard in front of the television camera and said that these are going to be the wages. I have no status in the sugar industry nor in the Workers' Union. The point I am making is this: if I have no status and I can come here with legislation to save the economy of this country from ruin at a time of crisis, *a fortiori*, to borrow a phrase from the hon. and learned member for St. Philip North — I think his Latin must be more extensive than the two words he quoted today, how much more can I as Minister of Finance, the sole representative of the 250 thousand employers, with the approval of the Cabinet which is the executive and functional arm of the Government of this country, come to

the House and introduce legislation to fix the wages, salaries and conditions of employment of our own workers? If I can do it in the sugar industry having arrived at an impasse between them, *res inter alia acta* therefore when I am part and party to the proceedings myself, I can come here and tell the House that negotiations have broken down, and that I put both sides as well as my limited powers of advocacy would permit me to argue both sides which I always did. When I was practising I always sat down in the evening and tried to do the other man's side of the case first, and then tried to break down his arguments by putting my side. So I put both sides as they represented to me at our first meeting, and I said this was their point of view and this was the Government's point of view, and the Government agreed that we would introduce legislation to settle the wages and salaries for this current period.

I want to make that clear because they have been saying that they would expect me, having listened to their arguments and having gone as far through my public officials as I thought it prudent in the light of the state of the economy of Barbados to go, to come back to the second meeting and to agree with him and say "I see your point, we are going to go to 60%". I would say that it would be completely dishonest of me as Minister of Finance or of any of us here in the House to tell the representatives of these organisations who were demanding a 60% as their minimum demand for increase in wages and salaries over and above the existing level of wages and salaries, knowing the severe crisis that confronts this Island along with all of our major trading partners in the Caribbean, and particularly in the context of a deficit on current account of some \$20 million and on capital account of \$50 million, and the deficit on salaries alone without pensions which I am asking the House to consider today. Without even adding in the additional \$5.4 million for these pensions that would bring us out with an overall deficit this year of \$100 million which I would be at my wit's end even now to know how to find all the money to pay for this. We can of course curtail the capital works programme and create unemployment if that is what they want. We also have to bear in mind that you cannot go through the voters' List and tell from those figures, but the unemployment of this country must be at the rate of 11%, 12% or 13%; that is the minimum of possibly 12,000, 13,000 or possibly 14,000 people who want jobs and who cannot get jobs. Can we exist in a society which ignores all the young people leaving school and who have left school sometimes for three, four or five years and

have not found jobs in order to buttress up the life styles of a relatively narrow sector of the economy of 15,000 people, and the rest of us have to pay eternal ransom to it? This is the angle from which I approach the whole thing. I do not look at it from the point of view of getting votes from the Civil Servants. I have to do what my conscience tells me is just and what is reasonable and what can be managed, and anybody who promises the Public Service that they can get more money out of the economy in this year or next year could only be misleading it.

I want to make my position clear, not only because there are two Trade Union representatives on this side of the House. I am a Trade Unionist. I could almost say I was born a Trade Unionist, but in those days Trade Unions were illegal. We had the Working Man's Association. I came up in the days when we had to run a soup kitchen at the corner of Mason Hall Street to feed the dock workers who were on strike. The hon. member for St. Michael West would know about it and those who would want to know would know about it. The Working Man's Association was the only representative of workers and had to masquerade as a Friendly Society because the Trade Union Act did not legalise Trade Unions. A Trade Union was a conspiracy in those days. I have represented Trade Unions, but I have never appeared against a Trade Union in an industrial dispute or in a court of law. I have been representing Trade Unions up and down the West Indian archipelago in various disputes, whether it is wages, salaries or industrial disputes.

5.10 p.m.

I have represented trade unions. I have never been against trade unions in an industrial dispute or a court of law. I have represented trade unions up and down the West Indian archipelago in various disputes whether it was for wages or salaries or industrial disputes. So, I do not think that my credentials are in question.

I would not like anything that I say here to be taken as critical of the officers of any of the organisations, even the National Union of Public Workers who are trying to get the best for the people they are supposed to represent; but my quarrel with them is that there comes a time when you have to be realistic, and there comes a time, which is more important, when you have to do like the Ministers and even like other Parliamentarians who have not protested up to now, and be nationalistic even to the extent of foregoing any claims that you might have, far less

the question of degree, because what the Ministers are doing, and what I have invited the rest of Parliament to do — of course they cannot do it unless I introduce a Resolution — is to forego any increase at all for the next two years at least.

I am saying that I am not being critical of any of the representatives, whether of the Police Association, the Workers' Union, the National Union of Public Workers, the teachers or any of them because they are trying to get more money, because that is what they are elected for, and they have to play a little politics in order to get re-elected. That does not apply so much to the two Parliamentarians behind me. In organisations such as these they have got to be a bit aggressive and a bit belligerent to show that they are proper representatives of the various categories of workers in their organisations.

I understand that. At the same time I want to make my position clear. I think that your patriotism and commonsense sometimes have to transcend your duty to members of your organisation, and you have to tell the people in your organisation the facts of life instead of misleading them and making them believe that the Minister of Finance has a big bag of gold somewhere at the end of the rainbow and that you only have to walk 100 yards to the end of the rainbow and take money out of this pot of gold.

I have the temptation sometimes to get angry with what I see going on in this country — the lack of realism; but I am not being angry. As I have said, I understand their position and I do not want anything I may say here in putting the Government's case, and what is much more important the case of the people and the taxpayers in Barbados to be translated into some criticism of personalities or anything like that. I am stating the case for the people of Barbados, and I think that we are all the people of Barbados.

I have given the background which led us up to these negotiations. I have to explain that we had some 18 meetings at various times from the time negotiations started late last year until they ended earlier this month. At the end of the first meeting I had with the workers together I said that I would meet them separately by the end of May. I was not able to meet that deadline, but I met members towards the end of the first week or the second week in June and I told them what the Cabinet had agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, that is the background. I would like to say a little more, but I just wanted to clear that particular aspect. I received a letter dated 21st June, signed by the President of the Barbados Secondary Teachers Union stating that "whereas this union deplores the action of Cabinet in determining negotiations by way of parliamentary legislation which is a procedure diametrically opposed to Government's professed belief in the principles of collective bargaining, be it resolved that this union urge members of both sides to vote against the Resolution as an indication that they do not accept the principle of legislating salaries as a substitute for the process of collective bargaining."

What I am trying to explain to them in a very simple way is that they could not get any money at all even if we had agreed unless we had legislation, because that is the law of the land. If we did not agree with them after 18 meetings and we reached an impasse like the Sugar Producers Federation and the Barbados Workers Union in 1968, whom am I going to turn to? Am I then to invite some big McGuffie from the Commonwealth Relations Office or from some foreign country to settle a dispute between me and the representatives of the public employees of Barbados? That would be a negation of our sovereignty and independence. We have to settle our problems ourselves and we have to find the money.

When we are finished, neither the President of the BSTU, the General Secretary of the BWU, the President of the NUPW or any of them have to do anything more than go and draw the money at the end of the month and draw their back pay. They do not have to find it, so they can afford to ask for the moon.

Let me give you the implications of what they asked for. They asked for a 100 per cent increase at the bottom which would mean when we worked it out right through the ranks, \$70 million in additional salaries this year alone, and \$84 million next year. Now, the total money that I collect from corporation tax and personal income tax, which is our major source of revenue, is for 1976-77 \$67,501,000. Now the demands which the NUPW made amount to \$70 million. Let us say that I under-estimated. Forget the \$20 million deficit which we have on current account. They are nothing to do with that. That is my problem. That is not their problem. I am not asking them to solve that problem; but it will mean that we will have to double the rate of income tax all the way up the line, and in some cases more than double it to meet their demands.

Now, as far as import duty is concerned, the amount of money which I collect from import duties in this year's estimates is estimated at \$35,507,000. So you will see that in order to raise this \$70 million you will have to have a 200 per cent increase in import duties because 100 per cent would only give you another \$35 million. So it will mean a 200 per cent increase in order to get an additional \$35 million. That would be contra-productive because it means that the prices of all the commodities which we use in this country will go up for everybody in the community including the Civil Servants themselves.

I can give you some comparative figures. When I first introduced my budget, the amount of \$26,219,316 represented the total of all the goods and services on Government account. That was the actual amount of money, and not the estimated amount. That was the total budgetary expenditure of Barbados, including Civil Servants salaries in 1961. This year it is \$182,480,111. This has been the growth of the economy; but out of that public officers salaries account for over \$70 million; so what the public service is getting in Barbados today is approximately twice and a half the total Government revenue in 1961.

But, Sir, they want more. I have no objection. I would like to see a situation in Barbados where we did not have any problems at all about money; where we had a super abundance of natural resources or were getting royalties from oil which would far transcend all the money which we now collect on various accounts on behalf of Government revenue.
5.20 p.m.

The point is that we are limited and we start off with a deficit. Therefore we cannot say 'transport workers got a big increase and therefore you have to relate what we get with what the transport workers get.' I am nothing to do with what the transport workers got. I am glad to see that the transport workers were able to get an increase. A lot of us feel that maybe, it was a bit out of scale with what is going on in the rest of the community. Most of the people to whom I talk feel that way. We may be wrong; that includes me. It is not that I feel that \$140 a week is too much for a bus driver. I would like it to be \$280; but in the light of what other people with various skills get in this community, maybe that was a big increase which was not justified by the increase in the cost of living or during the period since they last had a review of their salaries. A lot of us feel that way but you cannot use that as a fulcrum to say now, escalate

everybody from bus drivers and put everybody above the bus drivers. You hear talk about bus drivers are getting more than the police, but I am sure a lot of the policemen prefer to be doing the job that they are doing than to be driving the buses at \$140 a week. It is true that the bus drivers are getting more than a youngster who enters the civil service today at about \$280 a month, and that is what the bus drivers work for in two weeks; but a lot of the fellows who come in there in the public service do not want to drive buses, so that is the kind of thing — in every occupation there are certain incentives and disincentives which you have to look at; there are certain prejudices against doing certain kinds of jobs and you have to pay for those prejudices.

If you have an open mind you will go and do any job, whether it is a scavenging job or else. A lot of us do not want to do scavenging jobs because it is unpleasant and untidy. Even if you pay \$1,000 a month some of us would not do those jobs. You have to remember this. So the people who have to go and do those jobs, they have to be paid a special inducement allowance — if you may put it that way — built into their wages and salaries structure, which will offset the unpleasantness and approbrium of the particular occupation or calling which they may be following. I hope I have made myself clear; but you see, I mentioned this because the representatives of the workers brought this argument to me, that since the transport people were getting all of this money, that they have to start building up from \$560 a month, and we would go through the top of the roof if we follow that argument.

My position on behalf of the people of Barbados and on the part of the Government was, with a deficit of \$20 million on current account, that we start off with a zero position. I would say right now that when the World Bank team came down here late last year or early this year they warned the Government, and I have not taken their warning but I just want to say this, that they warned the Government against further inflationary rises in wages and salaries, and that strictly speaking the Government although it was under an obligation to review wages and salaries this year 1976, was not in a position to do so, would render itself ineligible — these are strong words — would render itself ineligible for World Bank funding for any projects and even if the Government did feel itself constrained to grant some kind of increase in wages and salaries, that it should be limited to something between 5% and 10%.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not like speaking with papers but, at a meeting which was held earlier this year the World Bank people said that Barbados would have to introduce measures designed to correct fiscal and balance of payments disequilibria in order to qualify for any assistance by way of loans from that institution. I do not want to go into the document in detail at this stage; I will make a further disclosure of those discussions at a later stage; but the point I wish to make at this stage is this. Both the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development tend to impose very severe restrictions and have very stringent lending criteria to countries which they feel are being bamboozled into inflationary situations and are not taking the proper corrective action in order to remedy balance of payments and other disequilibria in the economy.

Now while I am on that I would like to say this, that a statement appeared in the Press, I think day before yesterday, purporting to quote a Government official, that these salary increases would deplete Barbados' foreign exchange reserves. I have checked carefully with the officials in the Ministry of Finance and the Civil Establishments Division and no official in either one of those departments or any other that I know about — because certainly nobody outside of these two departments would be qualified to speak on an issue such as this — had had any discussion with the Press on balance of payments matters. As a matter of fact, the article is completely and utterly misleading, because civil service salaries do not directly have any bearing on our foreign exchange reserves. I want to make that position clear. Civil service salaries will have some kind of effect on your balance of payments reserves if as a result of the increased borrowing locally and maybe abroad, the import bill of the country is increased and indirectly it may have some bearing on your balance of payments because we will have to pay for those imports.

Any increase in imports over and above the existing level must have some kind of effect, therefore if you pump more money into the economy and as a result of your pumping money into the economy there is an increase in the demand for imports, that may have an effect on your balance of payments; so I just want to disassociate myself and my officials from any statement which appeared in the local Press to that effect during the past two or three days. I just want to get that straight.

Every one of my officials have denied having any such conversation and I certainly have had

no conversation with the gentlemen of the Press, neither do I agree in its over-simplification with the statements which appeared to this effect.

Now quite apart from the question of the revision of the salaries there has been a reclassification of the various grades in the public service. The exercise of reclassification was carried out over a period from 1974 to 1976 by officers of the Establishment Division and a Report was submitted in June 1975 — Report on Classifications and Grading of Posts in the Public Service.

5.30 p.m.

This report was circulated to Heads of Departments, Trade Unions and other interested organisations for comments, and discussions followed last year and earlier this year between the various organisations and the Establishments Division, and the Cabinet approved the recommendations in the report.

Any classification, Mr. Speaker, or any re-classification involves paying out more money, and as far as I can remember — I don't have the precise figure here — the re-classification by itself, pure and simple, without any revision of salaries, has entailed additional expenditure of something like \$1.6 million. If I find the correct figure I will correct it later on. That is without any revision at all. As a result of the re-classification the number of grades in the public service have been cut in half; they have been reduced from 100 grades approximately to 50 grades, and standards and criteria have been determined for the future assessment of posts, and it is hoped that in this way we will have a blueprint for meaningful assessment of any post in the public service from now on. That deals with the re-classification.

Naturally, there are a lot of people who are not satisfied with the re-classification, because quite a lot of people in the public service, notwithstanding the fact that there are organisations which represent them substantially, have individual grievances that they feel that somebody over yonder shouldn't be working for the same or more money than they are working for, and we have a lot of these people — particularly people in the higher echelons in the service — who would like re-classification to proceed on an individual basis, but what has been done in this re-classification, in the 1975 re-classification of posts which has now been embodied in the salaries revision is to look at the broad and general picture and try to reduce the number of grades in the public service to a

reasonable and manageable number. As I have said before, we managed to reduce it from 100 different grades to 50. One of the complaints which I have heard, apart from the ones which I have mentioned already, is that the teaching profession has been downgraded in the exercise.

I would like to get this matter straight, Mr. Speaker. Every single post of Head Teacher – I had this argument with the teachers' representatives, and I had to point out certain things to them, because they were saying that certain teaching posts were downgraded and that the whole teaching profession had consequentially been treated with disdain – but every post of Head Teacher in the primary schools, the newer secondary schools, the fifth form old secondary schools, have been upgraded with effect from 1st April, 1976. Similar treatment has been granted to the Deputy Heads other than those in the four sixth form schools, senior teachers, that is, non-graduates and qualified teachers, but the Government has a policy of equalisation of all secondary schools, and has taken a decision by the Cabinet that the Heads of Harrison College, the Lodge School, Combermere School and Queen's College shall eventually be accorded the same remuneration as Heads of the other secondary schools, but as long as those schools – not the people – remain sixth form schools, whether with the present holders of the office or successors, any incumbent, as long as the schools remain sixth form schools, they shall remain at the existing level above the Heads of the other secondary schools.

Now, they look at only one part of it where we said that with the gradual fading away of the sixth forms, all Head Teachers, all of whom have been upgraded will get the same salaries, and said that we had downgraded the four, what they call first grade schools, and brought them down to the level of the others. We have not done that, as long as they continue to have sixth forms they will continue to be paid the additional salary, no matter who the Head Teacher is, whether the present incumbent or future incumbent, but as soon as they all become fifth form schools then there shall be no discrimination, and that is the Government's policy. I need not say that so far as the teaching service and all the other grades in the public service are concerned that there is no discrimination between males and females doing the same job as existed in 1961, I believe, right up to about 1964 or 1965.

There was also a complaint that there was too wide a gap between the graduate and the non-graduate teacher, and that graduates are not

being encouraged to teach at primary school level. What I want to say about that argument is this, that the whole structure of pay in the teaching profession in this island has always been based on the concept of qualifications and experience. That is, a man coming straight out of a fifth or sixth form with four or five 'O' Levels does not expect and does not get the same salary as a graduate with second class honours and a Diploma in Education. There has always been some recognition of training and experience in the teaching profession more so than in any other profession. As a matter of fact, the teachers' representatives themselves have always insisted that this should be so. We have been trying, of course, for a long time to bridge the gulf between the graduate and the non-graduate in the same way that we tried to bring closer or telescope by upgrading, not downgrading, the people in the lower echelons of the public service closer to those who occupy the higher positions. I should like to make this point here at this stage, that there is no point in speaking about people in the primary schools and people in the secondary schools, because you get paid not according to where you teach, except in the case of Headmasters of course, but you get paid according to your qualifications, so it is possible to go in a primary school with a degree and get the same salary that you are getting, say, at Lodge School. You can ask for a transfer to a primary school, and we hope that with the new Teaching Service Commission we will have that kind of mobility and cross-fertilisation in the teaching profession, but right now there is a heavy imbalance probably for snob reasons or some other reason that I cannot discern from my socialistic background, but you will find that the graduates in the grammar schools – I have the figures here somewhere – out of a teaching establishment in the newer secondary schools of 750 there are only 150 graduates, and the population in those schools is twice the school population in the older secondary schools – what we call the grammar schools – and in those grammar schools with half the population there are 300 graduates.

These are circumstances which you are not going to remedy overnight. You can do it by persuasion, but certainly so far as salaries are concerned there is nothing to prevent, whether you are at Ellerslie or at St. George's Secondary or whether you are at Lodge or Harrison College you get paid by qualifications, but we have not been able to attract to the newer secondary schools the same number of graduates in relation to the school population that we have in the older schools.

5.40 p.m.

I do not know if they find life easier, or the children brighter, or what the reason is, but that is the situation with which we are confronted and which will take some time and a great deal of persuasion and, perhaps, examination in order to remedy.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, the Magistrates have been placed on a fixed salary. I think this is a very good thing. I think there have been speeches made in this House on both sides of the House urging that the Magistrates should not be on this long incremental scale. I agree with it, but I only want to say that we have preserved the principle that, in order to be permanently appointed as a Magistrate, you must have at least three years' standing as an Attorney-at-Law. I think that is right. Three years may even be a little too short, but since there is difficulty of recruiting people into the Magisterial posts, I think we are wise to restrict it to three years. We have removed the Magistrates now from this long incremental scale. I think it was a 10-year period, and we have put them on a fixed salary.

Every post in the Nursing profession has been upgraded. In so far as the Police are concerned, I mentioned earlier the minimum salaries that people entering the Police Force will get, but there are certain unresolved issues which we are still discussing with the members of the Police Force which should tend to improve, I hope, their conditions of employment. These relate to the hours of duty, allowances, and giving them compensation for excessive hours over and above whatever is the norm. Whatever the norm is worked out to be, I am not prepared to say. I am not necessarily accepting that a 40-hour week is relevant to the Police Force, but whatever the norm is, by a process of negotiating and collective bargaining, even without legislation, we will try to ameliorate the excessive number of hours that the Police now have to work, and give them some kind of compensation or duty allowance. We are also looking into the other allowances which members of the Police Force now enjoy or suffer under. I do not know which way they look at it. I do not know whether they enjoy the allowances or suffer from them, but having myself been in charge of that Portfolio at one time, I am aware of the problems of the Police Force and I am doing everything possible, with their co-operation, to bring these negotiations to a successful conclusion.

In looking at the pay of members of the Public Service, we frequently — when I say we, I

mean members of the general public and the representatives of the various categories of workers — tend to look across at the private sector and try to equate their conditions of service and their salaries particularly with what is going on in the private sector, and the attempt to parallel the two things is not always a very successful one because there are other factors which operate in the Public Service which do not operate in the private sector.

Let me mention right at the beginning the security of tenure. When a trade union manages to secure some increased remuneration for its workers in the private sector, in industry, or business, the employers react either by curtailing employment, declaring some of the workers redundant, or by increasing prices to the consumers who are their clients in business. This is how they get around it. But mainly where they cannot increase prices to increase their revenue in order to counteract the effect of the increased wages or salaries, they will do so by a planned redundancy programme. It may not take the shape or form of calling in a certain percentage of the workers and immediately giving them notices of dismissal. It may be in the form of when somebody falls ill and stays away more than what the employer considers is a reasonable time; he is laid off without any redress, unless the workers' representatives intervene, or when a job becomes vacant it is not filled. There are various other devices to which they resort, and in the last analysis they can always say, "We cannot afford to pay so many people; so we will give you severance pay", half of which comes out of public funds, and declare the worker redundant.

In the Public Service it is not so. There has been an inexorable growth in the numbers in the Public Service. I heard some discussion here today about the Government not finding employment for young people. I think it was from the member for St. Philip North. Let me give you an example of the growth of the public sector in this country. In 1961 there were 3,640 people on the established staff. Today there are 7,331. On the established staff alone the Government has provided 3,000 additional jobs. On the unestablished staff there were 840, and there are now 1,866. That is an additional 1,000 jobs in the unestablished staff. Amongst the casual employees there has been a reduction because a lot of the people who were casual employees have been promoted into members of the established staff by various Civil Establishment Orders that we have approved in here from time to time. The casual employees have gone down from 2,800 to 2,500. Amongst the temporary

staff, people, sometimes, who do not have the necessary qualifications to get into the Civil Service, are used quite a lot, and they have increased from 1,200 to 1,612.

In 1962, whereas the total amount of persons employed by the Central Government was 8,480, there are now 30,309 employed by the Central Government today, and that is an increase of approximately 5,000 additional jobs in the Government sector alone. I refer to people who are living off the public weal. In the Statutory Boards employment has gone up from 1,000 to 1,935, an increase of approximately 1,000 persons in Statutory Boards. Personal Emoluments increased from \$11 million in 1961-62 to \$82,951,000 in 1975-76.

You will see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that there has been an extraordinary growth not only in expenditure on wages and salaries during the period which I have covered, but there has been an extraordinary growth in the size of the Public Service of over 5½ thousand persons during the same period. Obviously, we cannot go on indefinitely increasing the size of the Public Service because there would not be anybody working in the private sector. The problem about the Public Service is that you do not have the authority, just because you have to pay out higher salaries, to say: "I am going to compensate for this \$25 million which I am paying out by laying off \$25 million worth of workers". A private employer can sometimes get away with this individually, but this is the Government, and the Government cannot lay off people. Every one of the persons, who is entitled to a permanent or semi-permanent job tonight, can expect on the 15th July to stretch out his hand and get his arrears of pay, and also from the end of the month, the first pay day, he can expect that he will get his increase, and that next year he will have something which is tantamount to a 50% increase over the existing level of his wages or his salary.

Now, I do not know any Government in the Caribbean, or any Government in the world, that has established such a precedent.
5.50 p.m.

It may be that certain branches of the Civil Service in Trinidad and Tobago this year for the first time have been able to secure, after marking time for a considerable period, increases which may actually surpass those which we have been able to grant, but our situation is not the same as that which exists in our sister colony to the

south. So I think that the only problem is my problem, — where is the money going to come from; but I know and I deeply feel that I could not come in here and ask the House to vote more money when I could not tell them that I was sure we had a reasonable expectation of raising this money without increasing taxes to any great extent. I have already indicated that what the Civil Service Unions were demanding would amount to doubling of income tax for everybody and an increase in the import duties of over 200%. Obviously that is untenable in Barbados. I have no intention and I want to say it categorically, although I am not quite sure where all this money is going to come from, of raising consumption taxes, of raising income tax or corporation tax. You cannot impose a corporation tax in this country of 80%; it is 40% now. The effective rate of corporation tax is really 52% when you take the trade tax into consideration; so when you go and double that just to pay the Public Service, then you are penalising and forever forfeiting any prospect of having private savings. There are no public savings as it is, and then you are immediately wiping out all prospects of savings from the private sector without which the economy cannot grow and the country cannot develop.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I shall be introducing later on today Orders in respect of old age pensions, to increase old age pensioners this year by \$3.00 and next year by another \$3.00 bringing them up to \$16 a week. With the Government pensioners that is going to cost the country another \$5.3 million. In so far as the Government pensioners are concerned, it was my practice to give an across the board increase. As a matter of fact, I think that the increases I have granted to Government pensioners have amounted to over \$125 a month over a period of time, so that one old gentleman who was getting \$8.00 a week from the Barbados Government Railway is now getting \$133 a month as a result of our increases. These have been across the board, but this year there is a slight variation. As from 1st April, 1976, I proposed that we should pay the Government pensioners \$30 a month where their total pension and allowances are below \$200 a month on 31st March, and those above \$200 a month shall be paid at the rate of \$40 a month. There are 2,747 Government pensioners receiving less than \$200 a month and 708 who receive more than \$200. The reason for that differential is that the people who are receiving more than \$200 we have calculated will actually have a slight net loss in percentage with the people below \$200 a month, and that is

why we have a differential. If you paid them the same \$30 a month they would probably come out in a minus position.

The cost of the measures which I have mentioned here, the increase to public officers which includes school teachers and policemen, will amount to \$20.5 million in wages and salaries; the allowances to Government pensioners will cost \$1.3 million more. On the reclassification of posts I said earlier I would give the precise figure. I said it was \$1.5 million or \$1.6 million; it is \$1.5 million and the increases to old age pensioners will amount to \$2.5 million making a total bill for this year of \$25.8 million in addition to the \$20 million deficit which the House approved in March of this year in respect of the revenue and expenditure for 1976-77 as part and parcel of this settlement. I cannot glorify it by the name of agreement because I am **not** pretending that there is any agreement between me and any of the organisations representing the public workers. But I will tell you something now, that a lot of people did not know, Mr. Speaker. There is agreement between me and the bulk of the taxpayers in Barbados which includes myself and my colleagues and I am sure some of the members of the Opposition who pay taxes. There is complete agreement between us, the rest of the people in Barbados, that the country is going through a hard time and that we are being very generous.

I am the target, so I will be abused, and they will parade and march and counter-march, but I only should like to say it is rather remarkable that the person who introduced in the laws of Barbados peaceful picketing saw the first violation of that Act here today in Barbados, because the Act provides for peaceful picketing at or near a place where the employer resides or works, but it does not say anything about in or on the premises of the employer, and we had picketing today inside the premises of the employer, and I am the person who brought that legislation to Barbados and introduced it on the Statute Book in the face of opposition from the Barbados Labour Party, not those present sitting members with the possible exception of one; but the people who were then occupying the Opposition benches with the Conservative Party voted against peaceful picketing. I never thought I would see the day when a Labour Party would vote against peaceful picketing, but I introduced it, and I am the first person that it was used

against that I can remember. That is the price you pay for democracy, but unfortunately it was used illegally, but as far as I am concerned I have a duty to discharge to the taxpayers of this country whether they voted for the Government or whether they did not vote for the Government.

I think it was Mr. Gladstone who said "the people is a great beast". People react in very funny ways. When the Minister of Trade reduces consumer prices, they say the Minister of Trade should not reduce consumer prices, and though they complain about the cost of living, they say he is causing a lot of small shopkeepers to suffer. When we introduced a standardised bus fare they do not talk about the seven million people who travel during the space of twelve months in the buses, many of them public officers, workers in every single sector of the economy of this Island; they ask what about the sixty pick-up owners, and say, good dear, you are putting them out of business. They are nothing to do with the seven million passengers.

Now as far as I know the people on the other side are in favour. I do not think they voted against the standardised bus fares. That is another \$5 million we have to find, but we did that for the whole community, all the people who do not possess motor cars, so that is the greatest good for the greatest number. But you do not hear the Government being praised for that; you hear them say it is an election gimmick. If I had granted the 100% increase to the public officers in the National Union of Public Workers, that would be an election gimmick and that would be entirely irresponsible on my part knowing the state of the economy of Barbados, knowing our chances of recovery, knowing the state of what our reserves happen to be from time to time to have conceded purely because it was election year that we could give in to such inordinate demands which we the rest of taxpayers, the other 235,000 in the community would have to be footing the bill. So I look at my larger responsibility. I do not mind the picketing. I have a duty to discharge to this country as Minister of Finance. So far I have discharged it successfully. This is the first year in 15 years since I have been Minister of Finance that we have been faced with such a tremendous and horrendous deficit on current account. It has been aggravated and made worse by the recalcitrance and the lack of realism on the part of representatives.

Now I want to say this without any fear of contradiction. One always has to distinguish

between the workers and the people who claim to be leading them, because as far as I know there has been no referendum in the public service saying that the Minister of Finance is wrong. Nobody has said that the country can afford to face what we are paying them now, but because you have people who are political aspirants contending against one another to show that they are more aggressive, they make these demands in the name of the people and a lot of sins are committed in the names of the people in this country.

6.00 p.m.

Let us bear this in mind; but as far as I am concerned, the families of the public workers are looking forward to their back pay. I am not saying if you give them 2 per cent they would have been happy, but I am saying that if they got anything above 20 or 25 per cent, far more 35 per cent, they would not tell us to leave the money in the Treasury. Even the ones who are clamouring so hard now and who write letters saying that we should vote against these Civil Establishment Orders, if we vote against them they would be the first people to tell your constituents to try to get you out of the House of Assembly because when at the end of July they go for their salaries they do not find the increase there, however small it is. Then you will know where the shoe is pinching and whether what the Government has brought down to the House is just or not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would relieve you now and try to make my address as short as possible. I just want to say in conclusion what I said earlier. I want to repeat that I hope when members get up to discuss they they will not bear me any grudge because I say not before the 1st April, 1978. This is 1976, and next year is 1977. In 1978 there will be another review if the country can afford it. I am not promising anything. Parliamentarians may get increases. Ministers may get increase. I am sorry for those people who will be put out and those who will be retiring voluntarily. It will be back dated for those who may be eliminated, only for those who may be eliminated. I am not usually on the committee but I will tell my members on the committee that I will give it my support since they have been holding strain, and they have served the country faithfully or unfaithfully for some period of time, they will be entitled to some kind of consideration. I will not be claiming such consideration. I will not be in a position to claim any such consideration.

What I am saying is that it is time that we became patriotic about our country. It is time

that we become nationalistic about our country. When the country is doing well, we expect to prosper with the country, and when the country, with the world situation as it is, and when our neighbours are doing badly and we are not doing so well, we should be realistic and cut our coat to suit the cloth. If the cloth is not sufficient, the jacket may look a bit skimpy but as long as it reasonably covers all of the exposed parts of your body then we should be able to go along with it.

I beg to move that this Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment Order do now pass.

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

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would give way I think that I said Order No. 12. I think that the Order I am dealing with is Order No. 13. I just want to get the record straight. It is the Civil Establishment Order No. 2 which I am dealing with. No. 12 is Order No. 2 on the Order Paper.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is Order No. 13.

Mr. SPEAKER: Then it is Order No. 13 as amended.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No. 12 is Civil Establishment Order No. 2 with which I was not dealing. Order No. 12 was called, but the one I dealt with was Order No. 13 which is Civil Establishment Order with no (2). It is Order No. 13 on the Order Paper.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister as he reached the end of a long and tedious speech said that he had spoken for a short time. I intend to be a little more realistic, and when I say that I will speak for a short time it will be for a genuinely short time on this Bill. These issues are really very simple. We do not have to go back to 1951 for the history of salary increases in Barbados.

The Commissioners who gave the increases in 1951 and 1955 and the other years when the modern form of the Civil Service was being worked out, when the Civil Establishment Bill itself was being passed and when the consequential Civil Establishment Orders were being made and when the Ministerial system was being laid down is not really relevant to this

debate. They are not on trial. What is on trial is the Civil Establishment Order without the (No. 2) for the year 1976, and what is on trial also is the Government's policy with regard to the increases in salary for workers in the public sector. What is on trial is that Government have sometimes taken a number of tentative and drastic steps towards announcing a prices and income policy, particularly the incomes side of it; and I recall that when these words became fashionable, it failed in most countries in which they were introduced, and they would surely fail in Barbados if they were not introduced on a realistic basis and particularly they would fail if they sought to control incomes — even then they were talking about the public sector — without any simultaneous attempt to control prices; and that is exactly what we have in this Civil Establishment Order.

The Government is introducing an income policy for Civil Servants repudiating the idea that you must relate public servants salaries and other salaries generally to the cost of living without at the same time looking at the increases that have been given in private industry and other semi-public sectors and without looking at the condition of prices in Barbados today.

Face with these difficulties, the Minister of Finance must not be surprised if he is faced with a massive objection to this Civil Establishment Order and the new scale of salaries it represents to the persons who will be the recipients of these salaries; and we were told that there never used to be a demonstration against the expatriate Salaries Commissioners. The answer was that rightly or wrongly, colonial minded or not, steeped in the pass or not, public servants trusted the expatriates Salaries Commissioners. Today I do not believe that the Public Servants trust the Minister of Finance.

He went on to say that people came into his office truculent, rude and in a state of inebriation when they never did this with Salary Commissioners. The answer is that he has failed to inspire in the representatives of the workers that respect which would make them a little more humble; because I think he was demanding humility. He wants them to be humble, but they feel that humility, respect and trust and so on are no longer owing to the Minister of Finance.

I am suggesting that for this he has only himself to blame. He has carried on a war against the "army of occupation" for a long time, and he has said so many indecent things about so many public servants, he cannot expect now anything

than truculence and rudeness. If he is rude to them, they must be rude to him.

I am reminded that one of the negotiators went out of his way to let me see the notes of the negotiations relating to only a short while ago, I believe the last of the 18 meetings in which they asked the Prime Minister if he would impose a solution — that was on 6th May — and he said no. He said that he was devoted to the principle of collective bargaining. I believe that the notes have been mistranscribed into "collective" bargaining. You can go back and look and see that that was not the last meeting before he told them that he had an Order and he would carry it to the House of Assembly. He was not interested in any more talking about the matter.

He cannot complain if he gets truculence from people whom he treats in that way. I think that the last collective bargaining was in 1973 when they were given 40 per cent at the bottom of the scale and 20 per cent at the top. The Prime Minister has quoted figures to show that Civil Servants' Salaries had more than kept pace with the increase in the cost of living ever since 1961. We did not hear any figures about the increase in the cost of living after 1961. I think that we were promised them but they got lost in the argument.

6.10 p.m.

Even if it is true that they have had more increases — and except for the Police Force it appears to me that it may well be true — even if that is so it does not mean that you can tell a man, because you had an increase in your standard of living, because the former increases were more than you needed to keep pace with the cost of living, you now have to back trap. That in effect is what has been said.

Now I think the cost of living since this Government came into power — it is hard to estimate since there was a break in 1965 in the methods of estimation; but the cost of living rose about 320% since the Democratic Labour Party was in power. That compares with an increase during the Barbados Labour Party's regime — and you must not laugh, Mr. Speaker, it is all here in the Economic Reports — that compares with an increase of 11.9% from 1953 when the figures began to be kept, until 1961. Eleven percent is what it went up in those eight years.

Now even if you double it and say, suppose it would have gone up 22%, the Democratic Labour Party has managed to increase it. (*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I have been hearing a voice on the Government benches. I do not want anyone to tell me. I will deal with any person. When the Prime Minister was speaking, no one spoke. I want to hear the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, that voice you hear on the Government bench is the voice of a smiling and happy man. He is smiling and happy because the Prime Minister is being given some blows in here. That intervention is not an intervention designed to hamper my speech. That intervention is an intervention to give more strength to my arm; but I agree with you that it is an improper intervention none the less.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to interrupt. No fighting will take place in here. You said 'blows'.

Mr. ADAMS: I am speaking figuratively, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh! Continue.

Mr. ADAMS: But it is an improper intervention. I agree with you, Sir, but I cannot promise on that account, not to continue to attack the policies and speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. I cannot promise just to keep the hon. gentleman in his chair. I cannot promise to leave the Prime Minister alone. He will have to have some attacks and the hon. member will continue to smile all through the attack.

Sir, the cost of living may only have gone up in the Labour Party's days eleven percent; it may have gone up between 1961 and 1966 only another, perhaps, 20%. Even between 1966 and 1971 it probably did not go up more than another 20% or 25%. I am not sure of all figures, Sir. We just know that there has been a phenomenal rise recently, but the Prime Minister's analysis has altogether overlooked what has been happening in Barbados between the years 1953 and 1973; (*Aside*) 1971 in fact is a much better year. All during those years, no matter which Government was in power, the standard of living of this country was improving. All during those years the productive base of Barbados was being widened. The wise and enlightened Hotel Aids Act of 1951 made it possible for us to build a tourist industry, the construction of an airport and a harbour in 1961 immediately before we went out of power, made it possible for the tourists to come in large numbers.

In recent years destructive and mischievous statements, unwise and short-sighted policies have led us to a reduction in the agricultural output of this country, but even in agriculture, between 1948 and 1957 or 1958 — I think, it will be found that the agricultural output of this country more than doubled, under the Barbados Labour Party's regime. All these things have made Barbados during that eighteen to twenty-year period a more prosperous place. I do not believe there is anybody on the other side who can again say the increases in prosperity between 1950 and 1960, least of all the hon. member for St. Michael West who perhaps will acclaim he was an architect in some of them. I do not believe that anybody on that side should claim there was no increase in prosperity between 1960 and 1970, and everybody in Barbados was better off by a factor that took no particular account of the rise in the cost of living. In other words, civil servants could legitimately demand salaries in excess of the rise in the cost of living index because they would only be demanding a fair share in the increased prosperity of Barbados.

We do not wish to view the cost of living index as the only measure by which the salaries of the public sector of this Island or any other sector should be gauged. If you can afford to give your public servants more than the rise in the cost of living index — in other words, give them an increased standard of living, it is your duty so to do, and you have no business to come to the House of Assembly to reprobate your actions in so doing at the appropriate time.

When the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister comes in to say that the civil servants got more than their share, it is a disgraceful and misguided argument showing no understanding of why people get increased wages and showing no appreciation of what the public service has done towards increasing the prosperity of Barbados.

To simplify my argument, Sir. If the cost of living is stationary civil servants would still deserve an increase. If in some strange way the cost of living had not gone up at all since the last increase in 1972, but production had improved, the number of tourists had increased and so on, the civil servants should get an increase to give them a share in the greater prosperity of Barbados.

6.20 p.m.

In 1962 the Prime Minister came to the House and said he would not have granted the civil servants an increase, the increase which the Barbados Labour Party promised them in 1961,

and he spoke then of giving them increases which were related to the cost of living. If you read the Daily News of the 26th May, 1962 you will find a full account of it. I haven't been able to trace it in the debate, there was a lot of attack then on an increase in the civil servants' salaries, and he was wrong then. It is true that the cost of living had in fact fallen in the last half-year of the rule of the Barbados Labour Party; 1961 was a year of falling prices and I believe you will find that the end of the year index perhaps was less than that at the beginning of the year. Certainly it was less than that at the middle of the year, and this was despite the completion of the harbour and the airport, and despite the productive works that were going on at the hospital and the housing areas, so Barbados happened to have had a very prosperous year in 1961. It was a year of political discontent coupled with great economic prosperity, one of these paradoxes that happens, and of course is clearly attributable to the fact that the Barbados Labour Party had been in power too long then and it didn't matter what they did, how good they were, the people had in mind to put them out as being there a little too long.

But the Prime Minister did not understand either the economic rationale of an increase to the public servants or the just claims of the public servants in 1972, because he could say they should not have got the increase then because the cost of living hadn't risen, and now he has returned to it and all that he has shown is that after fifteen years as Minister of Finance there are still large, vital, important areas of public finance and economic activity with which his familiarity is less than competent.

Now, the cost of living, I believe, was represented to the negotiators for the public servants of all varieties as having gone up 88%, and so they asked for a hundred percent as a negotiating point. They are offered a 35% increase. The first thing we have to understand is that *ipso facto* and *a fortiori* if I may adopt the phrases which the Prime Minister is adopting from the speech of the hon. member for St. Philip North, the standard of living of civil servants has had to go down. Civil servants are less able to maintain the standards of life to which they aspired three years ago than they are now. They have to pay more for food, it is clearly more difficult to buy a motor car. I venture to suggest that very few people newly appointed to the position of Assistant Secretary can feel comfortable with mortgage interest rates being what they are, can feel comfortable in aspiring to a house. I am sure that Senior Clerks

can't think about motor cars, I am sure that Clerical Officers newly appointed who four or five years ago could save up their money and think to take a holiday abroad can no longer think in terms of so doing. They are unable to reach those levels of economic activity and existence which they were able to reach some time ago.

It is an undisputed fact that the standard of living of civil servants has declined, and the measure of decline is the measure between the cost of living index and the increase which the Prime Minister has offered, and even that takes no account of the fact that they have been in decline already for two years. In 1973 the cost of living went up by 16% or 26%, depending on how you look at the figures; in 1974 it went up 36% or 38%, depending on how you look at the figures; in 1975 it went up 12% or 15%, depending on how you look at the figures. The Prime Minister in 1973 fiddled with figures to reduce the apparent rise in the cost of living. There was a great debate, two economists at the university said that the better method was the method he uses, well I hope he is satisfied now that the method he uses gives a greater increase in the cost of living in the last two years than the method which was previously used. The new method, which he said was so much better than the old, now shows that the cost of living is going up more, just as I said it would show. He might be regretting that he didn't stick to the old principle, but that comes from taking *ad hoc* decisions, instead of making himself look ridiculous following a new principle which makes the increase in the cost of living look even more inflated. But that is only by the way, the difference is not so great.

Looking at it one way the cost of living has gone up since this Government was in power to the end of this financial year, that is, to March. Looking at it one way I believe it has gone up 120%, looking at it another way it may have gone up 116%, looking at it generously the cost of living has doubled since 1971. The Prime Minister of course has always blamed this on outside sources, he always says even with less force sometimes than some of the more economically ignorant in the ranks of the Government — and I don't refer necessarily to persons in here — he has said that you import inflation and you can't help yourself, yet nonetheless he was forced today to concede in the terms of a previous confidential World Bank Report that there are certain countries which are being bamboozled into inflationary increases. What an admission, that the World Bank had to

come to Barbados to tell the Prime Minister that certain countries are being bamboozled into inflationary increases because they are not taking the correct measures to control the inflationary situation or their balances of payments. They are the Prime Minister's words. We have said over and over again it is mismanagement and not importation that is carrying the cost of living up, and a World Bank survey team comes down here and tells the Prime Minister that confidentially, and we have to wait for it to slip out on a debate on the civil servants' salaries.

I am just going to draw one example to show the truth of what he said. He spoke of India, how Barbados has a higher per capita income than India which has \$50 U.S. He didn't tell you that a pound of beef in India costs 62 cents, or a whole chicken can be bought for less than \$1.00 in India, he did not tell you that the cost of living went down in India last year by 8%, that for all this nonsense about imported inflation and it is a worldwide trend Mrs. Gandhi got the cost of living down 6% by controlling profiteering in rice, controlling profiteering that was causing some of the very riots and unrest which led to political disturbances in India. He didn't tell you when he was comparing Barbados favourably with India, that at least one thing they have done in India is to reduce the cost of living for 614,000,000 people, not 250,000 like in Barbados where you can subsidise, for 614,000,000 people, the second largest group of people on earth the cost of living was reduced last year, for more people than live in the entire western hemisphere, the entire of Western Europe the cost of living was reduced, and he is going to seek to compare Barbados favourably with that great country.

Any how, Sir, when you think you are speaking to the ignorant you will talk ignorance. Fortunately we still have an Opposition — one will talk ignorance, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not speaking at all, I am listening to you carefully.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir, thank you. It is not me that replaced you, Sir, so you must not think that I am reflecting on you in any way. If you are a little sensitive on the subject you must not think that it comes from me Sir. I live in your constituency, Sir, and as far as I am concerned you are a better member than the aspirant who is replacing you.
6.30 p.m.

I live in your constituency, Sir. As far as I am concerned, you are a better member than the aspirant who is replacing you. It is not me accusing you of ignorance. Those who think you are too ignorant to run for the House are not on our side, after 10 years of true and faithful service to the people. A young man in the prime of life, with experience all over the Caribbean and a lover of the people; no record for gouging...

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the Order.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir. We are talking about the cost of living. If I can emphasise this again, do not let us drag all of these red herrings about India, Trinidad and Tobago — I will have to deal with the Minister of Finance in Trinidad and Tobago in a minute, too. The essential thing is that the civil servants are being asked to take a reduction in their standard of living. Now, what is the justification for asking people to tighten their belts. You ask people to tighten their belts at times when the Government need to make exceptional expenditure; at times when a country faces serious economic crisis, and tightening the belt is the answer for it. You ask people to tighten their belts in times of war to make certain sacrifices, but there are certain principles in belt-tightening which I believe that in a country that aspires to liberalism, far less Socialism, should at all times apply. There can be no principle of unequal sacrifice as far as I am concerned in Barbados.

I am charging the Prime Minister with asking Public Servants of this Island to make a sacrifice unequal in scope to the sacrifice which is being demanded of other employees and other classes of the community. This is the basic charge. When the island has become more prosperous the civil servants have shared in that increase prosperity. I will concede that when the Island stands still; when the Central Bank is forced to report that industrial activity shows no more contribution to Barbados after 15 years of D.L.P. rule than it did in the last years of the B.L.P., I am forced to concede that where your economic programmes have failed, and the gross domestic product of this Island has diminished by 1%, 2%, 3%, 4%, or even by 10%, that people must all expect to make some sacrifice and have some diminution which correspond to the position, or the overall position, of the economy.

For some years now we have not had a proper estimation of what the gross domestic product of Barbados is. We have not had an

Economic Survey since 1972, and we did not even have a properly printed one then. Even to get hold of one, I had to ask the Clerk of the House of Assembly to lend me the House of Assembly's copy of the Economic Survey of 1972. The Central Bank's Reports do not estimate the gross domestic product of this Island. I believe there is a good reason for it. A good reason, that is, measured by the standards of obscurantism and the standards of concealment which this Government has sought to set for some time. The reason for not publishing the gross domestic product figures in Barbados and exposing them to the public view is that the gross domestic product of Barbados is declining. It is going down, and we are going nowhere.

Since 1971 the economy has stood still. A few people have done well, but by and large the economy has stood still since 1971. I cannot give you the figures. Maybe, the Prime Minister has them, but I am prepared to concede that over the period concerned, perhaps, Barbados as a whole is 10% worse off. I am prepared to concede that. I do not think it should be more, but if it is more it would be tragic. I would like to think it is not more; therefore, everybody in Barbados can expect to make a sacrifice of the order of 10%. Some people may have to make a little more.

Now, members of Parliament are properly asked not to have salary increases. The Government and its Ministers are properly asked to hold strain. The salaries were too high when they were raised, and I think they are far too high for the job they are doing. As far as I am concerned, if they were paid by results, the Prime Minister would be paying money into the Treasury every month instead of receiving. If he were paid by piece work, he would be bankrupt now. He would be borrowing from the bank every month to pay the Government. We may be asked to make an unequal sacrifice, because ultimately it is in our hands to choose what sacrifice we are going to make.

I would just like to say that the Prime Minister seems to think that time will march on without the intervention of such petty irrelevancy as General Elections. If he intends to be in power in 1978, and he says so definitely and without any doubt that he will be the Minister of Finance in 1978, I will tell him two things: First of all, he had better understand it is too late for him to rejoin the Barbados Labour Party, and, if he did, we will not make him Minister of Finance. Secondly, if what he means is that there will be no General Election, he must say so. Nothing in the speech of any hon. member on this side

should be taken to mean, or understood to mean, or considered to mean, that we are in any way conceding, accepting, thinking, or fearing that 15 years will be extended to 17 or 18, and that Barbados will have the misfortune of having the hon. member for St. John as Minister of Finance at this period which he speaks of in 1978. However, without this braggadocio and pomposity, without boasting, bragging, or anticipating, we would just like to say that we have never heard this famous pledge about the 1st April, 1978. We are not going to compete with pledges by saying that we are going to make it the 1st April, 1979, but we will just say that, if elected to power, we have no intention of taking any decision in 1977, 1978, or 1979, to increase the salaries of members of the House.

Our Manifesto will contain statements which will show that we have given thought to the problem of reducing the generosity of members for themselves in the matter of pension schemes; reducing the profligacy with which Ministries and the concomitant high salaries have been shared out; accepting the argument of the hon member for St. Michael North East, and reducing, if not abolishing, the post of Parliamentary Secretary. All of this will be found in due course. You will have to wait for the details. And certainly no Minister of Finance will be granting any increased salary at any time to any Minister. Ponder upon that and wait for the Manifesto itself.

You must understand that no Barbados Labour Party Minister of Finance will be granting any increase in Ministerial or other salaries. Ponder the words carefully, Mr. Speaker. I do not have to say that they will get them in 1978, or they will not get them in 1978. I do not even have to say that they will never get them. I stand by the statement which has been made and except, in the purely technical sense, any government coming from this side, after a General Election or otherwise, will be standing on that principle. We are going to do away altogether with members sitting down and saying, "I want this," and finding themselves getting it. Now, that relates to this little group of Public Servants.

Back to the army of occupation. I do not know how the Prime Minister managed to get through his whole speech without referring to them as such. I, honestly, do not know at what stage the peace treaty was signed, or at what stage he declared peace, but I think that they will just be as conscious of the words truculent, rude, and in a stage of inebriation, as they were of the words army of occupation.

6.40 p.m.

Getting back to the Civil Servants: granted that they may have to be asked to make some sacrifice, granted that a Permanent Secretary cannot think that because he got \$1,500 a month when the cost of living index stood at 114 that now it stands at 314 he must get \$3,000 or \$3,200 a month — I cannot remember the precise figures, and of course an increase in points is not necessarily a percentage increase, — on the other hand you will find that those figures are as near accurate as is relevant. We are not suggesting and we would not suggest on this side that this should be the principle, yet we believe that the sacrifice which the Public Servants are being asked to make is too great and the way in which they have been asked to make it is also too great.

I am going to take up another of the issues the Prime Minister handled, the transport workers' salaries. Don't fool yourself, don't be condused or mollified by the words "I am not saying that a bus driver is getting too much money when he gets \$110 a week; I am not saying that they are paying the conductors too much; I am not saying that the inspectors are getting too much." That is what he is saying. When a man says I am not saying but.... he is telling you that the Barbados Workers' Union succeeded in getting salaries that were too high for transport workers. He is paying tribute to the hon. member for St. Michael West. (Mr. WALCOTT: All of you said so.) I have not said so, but his attitude is correct, because that is the principle of collective bargaining. He went in there to get the most for his workers and he got it. He got the most he could and the taxpayers ultimately will have to foot it. The rest of Barbados, the Prime Minister's constituency, as he puts it, ultimately will have to foot the same bill for the transport workers, especially now that bus fares have been reduced to 25 cents. You gave them an increase which the Prime Minister has apologised for in the House and reduced the bus fares to 25 cents and introduced a subsidy of \$5 million and complain that people take action which would lead to increased taxation.

Here I want to add my parenthesis about the four Ministers of Finance in Trinidad and Tobago. The Prime Minister says this country has four Ministers of Finance. I am surprised I did not hear him say that in India they have 100. It is better to have four persons carrying portfolios with responsibility for different parts of the general economic development and financial responsibility of the categories of Government than to have one Minister of Finance and two or three idiots making statements about finance. Now I could not possibly be referring to Senator

Taitt; you would understand that. There is no way that I could be calling Senator Taitt an idiot.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would hope you are just saying that the Prime Minister said certain things. The way you are putting it you are thinking about Senator Taitt.

Mr. ADAMS: What I am saying is this: we are talking about Ministers of Finance. This is totally relevant to what we are talking because no question of increase of taxes to pay for salary increases was canvassed at inordinate illogical and indeed ignorant length in today's debate. I will deal with that, but Senator Taitt could make a speech in the Senate saying that there will be no new taxes to pay for the 25 cents bus fares. It is better to have more than one Minister of Finance, all carrying the ministerial responsibility so that if they talked nonsense the Prime Minister can tell them they are talking nonsense, than to have a man who is irresponsible in the strict sense, a man with no responsibility for imposing taxes getting up and saying whether taxes will or will not be imposed. The last person other than the Prime Minister whom I heard talking about imposition of taxes was Mr. Warrick Franklyn on television and he got and said how you will have to tax houses, and that was what the other column was for, and the Prime Minister and I had a bitter clash in here. He asked me if I had the television tape when he was trying to defend Mr. Franklyn, and we all see what happened to Mr. Franklyn. He got above himself, too big for his boots, and we all saw exactly what happened to him in the fulness of time. These irresponsible statements about taxation by persons who do not have charge of the Ministry and even in certain cases by persons who have some temporary occupation and custody of that particular ministerial chair do no credit to the Government of Barbados as a whole. We could hear how the Treasury has in money and they can pay all the civil servants. You now hear the Prime Minister say that if you paid the civil servants what they want you will have to double the income tax and multiply the customs revenue by four; but we will get on to that again in the fulness of time. It is better to have more than one Minister of Finance if more than one person is going to speak on financial subjects. That would be my answer. Nonetheless I believe that the Barbados Labour Party, if elected to power, will be able to conduct its affairs on a basis that people will understand the Ministries which they have hold of and keep the hands of other people without that sort of capacity or understanding out of these self-same ministries.

In Israel the Israeli Cabinet Ministers get \$US400 a month. You see you can tell us about

the sacrifices they must make in Israel. They have to spend one-third of their income on defending themselves, so the Cabinet Ministers have perhaps to make these sacrifices. Everybody is making those sacrifices, but I am not aware that in Israel anybody is called upon to make an unequal sacrifice, and I am coming now to the principle of unequal sacrifice and the prices and incomes policy to which I referred earlier. The basis of a price and incomes policy which is a form of words were dreamt up, I believe, as far as the English language is concerned in the British Economic Affairs Ministry a few years ago when serious attempts were being made to control inflation on the basis of not giving people salary increases. Promises were made that prices would be kept down if people would accept limitations on their income, and that is how a price and incomes policy came about, and the prices and incomes policy in Britain floundered because first of all there was inadequate limitation on dividends and inadequate limitations on the incomes of entrepreneurs and capitalists. It was never accepted by the workers that the well-off were having to make the same sacrifices which workers were being invited to concede.

Secondly it proved beyond the capacity of Government of either party in Britain to control prices. Thirdly the principle of unequal sacrifice and the erosion of differentials eventually destroyed the basis upon which the Trade Union Congress as a whole was being asked to carry on collective bargaining. People always wish to see the same percentage differential between their job and other jobs. In other words, the man who was a clerical officer — to bring it down to Barbados' terms — getting the same as a bus driver expects that if the bus driver's salary went up 80% his should go up 80%, because he could not see that the bus driver's responsibility had increased to any greater degree than his; so you cannot just dismiss the principle of differentials by saying it is a matter for the Transport Board if it pays the bus drivers more, or it is a matter for the Transport Board if a bus driver gets as much as a policeman. A lot of people prefer to be policemen than bus drivers. There are certain jobs that nobody would do at any price and so on.

I was discussing with the hon. member for Bridgetown, and let there be no doubt about it, that if scavengers were paid \$10,000 a month I can think of 22 or 23 perhaps of this House who would try to go and work at least half day as scavengers, and the 24th or 23rd if they did not go might be persons whose doctors advised them against it, whose doctors said that you might work a week but you might not live to enjoy many more even if you had a signed resignation

in your pocket. So that argument again cuts no ice with me. All of a sudden from nowhere it is discovered that being a policeman is an attractive profession, therefore you do not need to pay them so much money. That is what the Prime Minister's argument amounts to, that being a policeman is a respectable, honourable and attractive profession and people like the uniform; so you do not have to pay them so much. What are the figures he gave for policemen — that policemen used to get \$100 a month in 1961 and they get \$331 a month now. In other words, the police salaries have just about kept pace with the increase in the cost of living. If you say the cost of living is 320% up since 1961 and they are getting \$311, they are just about keeping pace.
6.50 p.m.

The Prime Minister has in fact said that policemen, because of the prestige and the uniform, have to take less money. All of these arguments must be understood. They must be thought through. They must not be related to the imagined prestige of the office of Prime Minister and then left to go for nothing. They must be rammed home into the minds of all those concerned.

I did not even hear him say what I believe the Minister of Transport feels, and the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union that you may have to pay bus drivers more because they will soon have increased responsibility for collecting fares. I did not hear that, but I feel somewhere inside of me that this is part of the reason that they say that they are going to get more money if they are going to take up fares too, that they will have to get a big increase, and that will take care of that.

That is what I would warn the bus drivers of if they feel that they will get another big increase when the Transport Board brings in new buses. It will not be the turnstile. It will be one with these coin buckets. You just drop in the coin. It is not the turnstile that goes around and checks the money as it goes in. The money goes into the buckets where the driver does not have to keep it in his pockets. When they begin to use the coin buckets that will be the answer given to the bus drivers in the fullness of time.

The Barbados Workers' Union, seeking to advertise the power of its collective bargaining, the authority of its General Secretary, the initiative of its Assistant General Secretary and the weight that it still carries in this community, has recently been putting on the second page of the *Advocate News* about negotiation for an 80 per cent increase in negotiations with Clarke &

Tucker and negotiations for a 72 per cent increase are now being undertaken with the Barbados Rum Refinery and so on, whoever it is.

All of these things go into the newspaper. I cannot remember all of them from memory; but the General Secretary and the Assistant General Secretary are aware of the laurels that they gain in negotiations with private industry. I am not quarreling. It is their work, but according to the figures, the cost of living has gone up nearly 100 per cent, again depending on how you look at the figures. Some would say that it has gone up by 105 per cent since the last salary increases for public servants; but give us an 80 per cent increase because the Government allow electricity rates to go up to all heights so that when the last price increase was asked for, the Light & Power Company was able to pay this 80 per cent increase.

How can you expect the public servants to feel happy when they see employees in the private sector having the cost of living index recognised in collective bargaining negotiations that are carried out to their conclusions? How can public servants feel happy when they are offered 35 per cent? How can they be happy when they see the Barbados Workers' Union succeed in negotiating for private employees an increase of double or more than double what the Barbados Workers' Union ask for these same public employees?

Small wonder that they say that the BWU has compromised because of its close association with the Government in carrying out these wage negotiations. I have been told so. This is not "Tom Say" but it is Tom repeating. Small wonder that it is said that the Union feels a total responsibility to its members in negotiations with private employers, but a certain persuasiveness seems to have eroded and diluted some of its militance when it comes to negotiations with the public sector.

I believe that the hon. member for St. Michael West would be right in tearing down this House which if I accused him of any less than militancy in dealing with the Port Department or dealing with the Telephone Company. I believe that he would be furious if I suggested that he used to keep one ear open to the employers in private negotiations and the other ear open to the workers. He would tell us that he is on this side and the employers are on that side; but can he say that he is deaf on the employers side when the employer is the Prime Minister?

7 p.m.

All of these matters which I hope and expect will be dealt with by the hon. member for St. Michael West, and deal with them dispassionately; do not deal with them as a party matter because it is not this party alone that is saying so, or even this party as a party that is saying so. Deal with them on behalf of people in your own party, the Democratic Labour Party. Deal with them on account and to the account of members of both sides of the House and supporters on both camps in the country. That is how the accusations against the Barbados Workers' Union must be answered.

Now there are not similar accusations against the National Union of Public Workers and the Barbados Union of Teachers. I too like other hon. members of the House have been addressed and, I may say, I turned a sympathetic ear to the mimeograph plea which has been circulated on behalf of one of the teachers' unions, not to support the Government on this particular motion, and by the end of my speech hon. members will be left in no doubt as to what answer we are giving the militant union, but I should just like to go on record as saying that I have received no plea of any sort from the Barbados Workers' Union for support for the public workers' cause or any other workers cause, and I have not been invited by the Barbados Workers' Union to take any or any particular stance on this matter. I just say that in parenthesis. Some of the other unions have asked hon. members including myself to take certain stances. The Barbados Workers' Union has not so far put forward any particular case for its members in this aspect as far as this debate is concerned. I am not suggesting that it should. I am not suggesting that the Barbados Workers' Union needs my help. Not for one moment. It does not need my help any more than it needs or wishes the help, for example, of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central or the hon. member for St. Michael North West, but I am just stating as a fact because I am reporting to the House what communications I have received and by which I may have been influenced in coming to the decisions which would govern my exercise of the vote when this matter is put to a division, if it reaches that far.

Now the principle, Sir, of collective bargaining. As to that, I am going to come to that now, but I hope that I have made it quite clear what is involved in the principle of not asking for unequal sacrifice. If hon. members are left in any doubt let me summarize it. You cannot ask public servants to carry a bigger share of the decline in the economic prosperity of

Barbados than you ask other classes of the community. That is the sum of it. You cannot ask public servants to accept smaller increases in their salaries than you ask workers in the private sector or other workers in the semi-public sectors. You must not do it.

If there is a case for an income policy here is a case — that you must have an income policy which has an over-all limit beyond which, if it is necessary for anybody to tighten the belt, beyond which nobody must go. I am just drawing some examples, Sir. President Nixon, a man much maligned and of course a crook, a wicked man, a purgerer, a liar, all sorts of other things now being said about him, he is now even being accused of being a great lover, writing twenty two letters to somebody's wife, and so on. When you give a man a bad name nothing he ever said or did was good; but Nixon succeeded in an income policy for a period, I believe, of eighteen months, to the extent that Nixon was able to make doctors and lawyers give back people some of the fees that they had been charging because they exceeded the six percent guideline. He said prices must not go up more than six percent, salaries and income will not go up more than six percent for a certain fixed period. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, you will know at arms length, I am sure, at least one doctor who will be bitterly opposed to any such action by a person such as President Nixon. The concept of gouging (*Asides*) you may even know lawyers, Sir. I see two lawyers on the other side indicating that you will know lawyers. Well, they must surely know their acquaintances, Sir. I am absolutely certain I am not referring to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. His name is up but whether he was practising or not I do not think he would as yet be in a position to be returning fees. You have to get fees first. That again is only in parenthesis, Sir.

President Nixon succeeded in a policy of limiting people's incomes, limiting price increases for a substantial time. The policy collapsed. I do not say it collapsed because he was a wicked man; it collapsed after a time; but at least there was a year and a half when America had a general stability on the basis of a prices and incomes policy, and perhaps the discipline in general at that time has allowed the United States to maintain relatively low rates of inflation, compared to certain of the countries of Western Europe, although all the inflationary trends are present within that country. That is my argument on unequal sacrifice; that the public servants' increases are postulated on a wrong principle because they are asked to make greater sacrifices than the rest of us.

Public servants are citizens too; they are part of the constituency of the Prime Minister. They are part of the public of Barbados.

Now I think I had better deal — since I now see the Prime Minister in his seat and I really do not wish to attack his logic unless he had an opportunity of replying, I had better deal with this argument about he would have to double the income tax to meet the increases which they have asked for. Now one of the oldest techniques of public relation is the scare story; the smear, the McCarthy tactics, the very Nixon tactics. You want to put a case and you do not only put a case on its merits and demerits. You put a case with red herrings, you put a case with smears. There are no particular smears in this matter but there are red herrings. I regarded the foolishness in the Advocate about reserves as inspired by — I cannot say Government circles because that would imply the public service — inspired by DLP circles. I am saying it straight. Inspired by Democratic Labour Party circles.

Last night when the Barbados Labour Party held its final meeting over this matter certain members in here when we came to this question of the foreign reserves and the depletion, I said 'look, don't tell me that;' and they said 'yes it is Barrow' — I beg your pardon, Sir. They meant the Prime Minister; but they called the name. They said it is he who told the Advocate; he told somebody to tell the Advocate so. I said 'look, I can believe many things about the Prime Minister but I cannot believe that he would be guilty of such horrifying economic nonsense.' Not even as a red herring and a frightening tactic. Where is the hon. member for St. Peter? He is sitting there. He will remember the argument well. I said, 'anyhow if he comes into the House tomorrow and says anything about the foreign reserves I will destroy him on it, but I do not believe he will say anything about it.' I want to pay him a tribute, that however it leaked out to the Advocate at first — and let us face it; the damage is done, because there are ignorant people who really believe that foreign reserves are something you have in the bank and you can go and draw a cheque on foreign reserves to pay civil servants. There are really people who believe that; and the foolishness which is more a condemnation of the absolute and utter economic ignorance of the news editor or the sub-editor or the idiot reporter whoever wrote the story, that ignorance which appeared on the front page of the Advocate, it really has people frightened and I congratulate the Prime Minister on exposing it for the ignorance that it was, and I am glad that my defence of him last night in our party's

councils has proved to be an accurate prediction of what he would say when he gets in here; but he only has himself to blame if otherwise sensible people think that he could be guilty of such an economic solicism. If he had not made many statements in the past which are on the level of that, nobody would believe he would be capable of it, but it is not incredible to think that the Prime Minister would come in here and say so because he has made economic statements of that class in the past; but I am very glad even though the correction contained a few little mistakes because he started off to say yes, it could have an effect because of increase in imports — I could not get the connection between the increased borrowing....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I do not think the hon. member understood what I was saying. I would not even worry to deal with his hallucinations. I said that any increase in the overall supply of money in the country whether by salaries or otherwise, whether by local or foreign borrowing could lead to an increase in consumption and an increase in imports, and I make no apology for saying that; and indirectly it might lead to some reflection on the balance of payments.

Mr. ADAMS: That is how he ended, Sir. He started out by saying increased borrowing but I must confess as he went on he spoke of the increase in imports. I was trying to say I did not see the immediate connection with it but it is accepted. I think people should understand this, Sir, you can only deplete your foreign reserves by a foreign payment. Even if he had \$1 million in United States currency and paid it to the civil servants they would have to go and change it at the bank and it would become a foreign reserve again.

7.10 p.m.

You can only run down your foreign reserves by paying them out overseas, and the only foreign reserves that could be diminished by a civil service increase and the few salaries that are paid to the Missions abroad — that two or three million dollars that is literally spent abroad on the overseas Missions — they are the only ones which can make a dent in the foreign reserves. I think it is a point, I really think that the Advocate newspaper that had the original nonsense ought to issue an apology, frightening Barbadians and trying to set Barbadians up against the civil servants suggesting that the civil servants are unpatriotic and asking for more money because it will run down the foreign reserves. I don't think that any service was done to the

Prime Minister when the article quoted the Prime Minister verbatim, because that is the whole point about the article, that it had that much more authority because the Prime Minister's words were quoted in a number of respects. They had nothing to do with the subject of the article, I can tell you that, they were not words that related directly to the foreign reserves.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to explain to the hon. member, if the hon. member will give way, that today is Tuesday and I returned to the island after an absence of nine days on Sunday evening when the Shades of night were falling fast, that is, pretty close to 6 o'clock, so there is no way that I could have had any interview or had anything to do with any article that appeared in the Advocate on Monday.

Mr. ADAMS: That is the whole point, Sir. There is no way he could have had anything to do with it, but the article still quoted him, and it did not really quote him on the point either. That is the thing. There is no way, as he said, that he could have given an immediate interview, but the article was lent authority by the calling of the Prime Minister's name.

The question of the taxation. There are certain things that should not be concealed even inadvertently. There is a certain duty on the Prime Minister to consider the weight of all the remarks he makes, and when he says that a \$70 million dollar increase for public servants would mean that you have to double the rates of income tax to meet their demands, he knows this is not true. He knows that that is literally not true, because the \$70 million itself generates new taxation; the \$70 million itself perhaps is going to generate \$30 million in new tax — not 30, 30 is the overall amount when you consider the increased imports, the increased income tax and perhaps the increased corporation tax — but even direct taxation, that \$70 million is going to surely depending on how you distribute it up and down the service, generate perhaps \$20 million of new taxation, and the extra \$25 million that we are being asked, or that we are going to be asked later to vote is itself not going to be \$25 million cost to the Government, because a lot of it is going to be taken back by the Government in income tax, and the injection of \$70 million into the economy has other tax generating effects as well. If you had injected \$70 million into the economy, clearly there will be a great inflationary pressure, the Prime Minister hasn't dwelt at length on this, but I believe he could very reasonably argue that the World Bank pressures and strictures are to some extent

justified. He mentioned them, but he could have expanded them — I am not here to tell anybody how to make a speech — but I am sure hon. members would perhaps have accepted arguments in an expanded line if he had to in that direction, but the \$70 million would by reason of the very inflationary pressures generate very considerable income to the Government. Consumption taxes, more import duties, many many more 5% sales taxes and many more in the course of time, so a civil service increase is not money lost to the Government, a civil service increase is money which helps to move the economy; a civil service increase is money which helps to put revenue into the pockets of the Government, and contrary also to what the Prime Minister said, seeking to make us believe that the choice is between employment and more money for the civil servants, a civil service increase can assist employment because of the pump priming factor which it has.

Everybody conceded twelve years ago during the windfall debate that one effect of paying out the money directly to the sugar workers would be to generate economic prosperity in Barbados. Everybody conceded that. (Mr. WALCOTT: You should be ashamed to talk about that). I am not ashamed to talk about it, Sir. Hon. members on the front bench at least, those of them who were then in politics and then in the councils of Government, agreed and conceded that some measure of prosperity and increased employment would result from paying out the windfall money. In the same way, giving civil servants more money is going to result in increased employment, even at the simplest, most ordinary level, Sir, the Key Scale Workers, it would be incredible if no Key Scale Workers paid a carpenter or a mason or a motor mechanic a little something out of his back pay, thereby creating that much more income and employment in this country, so it is a very dangerous line of argument to suggest that civil service salaries are antithetical or have a counter employment effect in Barbados. Indeed one may argue that there are few ways the Government can give money to individuals to do something for the economy more effectively than to raise civil service salaries. It is a very reasonable argument because you are dealing with the whole range of workers viewed by the size of their salaries in Barbados. You are dealing with people with very low salaries and people with very high salaries. The civil service represents in terms of salary mediums a salary cross-section of our community, and you are spreading a little bit of purchasing power throughout the community when you increase civil service salaries, so I don't ever want to hear,

Sir, and I hope I will never be saying that you can only pay civil servants at the expense of keeping people out of work.

Some years ago the Prime Minister put forward a different proposition, which was that you should take the money you are paying the civil servants and spread it among more civil servants. I recall that. That may have been wise in dealing with unemployment, it is also unrealistic when you are dealing with civil servants, and I believe that realism may have entered. That argument is a different argument, but it was not an argument deployed upon this occasion, it is not a realistic argument. I thought when he spoke about the effects of unemployment that this argument was going to be rehashed again, but it was not, it was the general economic effect and I cannot say, Sir, that I accept that.

Now we come to the principle, Sir, of collective bargaining. The civil servants are people like anybody else. I heard the Prime Minister say his constituency is taxpayers; the civil servants are all by definition taxpayers. If the Prime Minister can find one civil servant who has so many children and who does not buy anything in the shops or whatever that he doesn't contribute anything to the revenue of this island, I would be a most surprised man. If he can find a civil servant who eats on charity, drives somebody else's motor car, never buys a shirt or a pair of shoes or goes anywhere where he has to pay an indirect tax I would be a most surprised man. Civil servants are taxpayers, civil servants are also people, civil servants now have the right to be represented in unions and to engage in collective bargaining with their employer, who is the Government of Barbados.

7.20 p.m.

I hear that there is an agreement between the Prime Minister and the bulk of the taxpayers. An agreement to do what? An agreement to keep down the civil servants? I do not know whether the Prime Minister is serious when he thinks that the bulk of the taxpayers can be mobilised to say that it is correct to impose solutions without making more serious efforts at collective bargaining. I do not believe that 18 meetings is the maximum number ever held between representatives of a Government and representatives of the Public Servants of this Island before agreement was reached. That is a straightforward matter of fact upon which I have little information, and upon which the Prime Minister has all. But I do not believe that 18 is an unusual number of meetings in wage negotiations. It may be high, but I do not believe it is unprecedented.

I want to know how the Prime Minister's devotion to the principle of collective bargaining could be so great on May 6 of this year, and by the end of the month amount to a deep pact. The example which the Prime Minister drew of the negotiations between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union is no example at all in his favour. That was a case where, as the Prime Minister properly said, he was standing in a dispute *Res inter alios acta*, a thing between other people. I will now give him another Latin maxim: *Memo judex sua in causa*. No man shall be a judge in his own cause.

Is the Prime Minister saying that because he could judge as between the civil servants and the Barbados Workers' Union, that he must, therefore, be right in judging on the same principles between himself and the civil servants?

We, I must confess, Mr. Deputy Speaker, had expected the argument...

Mr. SPEAKER: Have you reduced me already?

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, the Prime Minister has treated you so badly...

Mr. SPEAKER: No. The Prime Minister has not done anything so at all. You are addressing me. I do not want to hear anything about the Prime Minister. I want to hear from you.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am very, very, sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the Prime Minister gets up, he addresses me correctly, and you will do it, too.

Mr. ADAMS: Does he call you doctor? (*Laughter*). I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I am very, very sorry. The Prime Minister in standing and deciding as between his negotiators — you must remember that he has negotiators. It is not the Prime Minister sitting down with the people and talking. There are negotiators who negotiate on behalf of the Government. When the Prime Minister dictates on the grounds that the Government cannot do this or that, it is a matter different from what took place between the Sugar Producers' Association and the Barbados Workers' Union.

We had expected that this argument would have been deployed, and it would not have been dealt with by the Prime Minister. We felt that he

would have left it to a minion, so that when the argument was knocked down the Prime Minister, like Pontius Pilate, could stay at a distance and wash his hands of the unfortunate accident which had happened to the illogician whom he had put up to be knocked down by the Opposition. But he has put his own neck into the noose. He cannot think that the public servants, or the people of Barbados, accept that because he could tell the Sugar Producers' Association what to pay the workers that he has an absolute right to say what the civil servants should be paid. The people of Barbados look forward to collective negotiations and collective bargaining.

Sir, while the unions are asserting, and asserting with some force, that the negotiations had not reached the stage of deadlock; while the unions are asserting that there was still room for negotiations, and there were still areas of possible compromise, I cannot accept that collective bargaining had come to an end and that there was a ditch on both sides of which parties stood, neither willing to give an inch more nor less. I believe that there are people still in life who admire the example of Alexander the Great who, when fretted with the gordian knot, drew his sword and severed it at a stroke, and that those who have the power to carry on negotiations in this way want to behave like the British Government when it reduced everybody's salary in 1931; they want to behave like the old planters in Barbados when they reduced the salaries of workers without making any corresponding cuts in their profits.

This Government, Sir, is not behaving like a Government that has no money to spend. This Government is not behaving like a Government that sees financial retrenchment as the order of the day. This Government is behaving like an election-year Government. In 1972, I heard the Prime Minister, when referring to allegations that the Budget of 1971 was an election Budget, say that he had never heard of any other type of Budget in the election year. This Government is barber-greening the roads in New Orleans on the week of the City by-elections; this Government is reducing the bus fares to 25 cents; this Government is increasing — (*Asides.*) — I am telling you things I am in favour of — the old age pension by \$3.00 a couple of months before the election; this Government is spending money like a drunken sailor in Nelson Street on a Saturday night in election year. This Government could not find the money in 1974 to reduce the bus fares when the Commission said it should. It could not find the money to raise the old age pensions

when the hon. member for St. James pushed for it. We heard arguments against it, indeed. It could not barber-green the roads in New Orleans when Elliott Mottley was a member of the House. It could not even barber-green them until they saw that Carmichael was going to be white-washed. This Government could not hear about the expenditures of money, or it could not countenance them until election year, but it seems that in the end the poor civil servants are the ones who have to finance the election spending. It seems that that is the end of it.

Sir, I do not know what is going to be the outcome of this debate at the end of it. I know there are a lot of high feelings on the side of the public servants. I know there has been a lot of nonsense talked. I have a note here, and I think I had better deal with it. These things pass you and then they rise up again when you think they are in the grave. They rise up again, they meet you, and they challenge you. The Prime Minister said that there were people who argued that the Minister of Trade should not reduce consumer prices. I challenge him to find a statement by any member of the Barbados Labour Party to the effect that consumer prices should not be reduced. Let me advise him that a writ for libel is being filed tomorrow in respect of certain documents that have been circulated in the Parish of St. Thomas, some of which make the same specific charges against members and a member of the Barbados Labour Party. Be very careful of what you are saying in respect to this matter. I challenge, before the matter comes into court and becomes *sub judice*, any hon. member to say on any occasion when we said that. The rice, in particular, I remember. We said all along that the cess on rice, which consisted of 11 cents, and which was imposed to bring the price of Venezuelan rice up to the price of Guyana rice, and which resulted in a year's overcharging, not by the merchants but by the Government, of the people of Barbados, should be reduced. It was reduced after a year. Are we now to be told that we objected to the reduction of consumer prices? What wicked lies! Whoever has told the Prime Minister that — I know he has not heard it himself — should be ashamed of himself.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I heard it myself up to last night, and I have witnesses. You will be surprised where I heard it from, and there are at least four or five people here who heard it with me. Do not worry with your writ.
7.30 p.m.

It has been mooted abroad in the newspaper columns and right throughout this country that the Minister of Trade is imposing a hardship on small shop keepers. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that it has even been mentioned on the floor of this House. I can't remember at this stage who said it, by reducing these prices. I suspect that if you turn around, circumspect.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said no member of the Barbados Labour Party. Deal carefully with those statements. If last night there were four or five hon. member present, well he heard it in D.L.P. circles. That would be where he would hear it because you hear any foolishness in those circles. It must have been a happy moment for you to hear it. We have certainly never heard that in mine; but that is really in parenthesis.

Now dealing with the Civil servants, the civil servants obviously are not pleased. All this nonsense about at or near and in or on, it is many years since the Prime Minister has been at the Bar. I wish he would not show it so obviously. At or on or in or near are terms of art some of which have been constructed much more recently I think than the Prime Minister was practising his Trade Union Law. We know we have some original interpretations of words in the English language in here by those to whom we have given to interpret, but the Prime Minister must give us a chance. I am not aware that any civil servant employed in the public buildings were picketing in the public buildings today. I am not aware that any public servants are employed in here other than the employees of Parliament and employees of the Post Office and I do not believe that any of them were picketing. So to make these statements because they look glamorous and because you like to play around with these words at or near and in or on is only really to try to over-awe the teachers. The teachers had a right to be in here as far as I am concerned because I see so many things happening in the public buildings yard and so many little Hitlers down there pushing around Members of Parliament, from you back down.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I have never been pushed around.

Mr. ADAMS: I saw a Police Sergeant treat you very badly when you tried to tell him who had a right to park in here. I was present and saw it. I saw a policeman give the Prime Minister a lot of trouble to get his car in here. I was told by Sir Theodore Brancker of a policeman arresting his

chauffeur at the foot of the steps when the chauffeur was bringing something upstairs for him. I did not see that personally but I was here the day. All those things I have seen. I do not believe that the Teachers' Union should be overawed by any talk that they should not be in here because this is in or on and not at or near. The teachers are employed all over Barbados and I do not believe it is at or near the Springer Memorial or wherever the others are. As far as I am concerned they were in here lawfully and nobody has any right abusing them. If we have peaceful picketing, whoever voted for it or against it — I know I was not here then — we must not get on with that.

Now, Sir, I said at the start of my speech that our attitude to this Resolution would be governed by the arguments which we hear and the speeches which are made. I am going to give all hon. members a chance to discuss not only the Resolution.... (*Asides*) Why can't hon. members on the Government side sit down and keep quiet. If they are too ignorant to know what is coming next, why are they assuming? If they don't know which way I am going, why are they going on? I am going to give all hon. members a chance to debate this matter not only with the Resolution in the form which the Prime Minister has put it, but with a Resolution that introduces an element of procrastination. I believe we should go back to the bargaining table on this matter. I believe that the operation of the Order should be suspended. The Prime Minister I believe has moved a Resolution in particular terms to approve the Order which was made on June 10, and I am going to move an amendment to that Resolution. I would be glad if the Clerk would reduce it to the precise terms, if I could know what is actually moved. What is actually move? That the Order made on such and such a day be confirmed? I have to ask questions. The Order was put in the wrong form anyhow. Does nobody in here know the actual Order that was moved? The Prime Minister said "the Resolution be approved". I will say, not that the Resolution be approved, it would have to be that the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976 be approved, and I will move that the words "be approved" be deleted and the words "suspended until the further pleasure of the House be known" be substituted therefor. I believe those words are Parliamentary and the Clerk can give you a decision. So that the Resolution will read "that the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976 be suspended until the further pleasure of the House be known", and I so move.

The Order is in operation already; it is already law and therefore we have to move the suspension of the Order in my respectful submission. The Clerk is there to deal with these things. Sir, I am in anybody's hand. I do not wish to move that further consideration be postponed, because if it is postponed for long enough the Order will collapse. I am just trying to do what I believe is proper, and I am moving the suspension of the Order. If you rule I can't do that which keeps the Order alive until the House debates it, you will be correct. If I move that further consideration be postponed and it is carried or suspended, there is a time limit on this; it must be affirmed by a certain time, and if it is not passed by a certain time, it collapses. It is not a negative Resolution. This is an affirmative Resolution and if it is not passed in a certain time, the civil servants will have to pay back their back pay, to carry it to extremes, and therefore I am moving that it be suspended to allow negotiations to be reopened.

7.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the Leader of the Opposition must decide which of three things he wants done.

Mr. ADAMS: I understand what I want done, Sir. There is suspension, postponement or amendment. Those are not three separate things. They are two things, either of which can be achieved or must be achieved by the third. It is necessary to amend or suspend or postpone and I have said suspension and not postponement. I have moved an amendment to add the words "operation of" between "the" and "civil" and remove the word "approve" and put "suspended until the further pleasure of the House be known". So it will read "that the operation of the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976 be suspended until the further pleasure of the House be known." That will give us a chance to think about it for as long as the Prime Minister decides.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, it is a pity that after hearing the Leader of the Opposition for over an hour we came to an anti-climax because he is not sure what is the right thing to do. The hon. member in speaking on this motion, began by innuendo to challenge the integrity of my colleagues and myself about our position in the trade union movement. The last time that I spoke in here, I had to leave this Chamber. Today I am going to be very serious because it is an extremely grave matter.

I did not hear the hon. member being stopped when he challenged my integrity, but I want to tell him that my entry into politics was

not by the road of money. When I came into the House of Assembly members were not paid. I came in as a worker's representative and I will go out as one.

The member made a vulgar reference about that is how the Prime Minister feels. Let me tell him that I do not have to make a decision on matters relating to the workers based on how the Prime Minister feels or how the member feels, because I am satisfied that if the workers had to rely on how he feels about them they would stand very poor indeed to get representation.

In September, 1971 we had a battle in here for \$29 a week. I did not hear the hon. member's voice or the voice of any member of his party. We know what was said, that you should bring down a Resolution stopping this. The Prime Minister could not have made the speech that he made today, but because he is encouraged — I would say by some of the culprits, we have in other places, and we hear some of them on other occasions.

I do not agree with the Prime Minister's reference about pious collective bargainings. This country has been saved by the collective bargaining process. More agreements have been reached by the collective bargaining process in this country and by agreements than disagreements. We had 76 agreements in 1975, 88 in 1976 and it would be utter nonsense and rubbish for anyone to begin to talk about your having more disputes. The Labour Department deals with agreements that are microscopic as compared with what is being done; but this country is running the gambit of having politicians on both sides acting, so that we are getting near to what was happening in Germany and Italy before the last war — mini Fascists.

The hon. members spoke for over an hour and said not a word on behalf of workers. He spoke in terms of getting the Civil Service vote. Any politician looks for a vote, especially in a year like this. We are not talking about votes now. When the hon. member talks about negotiations, we do not negotiate in public. We negotiate in private and we negotiate for what we want. We are not afraid of any employer whether the employer is the Government or an employer in the private sector. We told the Government what we wanted on behalf of the workers.

That Sir, is what we stand by. We do not want anything else than what we state. We reach a compromise and that is what we said we wanted. The Leader of the Opposition talked

about the Government making agreements with the Barbados Workers' Union for money for houses. He talked a lot of nonsense that the money should not be given to the BWU. Does he think that the money is coming to me? I have never looked at any of them in here for anything. Have any of them ever seen me walking into their offices asking for favours? I would die first. I do not want anything from any member of this Chamber. No member of this Chamber can say that he has seen me or will see me asking for a personal favour now, ever or at any time. I have been working for over 40 years. I have never been a loafer, an ordinary loafer nor a political loafer. Loafing has never been a part of my nature.

I cannot agree with any situation in which there are changes in relation to cost of living and in which it is felt that the cost of living is the only criterion. It is not the sole criterion for determining wage agreements. I have listened in this Chamber to speeches from time to time, and there is an anti-union an anti-worker bias running through it. I have heard this nonsense talked about bus drivers getting \$120.00 a week and they do not have any certificates. What nonsense is that? They try to sell that tripe and rubbish to the people in the community, and make the people believe that the only basis for getting an increase is the cost of living.

For that reason some people in the community are working for such low wages. It is because of the ignorance of making people believe that you cannot do a job unless you have a certificate. When a mason or a carpenter comes to build your house are you going to ask him how many certificates he has? Go and look at the equipment he uses. He may have a slide rule. Do not talk this nonsense.

When it comes to the question of determining wages, you have to sit down and negotiate. I did not agree with the Government and I told them so. I could never agree with any Government that undertakes to abrogate any agreement that is reached. I do not subscribe to that. I do not have to carry people down Broad Street singing nonsense, singing God save the Queen or anything like that.

Those are my views. We have a union which is a democratic institution. We have survived for many years and we got rid of those whom we could not trust; but I challenge any member of this Chamber. When the hon. member talks about integrity I challenge him to say anything about a lack of integrity because this is something to do with the Government or the Prime Minister.

7.50 p.m.

We made a statement and we stand by the statement we made, and we say if the Government cannot support that, we cannot support the Government in what they want. That is my position. I do not walk around begging people for support; I do not walk around begging people for aid. I am not one of those men. I have made a contribution to public life on the basis of honesty and integrity; not on the basis of stooping and getting on with any of these unsavoury tricks. You have to go and look for others in that. Do not come to me with that.

If I agree I can say I agree, if I do not agree I say I do not agree. I am not the lazy type; not allergic to work. I am not that type. I work every day in my life. Work hard. I enjoy it; I enjoy the work that we have done on behalf of the workers in this country. It was the Barbados Workers' Union that caused the public servants to be where they are. All the postmen came over to the Barbados Workers Union. We did not go and lasso them. We do not send out any emissaries to lasso anybody to get them into our union. We do not have to. When we go and sit down around a table we tell the people what the score is. I do not sit down around a table and be applying for a job. When I go and meet the Prime Minister I do not be sitting down meeting the Prime Minister and saying 'hold that application for me. I am coming back next week, I want you to fix me up.' There is no application of mine in any employer's hand in Barbados.

I have no grudge against anybody who is holding a job. I am not applying for anybody's job. I have my job and I am going to hold it as long as the people want me to. I do not mean any political job either, because that is not a job. Those of you who have the idea that politics is a job, you have another thought coming. That is why I deprecate there is no point in making any comparison between a Minister and a member. A political post is different from anything in the public service. There is no point comparing a Minister with a woman or a man working for \$52 a week and somebody working for \$60 a week. The basis of that comparison is odious. There is no point in making that comparison.

I would not be so silly as to sit down around a table and make any argument or comparison between what you pay a Minister and what you pay another person. If a Minister would be so silly as to believe that it is meet and right that a person who is getting \$52 a week, that the only way you can talk in terms of an increase is in the terms of pure percentage, then you do not realize what is going on.

Now what is the point in talking about the gross domestic product in India. The hon. member in the Opposition talked about the gross domestic product in India. India has nearly 800 million people. There is no point talking about that. Barbados is a predominantly wage earning community. There are more people in India who are non-wage earners than the total population of so many places put together in the world that there is no point talking about these economic matters. There is no point in dealing with it.

The danger they had finding a debate on the hand, you are going to get millions inside the Chamber dealing with a matter that they have not given any study to. They want to use it as a political issue. You want to make a political football of it. Too much of that has been going on in the past. You have to sit down and negotiate stage by stage, point by point, area by area. You cannot debate this in all the generalizations that you think of. Those are all right when you are dealing with generalizations, but if you want to get down to the specific, you have to get down to 'why do we want more money for the people.' Do we have a case? Yes, we do. We put up a case; and there is no absolute rightness about anyone saying your case was reasonable and your case was unreasonable. Our case is reasonable on the grounds that every situation in the cost of living is not an absorbing situation. You cannot receive — and I do not go in for 'each time the cost of living moves therefore you are swinging around.' You will have to have an escalator clause, and therefore the escalator clause will move it in small portions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not even engage in certain discussions with the Government that we do not believe in. For example, we do not believe in Christmas bonuses in a public service, because it is unscientific; but some years ago when you were operating in a different sector, somebody who had no idea about the whole economic matter came out and said, well because they give some people money to buy ham — so you reduce people into a stage of stupor, that it is at Christmas time that they want a ham, and there you go along and you are borrowing money to give them money and they turn that into a bonus.

Last year the Government gave one like that and turned the thing into a bonus. Okay; the public servants went for it. The Barbados Workers' Union did not go in for that because we were not going to have any insulting behaviour that we asked for twenty five percent, and then it turned out that 'you give me two weeks and I

did nothing.' No march was down Broad Street; no money in the House of Assembly. Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked me to write him a letter; write him a letter to ask him if we want him to vote 'yes' when I know he knows infinitely less about the matter than we do.

We negotiated 1976 agreement without your aid. Far from that you would like to see us disappear from the scene; a lot of people would like to see us disappear from the scene but as the workers, we represent something real in the society; we cannot and will not disappear. This is not an organization that arises when you are paying out salaries; not an organization that is going to rise when you are dealing with an increase in pay, but an organization of a continuous character that is going to be here all day, every day and for every day of the year. That is the meaning of a trade union. We believe in this philosophy that a trade union must be a continuous organization; and we do not go in for these odious comparisons.

I am not going to compare policemen with this situation. When we start these comparisons, do you know what you are going in for? You are going in for something that the Almighty went in for at the beginning of Creation, and He did not make all of us alike. Everybody does not have the same height, the same size, the same mental capacity, the same physical capacity; so at work we are living in a society in which people are paid different wages for doing different jobs, and that is in a general way accepted; but because we are operating in a society that is a predominantly capitalist society where even the workers themselves want to be miniature capitalists, what do you find? That each day you have to operate in a system against a background of a system that they cannot control. The system that they have to be at the bottom of the system.

8.00 p.m.

The people are not ready, you have to be ready, you have to have enough people to change it. Now when you have the idea that you can change a system like this it means that the public servants will be part of the total society, and as I have said before, if you had a labour market situation in this country in which you know what the total labour market position is, you have 100,000 people working in Barbados and the division of labour among 100,000 equals 10% of this group, 15% of that group, 16% of another group, and you had a spread to give over to the society, then you will be able to base that within them, and that is the basis for which

you would deal with it. But you are not, you are dealing with people bit by bit, somebody comes up now you have to deal with him now; another person comes up tomorrow, and you have to deal with him when he comes up tomorrow, and you have a situation like this. What do you now have? You have a situation where the public servants have a long time to wait. It is a fact, and there is no point anybody denying that. The cost of living has risen sharply, you had the oil crisis, but we couldn't negotiate on the basis that you were going to absorb the total increase in the first year, and then the hon. member talked about what we did. We did not have to ask him how to negotiate, we do not negotiate with every employer like a Chinese tailor, a man who gave a pants to a Chinese tailor to make, the pants had in patches and therefore he made the other pants with patches too, because he was to make it like the other one. He cannot come and teach us how to negotiate, we negotiate with different people in Barbados, but they are not identical, you have a wage index to follow.

We told the Government we could not accept a position from them where the public servants would be worse off than anybody else in the community, but we say as a public service now, nothing to do with who the Prime Minister is, as a public service as distinct from a private service — because there are conditions of employment, there are certain basic factors within the public service that are different from those services that you get in the private sector — so therefore where you have certain things built in you cannot be a clown and approach things in the same way as a man working in an institution or an establishment where the establishment doesn't give the person any time off other than the legal minimum, but in the public service you get other facilities and advantages that are built in. These are things you take into consideration when you are negotiating. For those reasons we said we would accept a position, and you don't negotiate the same way now that you would have negotiated for the last 25 years, each negotiation brings out its own technique. We said we would accept a 35% in the first year and a 60% in the second year for people up to \$100 a month. That is what we said, that is what we stand by, that is what we told the Government, and I will tell anybody so at any time whether it is the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else, I don't have to satisfy the Leader of the Opposition. This is where I stand on this and therefore I do not have to make any excuse for my position; never did or never will, and I stand by that, therefore if that is not going to be

something that I can support, that is what I stand by and I cannot support it.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: At this point, Sir, I beg to move that the sitting be suspended until tomorrow, Wednesday 23rd, at 12.00 noon.

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

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

8.05 p.m.

On Resumption:—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is an amendment before the House.

“Resolved that the operation of the order entitled ‘The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976’ made by the Minister responsible for Establishments on the 11th day of June, 1976, be suspended until the further pleasure of this House be known.

Insert ‘the operation of’ before ‘the order’ and delete ‘approved’ appearing at the end, and insert ‘suspended until the further pleasure of this House be known.’”

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that the Resolution to approve “The Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1976” do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Before you proceed any further, Sir, I am asking for leave to deal with three money Resolutions of which notice was given at yesterday's Sitting. A Resolution for \$487,000, a Resolution for \$1,328,000 in connection with Government pensions and a Resolution to grant the sum of \$2,500,00 which relates to Old Age Pensions, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare. Those are three we would like to proceed with later in the sitting.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, those money Resolutions will be dealt with later in today's Sitting in all their stages. (Pause) Leave has been granted.

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

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) (NO. 2) ORDER, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Order, Sir, is the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1976, No. 12 on the Order Paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 12 is the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: By the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1975 provision was made for the consultant medical staff of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to opt to receive 90% of the fees paid into the Treasury in respect of consultant services rendered within the hospital, or the full fees where those fees are collected by the officer. The consultants were requested to give notice in writing to the Chief Establishments Officer of their desire to opt as follows:

In the case of an officer appointed before the Order came into force, within three months of the effective date of the Order, namely 1st November, 1975;

and in the case of officers appointed after the coming into force of the Order, on the date of such appointment.

Sir, it has been found inconvenient and almost impossible in the case of the latter for this option to be made, and this Resolution is to give the Chief Establishments Officer the discretionary powers so as to provide a reasonable time for officers who have been appointed after the date. That is the object. The Order makes provision for the extension of the period prescribed for consultants at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to exercise their option with regard to the receipt of fees for consultancy services rendered within the hospital. Under the existing provision consultants are required to opt at the date of appointment, but this is not always convenient or possible.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee of Supply. Mr. LOWE took the Chair.
12.10 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, as hon. members will observe, the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works has not yet arrived. Presumably, he is late. That being the case, the appropriate files are not to hand, and we cannot proceed with this matter at this stage. I am asking that we go on with a Resolution for \$1,328,000 in relation to the increase in pensions for Government pensioners, which has been circulated yesterday, and for which leave has been granted to proceed with in all stages. This is just providing the money for Government pensioners, which has already been outlined by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance when he spoke. Of course, this is the actual Resolution to provide the funds, etc. As the Addendum sets out, it is proposed that with effect from the 1st April, 1976, a further cost of living allowance be granted to all Government pensioners: persons in receipt of pensions and allowances of less than \$200 per month, will receive \$30 per month, and those in receipt of \$200 per month or more will receive \$40 per month, as explained by the Prime Minister when he spoke and gave an idea of the reason for fixing those amounts.

Now, in the case of pensioners who start to receive pensions after 1st April this year, they will receive their full pension rights, and in case there is any differential when they work it out, the differential will be corrected so that they will each receive \$30 under \$200 a month, and \$40 for those who receive \$200 and upwards. This is really an attempt to assist pensioners in coping with the high cost of living. That has always been Government's policy. It has been clearly explained by the Minister of Finance and Planning, and I hardly think there is any point in my attempting to go over the same ground at this stage.

I beg to move that a Resolution in the sum of \$1,328,000 do now pass.

Hon. A. MORRISON: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second that.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I do not have any objection to the proposals but, as you will note, I am not speaking for members on the other side because I do not think that matters which have no political grist will attract their attention — matters of great depth. I have stated here already, and I repeat that we are passing the stage where pensions should be dealt with on an

ad hoc basis. Now, I am a radical when it comes to pensions. I do not subscribe to the view that pensions should be contributory, but I live with it. The reason is that the nature of your economy must provide for those who have inputs in the economy, and we make these provisions for them as a condition of employment.

In the same way that we have to make a condition for the replacement of machinery, adolescence, depreciation, and so on, without asking anything positive from the material point of view, or the personal point of view, we should give consideration to other things. It is because human beings are illogical and they have not reached the stage of understanding that it does not make any difference in your thinking. It is a question of how you are oriented. If you are capitalist oriented, like the majority of people in Barbados are, everybody in Barbados wants to become a millionaire and most of them value people by their possessions and not by how they think. You do not see that a pension is a reward for the contribution you have made to the industry, or to the enterprise, or to the society in which you live. I have heard some hon. members say that all of this is sentiment.

Now, I do not go to the extent of giving everybody, because some people do not make a contribution. Some people spend a lot of their time in a public institution, and we cannot say that they have made a contribution. We may look at them as parasitic, and when they reach a certain age we give them a pension. Such people are marginal and you do not allow them to work. But I consider that the Government must give thought and study to the escalating movement of pensions, and that pensions should not be something, and especially Government pensioners, that are conditioned by a period of time. If a man retires today under the Pensions Act, you are not going to negotiate with anyone what his pension is going to be. That is known, and it will not be negotiable. It would not be negotiable after that date. A pensioner should be entitled to draw a pension based on the emoluments of the post that he last held, and whenever that post is increased a corresponding readjustment should be made to his pension automatically. You would not waste his time with politicians fooling around saying what they are going to do for pensioners and a lot of nonsense. The whole economy and the whole fiscal policy must be geared to do this.

When the Prime Minister comes, I will speak on this matter. If you require a service, whether it is a bus service, a Civil Service, or any other

service, the taxpayers, who are pensioners, too, must be prepared to pay for it. It is as simple as that, and it is the best way of operating it. There is no Association of Pensioners, so the pensioners *per se* do not have an Association to look after them. They have to depend on people like myself and others to do certain things for them. Pensioners are scattered all over the country. As a matter of principle, we do not have to wait on any Royal Commission to go into this matter. What we require is good thinking and re-thinking about these matters; therefore, you must have bodies and committees and people who are prepared to study these new ideas.

I am not going to call on any section of the Public Service for any political advantage, because I do not require that. I am going to make a statement. Any person retiring from the Public Service should not be required to await the measures from the Government from time to time.

12.20 p.m.

It should be a settled policy that all of the people in Parliament, the people in the Government, should agree that when a person retires this is how he is going to be treated, and this is what would follow subsequently, because a pensioner is not going to live forever. I can speak quite authoritatively about this matter. My father-in-law was one of those men who lived a generation after he retired from the public service. He worked in the public service and died at the age of 93, so if he retired at 65 he would have lived 28 years after he retired; so you can imagine what he would be getting living in another period for which he would be qualified. I jokingly told him one day that they never calculated for pensioners to live so long. The actuarial figure is calculated on the basis that they would live for 12½ years. Over and above that they would break it down; so I told him he had gone over and that was his problem; he had lived too long after he had retired. If everybody lived as long as he did after they retired, then the cost for pensioners would be very high because with a generation of people still alive as compared with the labour force, you will then see what your pensioners would be as compared to what the actual labour force is.

This requires people whose job it is to be thinking about these matters from time to time so that they can put a sort of sanity into it, so that if a man lives to the age of 80, 88 or 90 he is not getting the same stupid argument that you gave him 25 years ago. You therefore have to give him a pension that equates to the salary of

the post that he held. Some of the school teachers retired when they used to get \$20 and \$25 a month and then when the salaries changed in the 1940s and 1950s they were getting pensions that had absolutely no relation to the post. Some of them were going to the Treasury to get \$8 and \$10 a month. Mr. Crick was the Head-teacher of St. Albans or one of the schools in St. James and he worked for the princely salary of \$16 a month at one stage, so you can imagine what the pension would have been.

I think the Government should give serious thought to this idea of having an escalator pension for the public service and negotiate this now. I am a believer that if the Government is meeting the Unions on these matters, that this is a matter for collective negotiation because people can sit down and discuss it and not have a situation as I heard yesterday. It is a subject that we can deal with. A pensioner is entitled to a pension until he dies. The question therefore is, if you believe in the principle that he is entitled to a pension until he dies, on what basis should the pension be calculated? Should he come up every time for enrolment when you make changes to the structure of the salary of the incumbent of the office that he held, or should you give him a corresponding increase in his pension? You should be able to reach agreement in a thing like that. If you do that, Mr. Chairman, you will save all this time. This would be an automatic and legal position because you would write it into the laws of Barbados and you would not have to worry about this anymore in the same way that you do not come here to determine what a pensioner is going to get tomorrow when he reaches a pensionable age. That is settled already and we do not discuss that each time because it would be laborious, unnecessary discussion not to be able to reach that point. You should reach the point of calculating pensioners in perpetuity now instead of continuing this wasteful exercise each time by coming with adhoc decisions on basic matters where principle is involved.

I hope that Government will see that this is something that is wise, sound and they should do it. The cost is a question of what the calculation is; it is not a cost *per se*. The cost can only be a cost to determine how much you say the amount of pension should be or how much he should get for the post that he held whenever he retired. My idea is that it should be worked out on a basis which would be reasonable to the pensioners and they would not have to come up each time wondering what you are doing for the pensioners. Those who like writing write to the press, but that is not a satisfactory method of dealing with

this matter, and I hope the Government will see the wisdom of dealing with a matter like this and taking the lead. If nobody has done it yet, it is a sound idea and they should take the lead.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, as I look at the Addendum presented here this morning, I am of the view that the Ministry of Finance has been at pains to provide it in its present form. If one were to look at it, it must be observed that Government is taking it upon itself to try, I do not want to say, to cheat, but rather to deprive some of these pensioners of what is their just due. I make this reference, Mr. Chairman, to a number of pensioners who now receive more than one pension. There are, as you know, some public servants who in addition to performing their functions as public servants, have been organists at churches under the Vestry system and the Local Government system and what not, and they derive a pension from having performed that duty with those institutions. It means now, Mr. Chairman, that some of them might receive a \$20 or \$40 pension or whatever it might be from the playing of the organ and in addition they may receive another pension from having been a school teacher or serving elsewhere in the public service. What I have pointed out to the Minister of Finance on more than one occasion previously is this; this Addendum speaks of pensioners and goes on to tell you about the total pension amounting to so much and so much; but it ought to be borne in mind that the pensioners to whom I refer who are entitled to two pensions or three as the case may be, depending on what fields they served in to be so entitled, receive a cheque from the Accountant General each month in respect of having been an organist, in respect of having been a school teacher and in respect of having served in some other department of the service. So you will find one pensioner receiving two pension cheques if you were to put it in that way.

12.30 p.m.

What this Resolution now seeks to do is not to accord such persons an increment on each pension received. We thought that the Government would have been convinced of the case presented for these people in the past and would have come out with something concrete to assist these poor people because, as the member for St. Michael West has said, this pension is a condition of service. When you are employed you agree to accept so much by way of salary because you know that when you have completed 10 years or whatever the case may be you are going to get a pension accruing from the service you

have rendered; and the pension is based on the particular salary. The point at issue is a specific duty performed at a particular price.

I am sure Mr. Chairman, that there is not in this case a lot of these people who would create any hardship upon the Treasury; and we feel that it is unfair, unreasonable and unjust for the Government to be seeking to deny these people what is their just due; because one must agree that you do not get two pensions from one job. You have to render two separate and distinct portions of service in particular fields.

We might be told that it is too late at this stage. It cannot be considered too late because the Government has had forewarnings of all of this. The Government has heard this plea on behalf of these pensioners time and time again; but the Government has not decided to remedy the situation to lighten the burdens of these people.

We know that there are some people who retired 25 or 30 years ago, and thank God, they are still living among us. These are people who deserve better consideration than the Government is willing to offer them today. The Government should be looking after the welfare of these people who gave of their blood and sweat, and sometimes their tears, when they functioned for little or nothing; because as you well know, in the years past there was not this grasping or thrusting for money. In truth and in fact their main concern was the good execution of their jobs. They did it more or less for the glory of it. They were rendering a service.

When it comes to the stage where one of these people has merited a pension, is it not fair that he should receive pension for a particular job which he performed at a particular institution and another pension resulting from the services that he rendered in another department? How is it that the Government now talks about total pension meaning this and that? It is the responsibility of the Minister of Finance to look after these people in the way they deserve to be looked after, bearing in mind the service they have rendered.

It is only fair, reasonable and just that the increments prescribed here — \$30 and \$40 — should go to each pensioner and not have us to be bamboozled by being told of total pensions of \$200 or \$300 or whatever it might be. What we want to see is increments on the total pension that a person receives. No other approach can do justice in the circumstances.

I do not think that anyone will argue against the increases that we see here. There would be no point at this stage arguing against the increases; but the method of arriving at the stipulated amount is what we question and question very seriously.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, let me begin by saying, Sir, that I am in favour of any increase for the old age pensioners of this island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This Resolution has to deal with Government pensions.

Mr. SIMMONS: But it deals with old age pensioners because of their age. I feel that they should be getting more. The Government claims to be impecunious. Yesterday, on another Resolution, we in this country were asked for the first time to tighten our belts. The appeal was made to the Speaker to set an example.

At the end of 1973 when we had the fuel crisis in this country and we were told that we would experience a black Christmas, the member for St. John came back here and assured us that despite the measures taken by the Ministry of Trade, there was no crisis in this island.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is absolutely nothing in this Resolution relevant to any crisis. I have given a lot of latitude in this Chamber where Resolutions are concerned. Hon. members will stick to the Resolution for \$1,328,000 relative to Government pensioners.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect and deference to you, this is (a) a financial resolution and (b) if the Government says that they can only pay out \$1,328,000, then I have to look at the reasons why the Government can only offer that amount; and with the greatest respect I am submitting that I am still within my rights to say that it should be more. (*ASIDE: That is fishing.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member on my right will adhere to Standing Order 33(6) which says that when any hon. member is speaking, all other hon. members must be silent.
12.40 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: What I am saying, Sir, is that we have to look at the provision to pay this money against the economic background of the country. Are you with me now, Sir? Well I would like to accuse the Government of total economic mismanagement which has resulted in depletion of the country's resources over the last four

years. The consequence of that and the upshot is that there is now not enough money in the Government's possession to enable them to pay more than \$1.3 million in taxes...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I appreciate the hon. member is new to the Chamber but it appears to me that he is completely ignorant of Government financing. We are discussing here recurrent expenditure to pay pensions and salaries — recurring expenditure which arises every year, year in and year out. As far as the Government's reserves are concerned they are higher now than they have been in the 350 years history of this Parliament. So this is only a lot of ignorance that the hon. member is talking.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member keep those remarks to himself. You have made your point and it is a valid point.

The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. SIMMONS: Who is talking about ignorance, Sir? That is the two of us. If he says I am ignorant I can say that he is double — he is a twin. He is 'two' ignorant. Two. He is a twin. Let me just be careful with what I say. I want it clearly understood. I am not like some on that side. I am not afraid of him at all. The more insulting he becomes the more I am prepared to deal with him. I have never insulted him in here and I have no intention of doing it unless he insults me, and if he casts aspersions about my intelligence I will have to tell him about his, because yesterday he got in here and said that he put the peaceful picketing section in the Act to deal with the people down there — Section 39 — and he did not put in "in" or "on" but "at or near" and what he failed to tell this House is that he also put in in there that you can peacefully picket where the employer happens to be, and you happened to be about here yesterday and the people happened to be there to deal with you too...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That matter has already been dealt with, and...

Mr. SIMMONS: I am dealing with the question of ignorance. He is telling me that I am ignorant and I am saying that he is ignorant of section 39 of the same Act which he claims he drafted, and he is ignorant that the Act contains the phrase "happens to be" in relation to the employer. That is what I am saying. I will get back to the substantive Resolution now and I am prepared to have it out today with him too if...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that the hon. member was in anything higher than the fourth Form at school when that Act was passed here. It says "at or near the place where the employer resides or happens to be." The right to picket is at or near. The right is not on or in the premises of the employer, and this is the point which I am making. You cannot go into a factory or a gentleman's tennis lawn to picket. It is nonsense. He gets more and more nonsensical the longer he is associated with that group over there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point made.

Mr. SIMMONS: Don't think you are going to do me like you did Elliott Mottley though. I am not for sale or purchase.

Look, Sir, let me get ahead with the Resolution.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I want the hon. member to get on with the Resolution, you know.

Mr. SIMMONS: I will get on with the Resolution in due time but there is nothing that is going to be said in here that I am going to sit down and let go over the top of my head.

Sir, what I am saying is this, that by reason of the fact that in 1975 tourism in this country declined there was no major project undertaken by the Government in the public sector in 1975 to provide people with employment. By reason of the fact that the amount of tonnage of sugar cane declined, and we were likely to get good prices on the world market for sugar, that it the only reason that we got out of real trouble last year, Sir. However, every sector of the economy showed a slump in 1975 under the economic management of the Prime Minister, and that can be found in this, the Central Bank of Barbados Report and Financial Statement of Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 1975. Throughout the Report the word 'decline' is used. We never heard prior to yesterday afternoon any talk about a World Bank team being in Barbados and World Bank team encouraging the Government to introduce measures to hold strain in the economy. Not until yesterday.

The Prime Minister who will tell you that he is a statesman, never yet on one occasion went on television and appealed to the people of this country in circumstances of economic distress and as Churchill appealed to the people of Britain in the 40s during the war years. Never appealed to their sensibilities to hold back in this country but instead the country was allowed

under his directions and his management to get on, behave and continue functioning as though nothing was wrong with the economy. That is what I am charging the Government with. That is why I am saying that they are not in a position to pay pensioners what should be a proper amount to cope with the cost of living increase which in 1925 on the monthly average was at 20.3% whereas in the annual average it works out at twelve point something.

The people in this country have to be given money to cope with the cost of living as it rises. Not only those who are in regular employment but also pensioners. Government or otherwise. You have to make it meaningful.

Now Sir, if the Government had proper fiscal and financial measures over the last five years we would not be in the position in which we are today. According to him yesterday, suffering a deficit of \$20 million on current account and being asked to hold down wage claims and all the other demands that are rightfully the just demands of the worker. The Government since 1971 has taken no steps to enlarge the tax base in this country, for example. Look at employment. In manufacturing, we were told in 1961 that the DLP intended to develop a system of manufacturing enterprises in this country to supersede the importance of sugar as a major sector of the economy, and in 1975, despite that policy and programme they could only encourage 340 jobs.

12.50 p.m.

They could only create 340 new jobs in a whole year in Barbados. That is one aspect of their failure to widen the tax base and for which now we are suffering. We are suffering because of the economic mismanagement of the Government. The Government's industrial policy has failed because the Government seeks all the time to attract foreign entrepreneurs in the industrial sector of Barbados. There is no encouragement given to co-operative development of local industries, nothing so, but any foreigner can come in here, set up a factory, employ people for three years, get tax holidays, and run back out and leave it and throw people on the unemployment market like ISL and Datacraft and so on. If we had a system of local development properly managed by Barbadians — you have some of the superstructure for management, BIMAP and these places — if we had a proper system, then we would be developing domestic industrial programmes which all along would foster and encourage employment and increase the tax base of this country from which the Government revenue could be continually enlarged.

No incentives are given in any meaningful way to export earnings. You get duty on expensive machinery brought in from abroad which competes with labour and no incentive is given to export and greater productivity, so that the Government by reason of its programme over the last four years — and it has been accused by one of its most senior members, Mr. Tudor, of doing nothing for four and a half years — the failure by the Government to stimulate the economy of this country has now resulted in our being asked to vote \$1.3 million for Government pensions, when in fact if there had been a proper stimulus within the economy we would probably now be asked to vote something in the region of \$3 million. I heard a lot of talk yesterday from the same member for St. John who tries to shout me down, but he can't get that chance too often, about how much a maid was earning in 1961. I want to know how much a maid was earning in England in 1961 compared with now. He was trying to give people the impression that under his Government exclusively only Barbados made economic progress from 1961 to 1976, but throughout the world, throughout the whole international community salaries went up, wages went up, cost of living went up, and standards of living went up, and Barbados was caught up in the international spin-off like anywhere else, and ours went up and progressed as a natural consequence of the international situation. So when he seeks to give people the impression that Barbados has done so well to the exclusion of other countries, that is misleading and it is being less than fair with the general public of this country.

I am pleading, Sir, for the support of the Resolution in the sum of \$1.3 million, but I want it clearly understood that the member for St. James has constantly over the years made a passionate plea for increased pensions for all the people of this country who are entitled to pensions irrespective of category, and this is only taking into account in 1976 the pleas made by the hon. member for St. James. Government cannot sit back and take any credit for this, during the by-election campaigns, we never heard them telling the old age pensioners that they would have given them more money, we did not hear them say that at all, but it seems now we are not having a budget this year so you are getting certain measures in here which would neatly fit into a budget, and this exercise this week and probably next week will take the appearance of a budget, and various hand-outs will be given in an effort to catch the votes of the now suspecting public.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in 1966 this Government took it as its responsibility to do in this country for pensioners what was never thought of in the history of this country before. We found people getting \$8.00 a month, \$9.00 a month and \$10.00 a month as Government pensions in 1966; we are hearing today that the increases are not enough. What I would like to state here is that under the Democratic Labour Party the Government pensioners got increases, and as the Prime Minister pointed out yesterday, between 1966 and 1976 the total increases to a pensioner getting \$8.00 a month under the Barbados Labour Party was \$105 a month. We are hearing the same Barbados Labour Party today saying that pensioners should be getting more. This was said by one hon. member. We had another hon. member, the member for St. Peter, who said that people who retired 25 years ago deserve better consideration. These were the words of the hon. member for St. Peter. Twenty five years ago the people retired under the Government of the Barbados Labour Party; 15 years ago those people who retired 25 years ago were still under the Government of the Barbados Labour Party. The cost of living increased during those ten years, yet the Barbados Labour Party did not find it expedient, convenient or otherwise to give an increase in pensions to Government pensioners.

The first time in the history of this country that Government pensioners benefited from an increase at salaries revision was under the Democratic Labour Party. They did not think that they deserved more than the little pittance which they got, but since we have given them in some cases more than 1,000% of what they were getting — work it out — under the Barbados Labour Party, we are hearing that it is not enough. Little is better than none at all. Under the Barbados Labour Party they got none, under the Democratic Labour Party they got a lot. You can imagine if the Democratic Labour Party did not have the interest of those pensioners at heart that you would still have pensioners getting \$8.00 a month now.

1.00 p.m.

You can imagine that. It is this Government that has the pensioners in this country receiving a minimum of \$113.00 now, but those same people would have been receiving \$8 a month if the Democratic Labour Party had carried on the type of Policy the Barbados Labour Party carried on. They have now questioned the method of arriving at \$30 or \$40 a month. I will tell them what the method is. The method is that the Democratic

Labour Party is interested in the welfare of the pensioners whereas the Barbados Labour Party was not interested in the welfare of the people. If the members of the Barbados Labour Party show interest now, they are only jumping on the band wagon. It is typical of them, Mr. Chairman. Whatever the Democratic Labour Party does, they will say, "We will do it better." There is no initiative on their part at all. They will come in here and, like Fascists, criticise what is being done by the Democratic Labour Party, but they cannot offer an alternative. Very few of them will offer us an alternative.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member must not call anybody in here Fascists. I doubt whether he knows what the word means, because he can be very ignorant at times. It does have a highly sensitive meaning. The Fascists are the people who kill Jews, who are opposed to black people, and so on. I respectfully submit that the hon. member cannot say of hon. members, who have spoken on this matter, or who come in the House at all, that we are like Fascists. I ask that he withdraws it.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, in case the hon. member does not know, I used what is known in the English Language as a simile. It is obvious that some of us do not like black people, because some of us marry white people when we are black. We cannot see a black woman to marry. If you want to know who likes black people, or who likes white people, and you want to bring colour in here, you can bring it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to govern his temper, and let us deal strictly with the Resolution relative to pensioners and ignore all asides. Now, I will find out first from the Clerk, as no Standing Order is here to guide me, if the word "Fascists" is unparliamentary. *(Pause)*.

I should like to inform the Chamber that I have been instructed that "Fascists" is not unparliamentary, and the hon. member may proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I am glad you said that you have been instructed. Is it not better to take a dictionary and not the Clerk's word?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order! You are challenging now what the Chair has ruled on.

Mr. ADAMS: I am challenging the ruling of the Clerk, Sir, and not the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Chair has given the ruling.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. Members are allowed to develop their points of order. I am submitting that Your Honour has not ruled. Your Honour's words were that Your Honour was instructed that "Fascists" was not unparliamentary. I am respectfully submitting that that is not a ruling, and it can be dealt with by argument. The Prime Minister, for example, spent many years in the war fighting against Fascism. I do not believe that I could call the Prime Minister a Fascist and have him feel happy about it!

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

Mr. ADAMS: I am addressing argument to Your Honour on the ground that, perhaps, the Clerk does not understand what Fascist is either.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no argument with the Chair. The hon. member must take his seat.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman you were in the House when Sir Theodore Brancker used to rule that certain words were unparliamentary, and it ended up by Sir Theodore Brancker being reminded indirectly about his habits.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat! I rule now that the word "Fascist" is not unparliamentary. The hon. member may proceed.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I was making the point that all we can hear from the other side is criticism of this and that. They are not offering any alternative to what we have to offer the people of this country. My point is that wherever you hear them, whether in here or outside, on every proposal of the Government they will say, "We can do it better than they are doing it," but they cannot come up with anything original. They were not even original in knowing that pensioners deserved better consideration until the consideration was given to these pensioners by the Democratic Labour Party.

I am going further, Mr. Chairman. We are told that they must be given more money to cope with the cost of living. Again, I am sure if the hon. member for St. Philip North was in here before, he would have put the proposal to them,

but they would not have paid any attention to it because they were never interested in the pensioners. The hon. member said that this was the result of the pleas of the hon. member for St. James. The hon. member for St. James came in here talking about old age pensioners. He never spoke for the Government pensioners. We are dealing in this Resolution with Government pensioners. The hon. member said he wanted an increase for old age pensioners. That would be for the poor, incapacitated, etc.

Now, those members over there have never criticized increases or asked for financial consideration for anything. At no time did one of them stand up in here and say how anything could be arrived at. They say if they told us how it could be arrived at, they would be telling us how to run the Government. I heard in another place that the role of the Opposition is not to make a meaningful contribution. They get on as though they are not elected to represent people. They pull down every attempt that is made on this side to do something in the interest of the people, but they can offer no alternative. They can only offer criticism.

I am saying that they had the reins of this Government for 15 years, and they never thought about pensioners. They gave \$2.15 to old age pensioners as against next year \$16.00. Now, \$8.00 for public pensioners; no consideration; no thought of an increase. The initiative came from this side. It was this side that not only started to increase pensions, but it even increased workmen's compensation when they refused to agree to workmen's compensation.

1.10 p.m.

Everything that was in the interest of the working class man of this country, the initiative has always had to come from the Democratic Labour Party, so let us get on with the people's business and listen no further to the sort of arguments which can make no contribution in the interest of the people, because they are only trying to delay and waste the people's time, whereas we are working in the interest of the people and finding a better means of living for the working class man and ex-working class man in this country.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this matter is about Government pensioners. I recall in here on an earlier occasion contributing to a debate on Government pensioners. I believe the hon. member for St. James has indeed spoken about Government pensioners. The Prime Minister will remember a debate about Government pensioners

in which he pointed out to us that a flat increase and not a percentage increase was the more equitable way of dealing with pensioners at the bottom because there were many pensioners, for example, the old railway pensioners, some of whom live in St. John, who had such small pensions that a percentage would mean nothing to them.

When people want to abuse you they abuse you. The hon. member will talk about whiteness, but he is running outside now to the white man who is waiting outside for him in the Lobby in order no doubt to collect some of the money he owes. Why can't I talk about that if you allow somebody to talk about marrying a white woman? The same hon. member who is running about behind Cow Williams, conspiring with Cozier at the Bank, not conspiring, dealing with Cozier at the City Bank and Hal Kirton, running behind every white man because white people have money and the one need they have is money, will still come in here.... run to your white man; he is waiting out there for you. Go and give him what he wants quickly. Run and go. There is a white man waiting for you in the Lobby, you Fascist. Fascists are people that like money and like grinding down the face of the working class, like buying land and selling to people to exploit them. That is some of what the Fascists did.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, the hon. member is not on good ground to say the least. I am not attempting to assist Your Honour, but I would suggest that you listen more carefully to certain remarks because the hon. member speaks of Fascists. Apart from being very irrelevant, he is dealing with Fascists and white people and that sort of thing.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member should be ashamed to get up and defend him. You married a white woman too. You should be ashamed to get up and defend that dog.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: It is not a question of being ashamed. I am saying it is irrelevant and nonsense to get in here and talk about white and black. The question of white or black does not arise. I am neither white nor black; so what!

Mr. CHAIRMAN rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take his seat. Now I have given sufficient latitude to both sides where white and black, khaki and molasses and all other colours are concerned, and the only thing I am prepared to hear now is

something relative to the \$1,328,000 for Government pensioners. And I am asking all hon. members directly to stick to the Resolution now. I have given all of you sufficient opportunity to say whatever you like. The Chair will now have to rule accordingly. There will be no more talk about Fascists or Fascism or else. That has been dealt with on both sides and I declare that matter closed. Let us get back to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I have often in here thought that some of the policies brought down by the Government are policies that would do no disgrace to a Nazi party, and I imagine that since Nazis and Fascists are the same that I will no longer have to refrain from getting up in the House if I feel the hon. member for St. Andrew behaves like a Nazi and saying so. If I feel that he behaves and his speech is to be paid no more attention than the speech of a Lord Roland, I can say so I presume. But what I want to know is this: if the hon. member knows that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing for the Government pensioners, if he can set out the history of the Barbados Labour Party in relation to Government pensioners, how come until June 1961 he was a member of that party and that we have letters asking for him to be a candidate of that party dated 1961 and to be admitted to the Councils of that party? Hon. members cannot take seriously what he says because he was a member of the party for all these years and wanted to be a candidate for all these years that he said we were doing nothing for the Government pensioners.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I have never stepped on the threshold of the Barbados Labour Party. There was a gentleman called Mr. Cox who met me in the road one day and told me to give him \$2.00 and he would make me a member of the Barbados Labour Party, and that he would make recommendations to run me in 1961; that was around 1959. What I am saying is that I have never contributed and if there was a contribution Mr. Cox made it. I have never entered, I have never signed any document for the Barbados Labour Party and as far as I am concerned I was never a member of the Barbados Labour Party. It is a blatant untruth to come here and say that I was a member of the Barbados Labour Party. If he feels to make me one or if Mr. Cox feels to put my name there, I did not put my name. They were looking for members and people with ability, but I was not interested in that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of order and I am going to ask the hon.

member for St. Thomas to desist from such irrelevancies in the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: It cannot be irrelevant that a man attacks the Barbados Labour Party while all the time he was a member or at any of the time he was a member. If a man argues to the House that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing, we were at liberty to show his insincerity on the Resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, I am saying that if they have my name on the books of the Barbados Labour Party, I never requested it. A man called Mr. Cox met me in Roebuck Street and invited me to be a member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order. That matter is closed.

Mr. ADAMS: It is closed with a lie on the record. I have a letter in his hand-writing speaking of our great party and asking to be admitted to the Councils and I can lay it on the Table of the House. It is in his own writing and signed by him in 1961. I have it and I can get it within an hour.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat. I have ruled that the matter is closed. Let us deal strictly with the Resolution, and I want to hear nothing more from either side relative to this matter.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not have to refer to it, but insincere arguments in my suggestion to the House deserve to be treated with the greatest doubt. It is suggested we have never said anything about Government pensioners in here. That is untrue. I have reminded hon. members of the debate and I recall all too well the Prime Minister calling by name a railway pensioner who lives in Martin's Bay and saying what would it mean to give him a percentage increase.
1.20 p.m.

So it cannot be true that the Barbados Labour Party has not contributed to the debates and has not called for pensions.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order. I did not say what the hon. member said.

Mr. ADAMS: When members persistently disobey the rules of this House, there are rules to deal with them. The Deputy Speaker at that? The Deputy Speaker, one who has to administer the rules?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I as Chairman, know under the Standing Orders what to do.

Mr. ADAMS: Yesterday he stood up and started to tell the Chairman what to do; and I do think that of all people who should keep quiet, it is the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker, who should have respect for their fellow Presiding Officer, not to tell him what to do.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Fortunately, there is no hon. member inside here who can tell me what I must do.

Mr. ADAMS: Only the foolish Clerk? It is strange that one of the most prerogative words in the English Language is not unparliamentary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. member to proceed.

Mr. ADAMS: Our argument in the past has been that Government pensioners are getting a percentage increase; and for what it is worth, I will say that on the occasion when we put this forward, the Prime Minister's reply was one which was satisfactory to the Opposition. There is no point in pretending that you are never convinced by an argument.

The Prime Minister pointed out correctly that some pensions were very low, and therefore we are now supporting the principle that certain people have to have their pensions increased by a fixed amount even though it means that they are being increased by a very much greater percentage than other people.

This is not anything on which I thought that there should be any controversy — not so much controversy — but nastiness and unpleasantness. You know that some people cannot help being nasty, but there are one or two occasions when this is not necessary. In my opinion, yesterday the debate was carried on with a remarkable absence of nastiness; and I am realising now that the reason for the absence of this remarkable degree of nastiness was that the two people who spoke restrained themselves, and one person who spoke had nothing nasty to say anyway, and that certain people did not speak in the debate. That is the only conclusion to which I can come.

The Opposition is not going to oppose the Resolution for an increase for Government pensioners, granted that we now accept the principle of giving a flat rate increase even though that exceeds the percentage to the lower pensioners. I do not know why it should give rise to unpleasantness and nastiness.

I was most disappointed since the Leader of the House has had to make a plea, and indeed after seeing the behaviour of the Deputy Speaker out of the Chair, and seeing his quiet and calm behaviour in the Chair, I am most disappointed about what I have heard in this debate this morning. I can only presume that it is due to the fact that a certain libel action was filed earlier today in the courts of Barbados.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I intended to speak on this Resolution which has come down before the House and which is seeking funds totalling \$2.5 million for old age pensioners. After hearing the speeches made on both sides of the House I would think that it is my duty to make whatever contribution I can to this debate.

I have heard what I considered to be a number of irrelevancies about who married somebody's wife. That does not concern us in here. I believe that if you look down the front bench on the Government side it would be difficult for them to swear in a Court of Law that at no time down the line they did not wine and dine with the fair, white sex. That is not important.

I have heard, Sir, all about those who are not members of the Barbados Labour Party; and this party seems to be the worst party that ever came to this country. You, Mr. Chairman, on more than one occasion told me how you once supported the late Sir Grantley Adams, the late Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party. The very Prime Minister was a member of the Barbados Labour Party. The Leader of the House, as he put it, held the lamp for the Barbados Labour Party. The member for St. Michael West in Fab Hoyos' Book is referred to as saying that the late Sir Grantley Adams, the former Leader of the Barbados Labour Party, was the Lord's annointed.

I am proud to be a member of the Barbados Labour Party. I will deal with the speech made by the member for St. Andrew when he said that all that we can do is to be critical of the Government and that we can offer no solutions. I would like to ask the hon. member what is the function of an Opposition party in Parliament. As I understand it, it is to oppose and to be critical of Government measures. There are some-times when the gap between Government policies and those of the Opposition are so narrow, so close, that one finds it difficult to be critical of some of the Government measures.

We have been critical of the Government's economic policy from 1961. I want to go on record today in here because I am not a hypocrite. Any party in power for 15 years would have to have made some contribution to the country. Let us accept that as a reality; but it is also on record that the Barbados Ambassador to the United Nations, making the 21st Anniversary speech of the DLP, made it abundantly clear that the Government after 15 years in power, and having had an 18-6 majority, sat on its laurels. You could not have it from any other better person than one of the founder members and the architect of the downfall of the Barbados Labour Party.

In this session we have been critical of the Government's economic measures, and that is our role. The Central Bank report shows quite clearly the Government's ineffectiveness between 1974-75. Now, since we are dealing with this Resolution, we have to examine some of the things said by the member for St. Andrew. He said that the Barbados Labour Party, or the Opposition, never came up with a solution as to what they would do. Page 22 of our party's programme sets out very clearly what our policies would have been if we were elected to rule the country. I will make it a document of the House if necessary. It said: "No just society can neglect its old people".

Nobody in the world can tell me that a Government, seeing the cost of living rise 320 per cent could feel justified. (*Asides*) This is a financial Resolution and I can talk about old age pensioners, Government pensioners or any kind of pensioners. Let us get that very straight.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would just like the hon. member to realise that we have on the Order Paper a Resolution for old age pensioners.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, I have not seen the Resolution. I am dealing with pensions which is a financial Resolution. I can deal with Ding Ding's pension. Let us get that very clear. After 10 years in here I think that I have been able to understand some of the things, if not all of the things in this human institution. No Government, if it is a just Government can feel deep within themselves that \$10 a week is good enough for a pensioner.
1.30 p.m.

I, in 1968 brought a Resolution in here, two years after I was elected to Parliament, asking the Government at that time to increase the old age pension from what it was then, to \$15 per week. I came back, Sir, in 1970 and 1972. The

Government stuck on a two-dollar bill on it, and in 1974 I brought a Resolution in here and the Government agreed with the Resolution asking the Government to review all categories of Government pensioners and old age pensioners. The Government agreed with it, and that glorified political parliamentary humbug who sat down not too long ago said that the Barbados Labour Party did nothing and did not know about anything they had to do until they came into power. Now I am going to give the Government this credit. The Government built Parliament. The Government built all the roads in Barbados, the Government built all the saucepans and pots that the father of the lady on my right was supposed to punch up, according to them; all the gas stoves also. Only when the Government came into power was the first time a child had a meal in a school. Only since they came into power; and you, Sir may not have been fortunate enough to have the biscuits and milk at 12 o'clock, which was considered a nutritional diet, and that was all the country at that time could afford. And I believe, Sir, that there was free university education in Barbados before that Government came into power, and the late Sir Grantley Adams benefited from the taxpayers of this country, having won a Barbados Scholarship and went to Oxford and studied; but the Barbados Labour Party should take no credit for that.

What the Barbados Labour Party must get a little credit for is just as much credit as the Government is expected to take — that we supplied it within our financial and economic resources; that we increased it to five scholarships; and the Government has come along now and they have allowed a greater number of persons to get free secondary education and university education; but the Barbados Labour Party has made no contribution, absolutely none. On that side of the House, long before the present Government was in power, there was a Barbados scholar — the Minister of Health; long before that Government came into power; and if I am not mistaken, I believe it is the Minister of Education who won an Island scholarship to Codrington College which is affiliated to Durham, and the Prime Minister, at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. Now you hear about the Government introduced free university and free secondary education. Where? You mean you have expanded it whereby a greater number of people and more so the working classes would have the benefit of a better education.

Now you are not going to bring that foolish cheap argument to me; but we went on with the old people in the 1971 programme, Sir, to

provide physical facilities for a proper geneatric treatment for the old and for the sick. That was our programme, Sir, and to provide health visitors and social counselling for the old people, so that when they are infirm and their children are no longer around them that you would be able to have volunteers, or pay people from the taxpayers money to sit and talk with them.

We went further, Sir, to raise the level of assistance to old people through an increase in old age pensions and the providing of free medical services, not to ask the same old age pensions to pay a five percent tax even on toilet paper or soap. That is what we did, as well as to give special assistance in housing for the old, to make sure that the old people who made a contribution whereby the same Minister can be drawing \$1,900 a month, and almost became, or became, a millionaire in five short years at the expense of those people who worked so hard for so little. That is what this party is set out to do.

I recall very well, Sir, the now Ambassador to the United Nations, the former member for St. Lucy came in here with a little basket of goods and set out cent by cent what it would cost an old age pensioner to live on. In 1959 that was done, and he said it would cost them at least \$5 a week. In 1959....

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Sir, the hon. member said that the former hon. member for St. Lucy came in here in 1959 and set out what it would cost the old age pensioners to live on then. He said it was \$5. It was \$1.80 that they were giving them then, and they increased it in 1961 just after the election. It was \$2.15 when they knew that it would cost them \$5 to live on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Mr. CRAIG: Sir, there are some people at some times you treat with scant respect in some places and at some times, and I have always treated the hon. member with some measure of respect sometimes but not all the time. It was the Ambassador to the United Nations who at that time came in here and said it would cost an old age pensioner in 1959, \$5 a week to live on, because according to him we were then paying them \$1.80 a week.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, Standing Order 28(2) states "A member must confine his speech to the subject matter under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Mr. CRAIG: Your Honour.....

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I am asking a point of order for a ruling on that. How do you interpret that Standing Order 28(2)?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already drawn attention to this particular Standing Order.....

Mr. WALCOTT: This is the first time I have drawn it to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the hon. member to desist and to deal with the Resolution.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am drawing to Your Honour's notice a Rule. This states: "A member must confine his speech to the subject matter under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto." There is only one Chairman. I am only drawing the Standing Order to your attention.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I have already intimated to the hon. member that he must desist from introducing new matter, according to the Standing Order.
1.40 p.m.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, there is a Resolution before this Committee for \$1.3 million. It is a financial measure dealing with pensioners and that is what I am dealing with, Sir. I am not concerned with whether it is the Governor General's pension, it is for pensioners and I have a wide range. I can refer to the various pensions and relate them to the pensions which a member of Parliament is getting. That is what I happen to know, but the interruptions would not move this bird, has never moved and will never move me, especially from the person who made them.

I am now going to examine the percentage as worked out for the Government pensioners, and looking at the old age pensioners, comparing the Government pensioners with the old age pensioners. I am going to support anything that would put money into pockets of the old and unfortunate, but I feel when the member for St. Andrew could get up in here and say that we never came up with solutions and are only critical of Government's policies, I think this is enough. In 1972 we were not only critical of Government's measures. we also came up with the solutions. and I personally brought a Resolution in here asking Government to review all categories of pensioners in this country. I

don't think the member might have been in his place then, he might have been a little more concerned with other matters.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1976-77 No. 8

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution is for the sum of \$2.5 million in relation to old age pensioners, standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Health and Welfare.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the sum of \$10 million is provided in the current Estimates under Head 15(5) – Welfare Grants to Individuals – and it is out of this sum of money that old age pensions are paid to those persons who qualify, under the relative legislation approved by Parliament.

As the Addendum to this Resolution states, it is proposed to increase the rates of old age pensions from \$10.00 per week, which is the current rate for old age pensions, to \$13.00 per week with effect from 1st April, 1976. This supplementary provision of \$2.5 million that is being requested is in order to meet the additional cost involved in paying that increase to the old age pensioners, from \$10.00 per week to \$13.00 per week.

As the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance said in his statement on a matter before this House yesterday, this is the first increase of \$3.00, and he has promised that next year there will be a further increase of \$3.00, but we are dealing now with the increase from \$10.00 per week to \$13.00 per week. I would like to state, inasmuch as the time for reading programmes, and the people of this country decided way back in 1971 which programme they thought was best for the country of Barbados, and in the Manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party we promised that there would be an increase in the old age pensions. This Party has kept its promise to the old age pensioners, it has kept its promise to those other persons of those services for which any promise has been made. By and large this is the record of this Party and this Government, and that is why the people of the country have placed their trust in the Democratic Labour Party over the years since 1961.

Ever since, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point that this Government has always

made increases to old age pensioners and it does not depend upon the time that the current members of the Barbados Labour Party came into this Parliament, this Government was increasing old age pensions long before I came into this Hon. Chamber, and before any of the members out there came into this Hon. Chamber, so it is not a case of the Government responding to the promptings or calls or requests from any member of the Opposition, it is a fact that this Government assesses the needs of old age pensioners from time to time and in accordance with the ability of the country to meet these requests for funds provides increases for the old age pensioners.

Let me just list the dates for increases in pensions for purposes of the record. It was in October 1961 when the Barbados Labour Party increased the pension from \$1.80 – that was the figure it was just before the last gasp of breath escaped from that dying party – \$1.80 to \$2.15. In April 1962 the pension for old age pensioners was increased from \$2.15 to \$2.40; in October 1966 the pension was increased from \$2.30 to \$3.00; in December 1969 the pension was increased from \$3.00 per week to \$5.00 per week; in April 1973 the pension was increased from \$5.00 to \$8.00 per week, and in December 1974 – not late December, early December 1974 – the pension was increased from \$8.00 to \$10.00, and this particular supplementary provision is to permit, if approved by this Hon. Chamber, yet another increase in the old age pension from \$10.00 to \$13.00 a week.

1.50 p.m.

That is the record of the Democratic Labour Party, in keeping with the promises it has made to the people of this country in general and to the old age pensioners in particular. I do not propose to speak extensively on this matter. I think the facts speak for themselves and the old age pensioners and the people in this country generally realise that this Party and this Government in accordance with the financial capabilities, as assessed and determined by the Minister of Finance, meets its commitments to the old age pensioners. This is yet another indication, among a series of measures taken ever since 1961, demonstrating that the Democratic Labour Party has the interest of the old age pensioners in this country at heart. When we are returned to power, again, later this year, we will continue to look after the interest of the people of this country including the old age pensioners.

I, therefore, beg to move that this Resolution for the sum of \$2,500,000 do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I hope you will allow me to stick to the Resolution in the same way as you have allowed other hon. members to stray. I do not think the Hon. Minister who introduced the matter laid enough emphasis on this matter. There is an ABC method of dealing with economic and financial matters in Barbados, but it is typical that easy lessons are good for fools and dunces. Even if we were paying the same amount of pensions in 1976 as they were paying in 1961 the cost would have been more. We must clear from the minds of the Opposition at some point that when you are dealing with a fiscal matter you must examine it in its entirety.

There is no point in saying that the Government is only increasing old age pensions by \$1. There are more old age pensioners in Barbados in 1976 than in 1961, so the multiple figure is going to be different. It is not merely a figure of \$3.00. I challenge, without looking in the book, the increase in pensions now. The old age pension now is greater than what the total pension was when it was increased the last time. I understand from the hon. member that it was \$900,000. What I want to find out now is that \$10 million in old age pension was equivalent to the total education vote in 1961. You have to know what you are talking about in 1976. There are different ball games. You cannot play cricket with golf rules. Because we are playing with a ball, some people feel that they can play with any kind of rules. They are talking about old age pensioners, and they know that we cannot spend all of the money in a State on old age pensioners. Every sensible person in community knows that we must have a balanced security. When you are cooking food you do not only look for water. You have to look for other things, too.

Now, when you come to \$2.5 million for old age pensioners, you must regard this as a substantial movement for the old age pensioners. What is more is that it must reflect and show that your social services are improving. Something must be happening. The hon. member says that the economy of Barbados has collapsed. It is a hell of a thing for your economy to collapse and your old people seem to be increasing! This is not an indication of a collapsing society. It is when the people are dying faster that it is a collapsing society. When it is proved that you are spending more on your social services, you will find that the people are living longer and, therefore, you will have more old people to take care of. Now, 25 years ago we did not have as many old people living as we have today where our social services are better.

Let us examine the situation and do not think that we are the worst people in the world. I think sometimes, in our emotional zest for getting at our opponents, we run down our own country. I know that it is a lie. I challenge them when they go outside to attend conferences to say things derogatory of their country similar to what they say in Barbados. Which of them can say that? (*Asides.*) I am not talking about *per capita* income. You can use the domestic product to prove one thing, and you can use the *per capita* income to prove another.

When you want to deal with the facts of life, you have to remember that Barbados has a small population of 250,000 relatively speaking. That is no more than a little village in some places. When you are talking of old age pension in terms of 250,000 people, we are spending a lot of money. This is where Barbadians have to get down to the facts of life. We have relatively high standards in Barbados, and I would like to see the same taste we have running through everything in our society. We have high standards in a relatively small community. In communities in Africa with greater economies than we have, they do not have what we have as yet. In Bonn, which has a bigger population than Barbados, they cannot provide their old age pensioners with what we are providing our old age pensioners with. That is a fact. That is not something that I am asking the United Nations to tell me.

Now, as the Minister said, old age pension did not arise in the House of Assembly. Old age pension arose outside the House of Assembly. Reverend Dodson did a lot for the old people, because at that time the members of the House had no conscience. I know that over the years sometimes you get a re-cycling, and those with social consciences seem to forget them after a time. Some hon. members spoke about the education in this country. The members who sit in this House now are the social recipients of what took place 25 years ago. All of us who sit in here now are the recipients of what the taxpayers paid for 25 years ago. All of us who sit on these benches are not the products of parents who could send us to a private school; so we had to be educated and nurtured by the public purse in one form or another.

2 p.m.

They had to be nurtured by the taxpayers. When we talk about old age pensions, we have to talk about it in the social context. How many people do we pay today? We are paying more old age pensioners and there is no point anybody making any fuss that the Government is not

paying enough. I hear the hon. members on both sides talking about old age pensions and beating off one another. I am on this side and I will say that we on this side have a responsibility. I do not take any credit for saying that we are paying out \$2.5 million. We have to because we are here now and if they get here they cannot reduce it. They were talking about food and about school meals; they cannot take that away either. I dare them to. In England they tried to do these things. There are certain things that are built in in your society and after you put them nobody can take them away. You cannot take away school meals or old age pensions.

What you will find, Mr. Chairman, is that whoever gets into power must live with the facts of life, and the reality of the situation is that if in the next ten years old age pensioners begin to live longer still and you have more of them coming on, you have to look at your old age pensioners because they have to be balanced within your fiscal policy with those people that you have to pay. You have a Fire Brigade Service, you have a Police Service and you have all the other services to run. The total service is a public service, so when you have the total service to run, it is a question of a distribution of the resources throughout your total service. What we have to learn now if we want to be serious politicians is to stop this nonsense we are talking now and get down to the facts of life and tell the people that we intend to have a redistribution by starting with ourselves. I have told members in here that we should start with ourselves by cutting out the food in here when people outside have to pay for the food they are eating, and all of us are getting salaries for coming here. Why do you want food to be served in here? Why don't you pass a Resolution from over there asking the Government to cut it out? If charity begins at home, show that you are going to start there. The point has been made as to what about the staff. (*Asides*) If you do not get a quorum because you are feeding them, the final result will be that if people are only coming to the House of Assembly knowing that they will get a meal, I would give them a meal and stop the pay.

Mr. Chairman, I was one who voted for members being paid, not of the same type who come here now, but on the basis that a poor man should not be deprived from giving service to his people based on impecuniary circumstances, not with the idea that you are coming here to get a meal. It is nonsense and a waste of public funds anyhow. If you have to feed the Clerks and the servants of the House, you should make provision to feed them, but do not make provision to feed

any of us. We do not have any claim whatsoever to getting any money spent on us to feed us. Let the members over there bring in a Resolution saying that they do not want that. That is what I have said any of you should get up and say you believe in it if you have the courage. If you want to start, start where the beginning should be, but do not have this snipping and these inner prejudices and things that you do not believe in.

Mr. Chairman, I have no compunction in my mind about a matter like this. (*Asides*). Time does not matter with me. I have come here to do work and I was never a clock watcher. It's the Chairman's business if he wants to watch the clock. When the time comes I will bring my speech to an end.

I am serious about these matters because we waste time on frivolities and give wrong impressions to people. Some of us, when we see a few people in the Gallery, do not know what to say and get up and make a big thing about old age pensions as if it is something that has just come into fashion. This has been going on and will go on for a long time, even when we begin to draw old age pensions if we are eligible, because a member of the Opposition said that he is going to take away pensions from members of the House. I saw a Labour Party member die in the almshouse and I said that no member of the House of Assembly should have to reach the stage of dying in a public institution like that, and you should save people from these impecuniary circumstances. You have to have institutional structures to save some people from themselves, and there is no point thinking that you are doing something to me. There are some people who do not need a pension. You do not have to provide a pension for people like me; so I do not need anybody to do anything for a person like me. They have never done it; I had to do it for myself and that is why I can stand up to all of this. That is why I do not have any respect for people who are not sincere. Hypocrisy does not mean anything to me. A hypocrite should be blindfolded and put at the end of the careenage and pushed over because I have no uses for them. When you talk about these things, this is where I say I do not speak to hypocrites, I shun them.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to issues of national importance, you have to realise where you are. This is a matter where I feel you should not accuse the Government for doing it because it is an election year. The other side knows that you cannot deny some help and assistance to the old age pensioners in Barbados. There is more disguised poverty in Barbados than you will

realise, but Barbadians like a little bit of showing off. They like you to believe that they have more than they have, but some of us who move around would know. I hope that this will bring some sort of relief to the old age pensioners and I hope that some of the inspectors who go to inspect some of the old age pensioners' homes will have a little more charity and understanding, and that the old woman does not have to hide the television set or the radio under the bed or cover them with a sheet in order to get an old age pension. They should use a little more charity and understanding about these things so that they will not be deprived of a pension.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, at this stage I think it is convenient to have the suspension.

I beg to move that Your Honour do not report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.15 p.m.

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

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

On the resumption:

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At the time of interruption the hon. member for St. Michael West had completed his address.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with old age pensioners I consider it my duty to speak

on their behalf and to commend this Government for the increase which will be given to these poor people. It is an increase of approximately 30 per cent for this year, and if we consider the amount which they do receive at present, it will be 60 per cent next year.

Mr. Chairman when I first entered this House of Assembly I introduced a Resolution requesting the Government to deal with the payment of pensions to these people by cheques instead of their having to go to the various paying centres for the amount which is granted to them weekly. This has taken a very long time, Sir, but I am very happy today that I have been told that the system of paying these people by cheques has been introduced, and I have no doubt that in the very near future they will not have to inconvenience themselves by having to go to the various centres for the money.

Now, this proves beyond the shadow of a doubt the interest which I have at all times displayed in these workers. I am not ashamed to say that they have played a very important role in my becoming a member of this House. These people have contributed to the economy of this country, and now that they have reached old age it is the duty of any Government to do its utmost for them so that they can enjoy a better standard of living.

I am aware of the difficulties which confront them. I am aware of their hardships; but we have to take into consideration that we do not only deal with old age pensioners. We also have to think about people in this country who are incapacitated, people who are unable to work and they all have to be taken care of. Some of them receive a maximum payment and this is \$8 a week. Therefore when we come to deal with the increase to pensioners, the Minister of Finance has also got to think about the number of people who are receiving national assistance.

I make that point to prove to you that the increase which has been given is a reasonable one. If this country could afford it, I would be glad, I would be happy to know that we could pay them \$25 a week; but when we think about the slender resources of this country, and when we have to depend on the Sugar Industry and Tourism to run the affairs of the country, I must say that we have done our best.

I can assure you that these old people, the majority of whom were agricultural workers, will be grateful to the Government for the assistance they will receive in the very near future. I would

like to say how happy I am today. It is a tonic to my mind to know that with all the problems this Government has, it has found it possible to increase old age pensions from \$10 a week to \$13 a week this year and to \$16 next year.

Mr. Chairman, when I first entered this House the amount was approximately \$2 a week. Today these people will receive \$13 as soon as you pass this Resolution. I would like to say, regardless of the criticisms, regardless of who may say that we could pay \$40 a week, I am here to say how grateful I am to the Government, and especially to the Minister of Finance who has found it possible to do something to assist in alleviating the hardships which these poor people suffer.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be generous like the member for St. Philip South in passing encomiums to the Government for what is their bounding duty. I see no encomiums to give to the Minister of Finance or the Government as a whole for the scandalous attitude they have adopted to the most under privileged section of this community. There is nothing in this Resolution other than the widow's mite which is being given to these people in the community who are more deprived than anyone else.
3.25 p.m.

In the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto in 1971 we made it clear that people were entitled to a minimum standard of living below which nobody should go. That form of words was subjected on the platform to severe criticism, and of course some people were gullible enough to misrepresent this as meaning that we were reducing people to minimum standards as compared with maximum standards. What we say is that regardless of whether you are an old age pensioner or a person in active employment in Barbados, there must be a minimum amount of money available for you to provide at least the basics of living; and those of use who have constituencies as mixed as the one I represent see the contrast in living styles in this country between the people at the lower rung of the ladder and those at the higher rung of the ladder.

Now there is no doubt in my mind at all that old age pensioners have consistently been badly treated, and that there are several of them who depend on hand-outs and gifts from people in this community. I see no boast about making any idea about it has increased from \$2 to \$13. That is in ten years of the Government's rule but when you look at the true value of money and

the fall in the purchasing of the dollar in relation to the cost of living, and when you analyse it also in the light of the cost of goods and services from overseas you will find that the true increase is nowhere in the region that the people are talking about.

Now all these old age pensioners are most of them below the minimum line for the standard of living, and if you look at the per capita income of Barbados you would find that they do not qualify even near to 50% of what is the per capita income of this country. Now Government must realign its sights in dealing with the underprivileged in the community. I would have thought that if you were looking at classification in wages and salaries in the country, you would want to rationalize it and use the resources of the country — not the resources of the Minister of Finance — getting in here and making it appear as though the Minister of Finance is taking the very people's money and doing them some service to give them a little dish-out of \$3. Not his resources; it is a question of how we use the resources of this country to satisfy the people who need them most; and I cannot give Government any praise for telling me that in this year of 1976 of our Lord, that to give people \$3 on \$10 and talking about a 30% increase sounds a big thing. If we give a dollar on a dollar it is 100% increase but it has no reality in terms of purchasing power; no real value in terms of purchasing power. What is the purchasing power of the \$3 that you are giving them when you admit that the cost of living has gone up over 100% in three years and over 320% in the last five to six years? What is the value of that? Let me hear the Government come in here and tell me that they are going to initiate schemes by which old age pensioners who are below the poverty line are getting subsidies by way of free food in this country. That is what I want to hear them tell me; that they have proper vouchers to get that sort of service free. Let me hear the Government come in here and tell me that they are going to stop the policy at the Housing Authority where the MPs like ourselves have to beg for old age pensioners in our constituencies to get proper housing and, housing is being distributed on the basis of if you know the Chairman of the Housing Authority; he has to pass it first. That is what I want to hear the Government tell me.

I am not giving the Government any encomiums for things like this. The hon. member for St. James has consistently in this House urged the Government to have a different attitude to the underprivileged. What we are doing in this

society and what we continue to do is to keep the class society and to continue the classification that has existed from a long time ago. That is what has happened. Just look at all of the structures that the Government has come in here with. They keep a classification, and if you are an old age pensioner you are going to die an old age pensioner, waiting for a handout. Proper planning would teach us that if we would cut back and improve the efficiency in Government we would be giving people their rightful due in this community.

What people want their politicians to recognize today, Mr. Chairman, is that the first thing is that we must be efficient in the use of the resources of the country, and one of the reasons why the Government is in financial straights and cannot answer the position, is that there has been great inefficiency in this Government in the last few years. Its External Affairs Bill has skyrocketed and cannot be justified. The Government could come in here on the Capital Estimates and ask for half a million dollars to buy two houses for diplomats — almost a quarter of what they are giving old age pensioners now. Government could come in here and confess that they wasted \$350,000 in a crematorium; they could bring down figures year after year in ten years of DLP rule and show us that they have lost \$40 million almost in their inefficient management of statutory boards.

If they want to know how they must pay civil servants and how to look properly after old age pensioners, they must get proper Government. I doubt very much if the productivity that one is recognizing, even from on high, is worth it. So I have no encomiums for any Minister on this. It is his duty if he wants to be Minister of Finance, to be able to run the country properly. Everybody knows the old age pensioners have needs. That is his duty. Praise him for what? His contribution to the matter is very little. It is coming out of the gross national product of Barbados and the gross national resources, so there is no praise on that.

I would have thought that these economic wizards would by now not be confessing that the tight economic circumstances have the country in a hard way. The Minister of Finance's justification, as I understand it, for not having more money is that the tight economic circumstances have brought about this situation.....

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What about the tight economic

circumstances of Great Britain and New York?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. FORDE: I accept the point of order, Sir. The Minister has not only achieved the same inefficiency that has occurred in Great Britain but he has exceeded that in New York. That is what has happened. Do not bring me any overseas position and say what about this somewhere else; because it has happened in New York, must it happen here? It has been proven in New York that Majors prior to be have been very inefficient in managing the resources; and as for the United Kingdom, what has happened is the United Kingdom must happen here too. There has been more millionaires made in conservative rule and under some of the labour governments — the same thing has happened in this Government; you can see them daily driving on the roads. Sixty-seven thousand dollars in cars, buying up plantations, praising the Government, and they are making the millions, and the old age pensioners begging for \$3. That is what has happened. I accept that point of order.

Whenever it comes to the question of talking about using national resources to help people who are less well off than any of us are, even if I sound as though I am a rabble rouser, I will accept that criticism, Sir, because I was brought along at the time when as I understand it, we were trying to move the concept of people from the concept of the class society, the concept of handouts to making people believe that we could equalize not only opportunities but equalize living standards; and therefore it hurts me when I see that we are not achieving it, to hear that we have to heap praise on ourselves for circumstances such as these.

3.35 p.m.

We are not achieving it, we have not achieved it, and in my view we are delaying the achievement of this situation, and that is where I would like to hear what plans the Government has. I want the Government to tell me what plans they have for changing this attitude when we come in here and pat ourselves on the back for giving somebody \$3.00 on \$10.00 after the several years they have served this country and helped to contribute to the resources. That is what I want to hear, I don't want to hear all this praise.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, we have heard contributions to these debates on pensions, we have heard contributions from the Eric Fly of the

Trade Union Movement, we have heard contributions from the hon. member for St. Philip South whose argument was at the level that any increase in the old age pensions the old age pensioners should be glad for, but we have heard very few remarks of quality.

There are certain issues of principle which have divided the two Parties on the matter of old age pensions. The Prime Minister quite clearly took the view that since the problem of the old age pensioners is a diminishing one, because there are fewer and fewer old age pensioners as time goes on...(Mr. WALCOTT: The reverse is true). I heard the voice of an outright idiot saying the reverse is true, a man who should know better after many years in Parliament.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, when the hon. member talks about hearing the voice of an idiot, you know it is improper to say that you hear the voice of an idiot in here, because when the hon. member is talking about people who have done well during the BLP rule, you have done well and I think it is outright viciousness on your part.

Mr. ADAMS: I really didn't think that Eric Fly was in the House today.

Mr. WALCOTT: The difference between you and Eric Fly is that you are a lawyer and you haven't gone to prison yet.

Mr. ADAMS: I still didn't think Eric Fly was in the House today. I didn't know you were Eric Fly's friend, Sir, because I heard you being told you were Eric Fly's friend, I thought you were a man above that, I thought it was another candidate from St. George who had him as chief canvasser, not you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now, I would like both hon. members, and all hon. members, to speak relative to this Resolution and let us leave out the flies, the donkeys,....

Mr. ADAMS: And all other members of the animal kingdom....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. ADAMS:.....so clearly delineated by certain hon. members on the other side, the most recent being the hon. member for Christ Church North Central.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Therefore I would like the hon. member for St. Thomas to keep this debate at a high standard. This is what I am asking.

Mr. ADAMS: I am making a straightforward statement. It is a fact that the number of old age pensioners has not increased, and if the hon. member who sits on the National Insurance Board as a member does not know the reason why, he could only be condemned in the terms which I have used already in here. The numbers are diminishing because people are getting National Insurance.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, I don't want to cross the hon. member, the hon. member must not state that as a fact, because there are more people over 68 in Barbados today than there were before. That cannot be a fact, that is when you qualify, what the National Insurance does does not in any way prevent more people from qualifying.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member hasn't understood that we are not talking about people over 68, that we are talking about old age pensioners. Does he not understand that the 68 doesn't mean that you are an old age pensioner? I am talking about old age pensioners, nobody can qualify as an old age pensioner if they are drawing a National Insurance pension. I don't want to use these words unnecessarily, I won't say fascist — is that the word that is unparliamentary? — the great sagamore, the werrouac, those words are in the dictionary, of the Barbados Workers' Union; the inkosi of trade unionism. He can look them up to see if they are good, bad or indifferent. He does not understand you don't qualify to be an old age pensioner if you are receiving a National Insurance pension, no matter how old you are? I am talking about old age pensioners, and the number is going down, and these are only prefatory remarks.

The problem of the old age pensioners is a diminishing one, and the two parties have taken different lines on this problem. The Government says the problem is a diminishing one and has given us this answer in the past, therefore it is unnecessary to make any particular sacrifice at revenue level to help the old age pensioners. I have heard these arguments used in here against the hon. member for St. James, because sooner or later all of them will be getting National Insurance pensions and you won't have any more old age pensioners. We have said that since the problem is a diminishing one, that we could make a sacrifice at this time for people who cannot get a National Insurance pension because they didn't come along at a time when the National Insurance was going.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the hon. member knows that previously no person could qualify for an old age pension who was drawing a pension from any other source either. They wouldn't give them, so it doesn't have to be National Insurance.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member should do two things. He should first of all give me credit for knowledge about what I am talking, and secondly give me credit for understanding. I believe he has been exposed to the first of those, but unfortunately every one of his interruptions obviously are not points of order, and equally obviously reveal a lack of understanding what is going on. I am not in the slightest interested in his last point of order. It is quite irrelevant, I am talking about now, I am not suggesting that National Insurance is wrong because it deprives people of an old age pension, I am just saying that as a fact the problem with the old age pensioners is diminishing because more and more people will qualify for National Insurance pensions, and therefore the volume of pensions that has to be paid out would be less and less as the years go on, and we say that in these circumstances we should be prepared to support the old age pensioners with a pension at least as generous as the National Insurance pension.

We should be prepared to do it and it will be a financial sacrifice which will diminish as the number of pensioners diminishes, and this has always been the division between the parties. People in here on the other side, hon. members, seem to be afraid sometimes of facts and figures. They orate on emotional issues, they talk about the members' luncheons. Are we prepared to give up lunch as members of the House of Assembly? It is my belief that for the members of the House — I am just speaking about the members, I do not mean the other people who get lunch — because more people are fed out of the House of Assembly luncheon vote, more than twice as there are members. The luncheon vote is for 50 people, there are only 24 members and all of us do not eat; let us get that clear. There are 26 people, policemen, reporters, servants of the House, Clerks of the House who eat out of the luncheon vote, and I doubt that more than 20 members have ever been known to eat in one day. I will say, without any fear of contradiction, that you have never had since I have been in the House, more than 20 members eating in there and it represents to us at \$10.00 each no more

than, say, \$25.00 a month, because the House meets around five times in two months, and I am not counting the vacations.

3.45 p.m.

The House meets around five times in two months, and I am not counting the vacation; so do not say that members eat the food. Something that is worth, perhaps, \$25 a month for each member? There is no big thing of \$25 a month between 24 people. It is only a foolish emotional issue being dragged as a red herring through a debate for \$1.3 million. The reason members have lunch in here is because the House sits until after two o'clock, and it is difficult for people to eat so late outside. That is one of the main reasons. I would like to dispose of these arguments that you are a hypocrite if you eat lunch in the House and yet say that the old age pensioners should have more money. I say that a man is a hypocrite when he asks private employers for a 60% increase and agrees with the Government for a 35% because he has to give general political support to the Government. I say that is hypocrisy, and that is what I do not like. You are giving general support to a Government, perhaps, even above the support which you give to the interest of the people on whose behalf you are acting outside of Parliament. I do not want to hear any of that.

With regard to the amount of the increase, the same remark which I made yesterday about the cost of living increase and increases given to Public Servants equally applies to old age pensioners, but with a difference. Old age pensioners clearly are not spending money on education. There cannot be many old age pensioners who have to take the education part of the cost of living increase into account. For the most part they are not spending money on transportation; they are not spending money on the miscellaneous aspects of the cost-of-living index; one presumes that a house is already bought for them, and they are not spending money particularly on housing. Their expenditure is on the basic necessities of life. Basic necessities have gone up much more than the cost-of-living index as a whole. Food, electricity, and so on represent the expenditure of an old age pensioner. There is also the principal consideration to be looked at when you are dealing with these people.

The Minister quite properly pointed out to us in debate, as I said on the last Resolution

some time ago, that it is meaningless to give a percentage to railway pensioners who are getting something like 30s a month if they are engine drivers, unless they are subsidiary employees of the railway. Now, \$6 a month, in other words, is no pension at all. You have to give those people a flat increase. It is no use to give old age pensioners a 35% increase on \$2.10, or a 100% increase on \$2.10, because although that might represent the cost of living increase at a certain stage, yet the absolute value of what people have to buy has gone up more than the percentage that the increase has allowed for. That is the whole point.

When the baskets of goods were brought in here, and we realised that old age pensioners cannot afford to buy meat, this, that, and the other, it is merely to tell them that they have the same percentage as the increase in the cost of living. If the pension was always inadequate; if at \$10.00 a week it is insufficient to buy food, pay for electricity, and provide a little quiet entertainment such as, perhaps, a bus drive on a Sunday afternoon to hear the Police Band — goodness knows the old pensioner cannot afford any more. If it is inadequate at \$2.00, at \$6.00, at \$10.00, increasing it by a certain percentage is not going to make it adequate.

You have to keep on increasing the old age pension until, as the hon. member for Christ Church West in his very able speech has said, you reach a stage of a minimum standard of living. Until you reach a stage of minimum amount on which a man or a woman in Barbados needs to support life in 1976. Now, \$13.00 a week is not such a minimum amount. That is the argument. It is a matter of common sense that the Opposition is going to support any increase for old age pensioners. If there is one thing the member for St. James is bound to go down in the political history of this country for, it is his consistent advocacy, over seven or eight years, for an increased old age pension. Nobody can say he is doing it for selfish, political reasons. I do not think that St. James is a parish which has an exceptionally large number of old people. As a matter of fact, the oldest constituency in Barbados — it may surprise some people — is Christ Church West. Christ Church West has the highest average in any constituency in Barbados. The youngest is St. Joseph and so on. Many of us are in very young constituencies. The next youngest is St. Philip North. St. Thomas is a constituency with an enormous number of young people and so is St. James. The hon. member for Christ Church West and the hon. member for the City who mostly represent constituencies where

the overwhelming majority of the people are young put forward a claim for old age pensioners, they are not putting it forward for any selfish reasons. They are putting it forward because this is a deprived class of the community. They have not yet reached that minimal standard of life that all our citizens can expect to reasonably aspire to in this year of 1976. This is why we have been pressing for a higher old age pension.

Now, I emphasise that percentages are a waste of time where people are starting from nowhere. If you start from nowhere, then a 1,000% increase gets you nowhere. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, although we think that the pension is a very low one, we will do anything on this side of the House to assist the old age pensioners to a better life.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on this side have on more than one occasion mentioned that I have tried to champion the cause of old age pensioners, and that I would go down in the parliamentary records of this country as having tried my best to improve things for old age pensioners. Quite rightly one of my colleagues said that I have never done this for political gain. This came forcibly to my mind in 1966 whilst campaigning at Springhead. I saw something that I would never like to see again. I saw the living conditions of a human being. She told me that she was 66 years old; she was unable to work; she had no relatives, and her condition was horrible. She had a dog outside of that house as her only companion and, perhaps, protector. It is from that day until now that deep inside of me I have had this feeling and sympathy for very old people.

Mr. Chairman, it is immaterial to me whether you are white or black. I feel that after one has given so much to the country in the very dark years that one should be entitled in the evening of his years to a proper way of life. That is how I feel about the matter. The Minister introducing this Resolution emphasised the amount of money which they are now giving to old age pensioners. When we pass this Resolution in here today it is going to work out at \$13.00 a week.

3.55 p.m.

A sum of \$13 a week over a period of 20 years will give you a total of \$13,520. Let us assume that the person at the age of 65 lived until age 85, that person would have received from Government for their contribution \$13,520. Mr. Chairman, that person would have received half the amount of money that a Minister of

Government is getting in one year, and you hear the stupid argument coming from the Government side about a person earning \$16 a month as compared with earning \$1,500 a month today. I can never see the argument. It is such an argument that one cannot really examine it as coming from persons whose intelligence should lead them to look at the matter in a positive and constructive manner.

When I was 16 years of age that is 31 years ago, I paid Dr. Cummins \$2.00 which my father gave me, for an examination. If Dr. Cummins at that time had seen 20 patients in one day, he would have earned \$40 as against some of the doctors in this country today where one visit is \$40, therefore you had to examine what the country could afford then and pay out what the country's revenue could afford. You cannot come in here today and say that the Government is paying out over \$10 million to old age pensioners and in 1961 they were only paying out \$900,000.

I have heard the hon. member for St. Michael West say in here so often that when he came to Parliament they never paid M.Ps, and it was only in 1955 when they had achieved Ministerial status that you started paying members of Parliament. What we are looking at today is that there was economic expansion in the entire world and Barbados was caught up in this. When you examine the cost of living today as against what you are going to give an old age pensioner, it is here where the Opposition has to be critical of Government policies. You cannot come and say you gave old age pensioners \$1.80 or \$2.40 in 1961 when at that time we were bringing into the country some \$32 million, as much as the Government boasts it spends on education. But there is economic growth. After World War II the entire world was in an upsurge in their economy. After the battering of Europe, North America was able to turn out all sorts of machines, people had money coming to them and it probably went on until 1974 when you had this little recession; so talking about giving old age pensioners \$3.00 a week more is scandalous. I have with me an old age pensioner's card and a letter from her asking me to help her pay her water rates of \$8.92, and I am sorry that the Minister of Education is not in his seat because he told me it was over a three months' period she had to pay this and she could have put down 10 cents a day, that scandalous Minister.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now you must withdraw the word "scandalous"

Mr. CRAIG: I will withdraw "scandalous Minister", but I will say that the remark coming from the Minister was scandalous. How can you sit down in here and say that an old age pensioner when she has to buy a sandwich loaf for 65 cents could put down 10 cents a day out of \$10 a week to pay her water rates? The same old lady has a card from the Coolie Man whom she is paying 50 cents a week for two dresses that she took from him.

When I came in here and said there should be a means test to determine exactly what is the position with old age pensioners in this country, members on the other side including the Minister of Education said that the Government could not afford another cent for old age pensioners and that Government could only afford as much as it can put out; but when the salaries for the members of Parliament were to be decided, the same Minister said that he had made a sacrifice to come home to Barbados and was only getting \$2,000 a month and he could have been doing better than that. So \$10 a week was good enough for an old age pensioner and she must put down 10 cents a week to pay water rates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I try very hard in my little way. I am no economist and I do not believe that Ricks Miller is one either; I do not believe that Darnley Greenidge is an economist. It is true that Happy Bryan was his financial consultant, but I know nobody in the world could be a financial consultant to the man I know as Darnley Greenidge. You might be able to consult with him about money, but not to be able to tell him how to spend it or use it, and therefore we have our own approach in arriving at our little methods.

I sat down and telephoned a few supermarket owners and I asked them what it would really cost in food per week for a sick pensioner, not a strong one who would eat a good meal, and I was told it could not pass \$23.87, and that did not include beef, butter or kerosene oil,

Since 1974, not an election year, I came in here and begged the Government to give old age pensioners not less than \$25 per week and furthermore that they should be exempt from paying water rates and they should be able to have free medical attention from all the doctors in this country either at specialist level or general practitioner level, and they should be able to go to any drug store and get free medicine, but I was told in here that I was talking nonsense and to do it when we get into power.

4.05 p.m.

This is what I was told, Sir, now today the Government rushes in, as the member for St. Michael West rightly said in an ad hoc fashion to put on \$3.00, and they cannot tell you how they arrived at \$3.00 a week more for old age pensioners. Even if you gave them a 100 per cent increase it would only bring them to \$20 a week which would be the lowest income level in this country.

They were walking about in old dresses as we heard from the other side in 1961. I know that they are still doing it, and they are hungry because they do not have the facilities, not that they like to do it. I beseech the Government. I said that I was going to support the Government on any measure that they have brought which would benefit old age pensioners or any pensioners because they are the most unfortunate ones in this country. Many of them have grandchildren overseas. These grandchildren started sending them a little something; but since they have started to raise their own family, these old people are forgotten.

These are the people who suffered during the years, people who went through the riots and were shot down. They made more sacrifices than you and I will ever be able to make. The Minister of Finance talked about foreign reserves in this country and could lend Jamaica \$10 million, but he cannot afford a single cent more than \$3.00 a week increase for old age pensioners, a 30 per cent increase.

I am going to call on the Minister to do this country one favour, that is to re-examine this situation, this Resolution. We are not speaking of any political gimmick. Let us forget this type of talk. When we get outside all of us will do 'dixie' out there. You will not be in it. I am sorry about that. The plea I am putting up here today also relates to you because you will soon be a pensioner, and I am sure that you would not like to be treated as scandalously as the others.

I am calling on the ~~Leader~~ of the House to re-examine this Resolution. Have a survey carried out. Do a means test whereby you can find out the really poverty stricken persons and the ones slightly better off, so that those people who gave so much to this country can say in the evening of their days that they have got some reward.

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I will be very short on this matter, but I think that it is important to say two things in connection with this Resolution. The Leader of the Opposition a few weeks ago referred to a situation where he

indicated that we accepted 60 per cent from private employers, but only 30 per cent from the Government which the Barbados Workers' Union supported. I want to say that that is hypocritical and practically criminal for the Leader of the Opposition to make a statement of this nature.

Mr. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I heard a lot of words bandied about in here over a period of time. The member said that it was criminal for the Leader of the Opposition to do so and so. I am asking that the member withdraw that remark. Seek advice from your Clerks again on this occasion. (*Aside:* He said practically criminal) Whether it is practical or impractical, he said that it was criminal I am asking the hon. member for St. Lucy to withdraw the remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member for St. Lucy to withdraw the word "criminal".

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: It is hypocritical for the Leader of the Opposition to have made a statement like that when the BWU has put the position to the Government for a 60 per cent increase over a two year period. It is nothing short of being hypocritical when we have stated in no uncertain terms what our position is on this.

I would defy the Leader of the Opposition to substantiate the statement that he has made about accepting 30 per cent. He has a facility for confusing the situation. Any opportunity which presents itself for providing additional money for old age pensioners is welcomed. We would like to see a position where we can make representation for more money on behalf of the workers; but we recognised that if we allow the situation to go unchecked, people will ask for all sorts of fantastic increases.

I do not think that anyone on this side will deny that old age pensioners should get more money from the Government if it was possible. I want to say that whatever this increase is, it will bring some measure of relief to these people and will be well received by the old age pensioners of this country who will be thankful for any improvement in this particular area.

I would like, however, to say that I think that the hon. member for St. James made an interesting point when he called for a complete survey of the way in which this scheme operates, and the criteria used to determine whether a person gets old age pension or not. I am sure that all

members have come across situations where people have been given old age pensions and others have been denied; and although we are not professionals in this particular field, we can see that one person who might be in a better position than another person gets old age pension while a person in a less fortunate position is not getting.

I know a case in point. There is a situation in a constituency where a person has reached the age of 65. This person has a motor car and is living in fairly comfortable surroundings. Another person who has reached the age of 65 and who was an agricultural labourer, is now taking a job here and there, and because of this the Welfare Officer has excluded him from getting this pension. I agree with this point which the member for St. James has made that some proper survey, some proper method of evaluating old age pensions should be taken into consideration.

4.15 p.m.

I want to join in the plea for having a proper survey done, and rather than leaving it to the whims and fancies of one individual because you have a situation where a person might make an application for old age pension, you go to the Welfare Officer, the Welfare Officer turns it down and gives you a form and tells you that you can appeal; but what is really the effect of the appeal? Because when it goes before the Appeal Board, Mr. Chairman, the Welfare Officer still has a lot to say as to whether or not this person is going to get the old age pension. I do not think this is fair.

I think that a proper and a more equitable manner of determining whether or not a person should get an old age pension should be taken into consideration.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the longer you remain in here the more hypocrisy you hear from some members on the other side. Now the hon. member for St. James said that in 1974 he asked for an increase for old age pensioners to the tune of \$25. This is untrue. What he did ask for was \$15, but this is how he dances the twist. We are giving them by April next year \$16, so he must come one better, so he is coming today to say he said in 1974 that they would have \$25. What he did say was that they should have \$15. We are giving them \$16 now so he has to appear to be a little ahead of us so therefore he goes to \$25.

Now when we talk about the contribution to old age pensioners in this country we have got

to take the whole contribution in its totality. If the hon. member wants to be fair he would point out the other benefits which old age pensioners are receiving from this Government which they did not receive and which indeed they were denied under the Government of the Barbados Labour Party. I am going to point out a few; but before I go to that I will state here that the question of means test was increased from, I think it was \$3.60 a week under us, to as high as \$15 a week. In other words it was proven under the Government of the Barbados Labour Party that if an old age pensioner was making \$3.60 a week, that old age pensioners could not get old age pensions. That was under the Barbados Labour Party. We increased it to \$15 a week; but look at the things the old age pensioners are getting from this Government which they were not getting from the Government under the Barbados Labour Party. (ASIDE) To talk about the means test? We inherited the means test from them and we are now giving further consideration to the means test to see whether there should be a means test at all, or what it should be.

Now look at the benefits. He said that the old age pensioner had to put by ten cents a day, or something like that, for water rates. This is nonsense, Mr. Chairman. No old age pensioner who has in water is made to pay water rates because they are exempted from paying water rates. As long as they apply for the exemption they get it. The Chief Engineer of the Waterworks Department would not know who is an old age pensioner but as long as they apply for the exemption from water rates they get their water rates free. But the hon. member for St. James is a representative of the people of St. James, and also a representative and chief spokesman for old age pensioners, and he does not know the facts. He does not know that as long as they apply for exemption from water rates, that they get their water free. (ASIDE) I am stating as a fact that every old age pensioner who has applied for exemption from water rates are exempted and there are some of them who do not pay any water rates. Furthermore they could not get an exemption under the Barbados Labour Party because none of them was in a position to have water attached to their homes under the Government of the Barbados Labour Party. None. Look at the number of connections that we have made in this country. The old age pensioner has to go at the standpipe, under the Barbados Labour Party Government, but not so under the Government of the Democratic Labour Party. These are contributions which we have made to old age pensioners in this country. Further, every old age pensioner gets his house or

her house repaired, and if the house is irreparable, is given a house in which to live until the day or the date of his or her death. They never got this under the Barbados Labour Party. Everyone of them is entitled to having a house repaired and if the house is incapable of being repaired they apply to the welfare section of the National Housing Corporation and they are provided with a house. This has been going on for years. This is not something that started yesterday. This is a fact.

Then the hon. member talked about contributions to old age pensioners. They never had it so good. They do not have to pay bus fares; they travel on the buses free.

Then the hon. member came in here and said about they having to pay for medical attention. This is nonsense. They do not have to pay for medical attention. The district medical officer in every parish.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of elucidation, Sir.

Mr. EDWARDS: I am not sitting on a point of elucidation.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The member is wrong when he said that I came in here and said that the old age pensioners do not get free medical attention. What I did say was that I advocated whereby the old age pensioners should be able to go to any medical practitioner and get free medical attention in any district, and not necessarily to the PMO or the DMO. That is what I said, Sir.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, the Government provides a district medical officer that succeeded what was known as the parochial medical officer in every district, to look after the medical care of all people who come under the head of Public Assistance.
4.25 p.m.

Today this vote we are dealing with is a vote under National Assistance for old age pensioners. All of them are entitled to free medical attention and drugs. You provide the service in the parish for them. What is the hon. member telling us? That you must tell an old age pensioner that he must leave St. Lucy to go to St. Philip to be treated by a doctor in St. Philip for Government to pay for it, when the Government has provided a medical officer in St. Lucy to look after the interests of that pensioner? They are also exempt from property tax, they pay no property tax. All

of these are benefits given to old age pensioners in this country from this Government.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Bearing in mind that they have no property, would the hon. member like to tell us how many old age pensioners actually are exempt from property tax? Have you ever heard about a means test?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am sure that the Minister of Welfare, if the hon. member brought in a substantive question, would give him the answer. How does he expect me to tell him? I am just an ordinary member of this Chamber as the hon. member, if I want to find out how many they are I would have to go and ask the Minister. He can bring in a substantive question on that matter, he is not asking me, I am not a Minister.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, has the hon. member obviously not misunderstood my question? Am I not right that if you are a property owner by and large you can't get an old age pension? So the exemption from property tax of old age pensioners is a well nigh meaningless exemption?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. I can assist, I think, slightly. It is a matter which is dealt with by the Relief Board. It is a financial matter and all the old age pensioners apply for relief under the Relief Board, so they are granted relief.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, you allowed the Leader of the House to lend some assistance in the debate and I am asking the same thing. What the Leader of the House ought to remember is this, that when the Minister of Finance was pressed on this particular tax exemption matter for the old age pensioners, he specifically stated that it was a tax against the property. In other words, that the relief that would have been given to the owner the old age pensioner, still remained as a tax against the property. That is the point at issue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. Neither was the Leader of the House's contribution a point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: But, Mr. Chairman, I am in a position to state now that if the hon. member would reflect they should be ashamed to talk about taxing old age pensioners, because they do not know the facts. During the time the Barbados Labour Party was in power there was a woman in St. Lucy by the name of Rhoda Franklyn who

owed \$4.97 in tax and they put the old lady — she was 97 years old — in court for it. The Barbados Labour Party did it.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, at that time, to the best of my knowledge, that would have been under Local Government and not Central Government, so the Barbados Labour Party was in control of Central Government. (Mr. ADAMS: The Vestry).

Mr. EDWARDS: You see, he has come right back home. The Barbados Labour Party dominated the Northern District Council. They appointed the Aldermen, they had the majority — unless there were two parties — but I know that the Barbados Labour Party controlled the Northern District Council when Rhoda Franklyn of St. Lucy was put in court for \$4.97 for taxes at the age of 97.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order, Sir, the same Rhoda Franklyn the hon. member is referring to was the best friend of Mr. Cameron Tudor, at the time a member of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is because Rhoda Franklyn was the best friend of Mr. Cameron Tudor that the Barbados Labour Party put her in court for \$4.97 at the age of 97 for taxes.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, all of this is going on. It is well known that the Rhoda Franklyn issue was carried on by Mr. Tudor who told her not to pay the tax and then told the people of the Council to put her in court so as to make a political issue of it. Why has he got to revive it after all of these years? It is well known at the time that Mr. Tudor was exposed as not willing to pull his pocket to pay the \$2.00 but tried to get the woman involved for political purposes. Why go over all of this at this stage?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule that this matter stands closed. The hon. member has three minutes more to speak. No more Rhoda or roads, no more courts or else, we will deal now with \$2.5 million for old age pensioners, and since Rhoda is dead and gone, let her rest in peace.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure that she is dead. I am talking about old age pensions, I am talking about tax bills which the hon. member for St. James brought in here waving about, when he himself as a representative

of the people did not know that these people could be exempt from tax. That's what I am saying. Furthermore, since 1956 the hon. member here, the Union boss, the hon. member for St. Michael West, was asking for the introduction of a.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir, I do not appreciate being called the Union boss, I am General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point well taken.

Mr. EDWARDS: I beg your pardon, the hon. member for St. Michael West, the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, came in here since 1956 asking for the implementation of a Provident Fund Scheme for sugar workers. Those people, who are not old age pensioners, had to wait ten or eleven years after that to get a Provident Fund Scheme. They are now benefiting from \$14.00 a month under the Provident Fund Scheme which is added to the \$16.00 which they had from 1st April, plus all the benefits provided for them under the Democratic Labour Party, and then you find people coming in here criticising the Democratic Labour Party, saying they are not doing enough for old age pensioners. I submit that they never had it so good, they will never have it so good,.....

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The member referred to some house being pulled down. If the hon. member were allowed to go into St. Michael West he would see next to Westbury Cemetery a house which the Government pushed down and is still there up to now.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I never mentioned anything about a house being pushed down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I never mentioned the removal of any house. The hon. member is in dreamland, he is not in this Chamber, because I did not mention anything like that. What I am saying is that they have never had it so good, they will never have it so good unless and until the Democratic Labour Party is returned, which will inevitably happen when we call an election.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, it is time that this matter of old age pensioners is put in its

right perspective, it is time that the Democratic Labour Party Government gets its priorities right. I am going to bring a woman's view to this now. I have heard a lot of nonsense coming from the other side today about old age pensions. I seriously doubt that anybody on that side has recently gone into a corner shop, because the old age pensioners cannot afford to go into any supermarket, for the bare necessities of life.

4.35 p.m.

I am talking now about food, clothing and shelter, and I do not see how members on that side in 1976 could seek to defend \$13.00 a week to feed, cloth and shelter somebody. It is indefensible, and all of this foolishness about old age pensioners not having to pay water rates cannot help them. How many old age pensioners can afford to have running water in their homes?

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. All of the old age pensioners can afford to have running water because they do not have to pay for it.

Miss MILLER: Maybe, the member for St. Andrew can tell the House how many old age pensioners have homes to put water into. There has been a lot of talk about the luxuries of life to which the old age pensioner cannot aspire. I have heard a lot of stupid talk about pensioners who, in nineteen sixty something, were getting \$2.40 a week when a loaf of bread was worth a penny. That argument has no bearing. *(Interruption.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask hon. members on my right to speak in undertones because the noise is affecting the Reporter.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I say that it is indefensible, and it is shocking that these men were born by women. They have mothers. I find it difficult to believe that they have mothers. Some of them are the age of old age pensioners and they seek to defend \$13.00 a week in 1976. I am a single woman; I go **into** the corner shop, and I know what \$13 **will** buy and what it will not buy. I know for a fact that it will not feed, clothe and shelter a person of any age including a baby. That is why \$10.00 a week in the magistrate's court for a child is equally indefensible. You give them \$13.00 a week in 1976 when a loaf of bread will cost 65 cents and what is passing for milk coming out of the Pine Hill Dairy in dirty bottles....

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is getting on as if an old age pension is a salary. When you add the old age pension to all the fringe benefits they can get, they will receive more than some of them on the other side pay their messengers. Some of them are paying their messengers less than \$40.000 a week. When you add all of these benefits you will find that they will get more than \$40.00 a week.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order! The hon. member may proceed.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to continue without any more nonsensical interruptions, in my view old age pensioners, like children, are people for whom we must take an especial responsibility. We spend the largest chunk of our budget on education and on children because that is our investment for the future. The old age pensioners are those people who built a future in their time. They built the foundation on which we stand today, and it is not proper that in their old age we should look down upon them and give them a pittance as though they are ready for the grave, cannon-fodder, and the least we give them the sooner they will starve to death, or the least they have to wear the sooner exposure will get at them.

Old age pensioners are not treated well in this country. A pensioner came to my office one day this week and told me she had lost her card on the very day she had to go to draw her pension. She was told when she went to draw her pension that she would have to wait until somebody had found her card, and if it could not be found she would have to wait until a new one was issued before she could draw any money. I took it upon myself to telephone the office in Country Road and asked them what this woman was expected to exist on until somebody found the card, or until they saw it fit to issue her a card. That is how old age pensioners are treated. I have old age pensioners coming to me day in and day out. They say that I have a property and therefore I am ineligible for a pension. Each of these cases must be treated on its own merits. It is true that some of these people, who qualify for old age pensions, own property, but when you go and look at it you will find it is a large old house that the old age pensioner cannot afford to upkeep that is falling down around his ears. In truth and in fact those persons are more in need of an old age pension than anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair to suggest that all old age pensioners need are food,

clothing and shelter. They are entitled to some of the niceties of this life. They are still persons — persons with more leisure time on their hands than those who are in the prime of life and are still working. They are entitled to a little rediffusion. They are entitled to a little bus drive, as the Leader of the Opposition says. Can anybody over there seriously tell me that \$13.00 a week, plus the perks the member for St. Andrew is talking about, the free water, and so on can take care of those people?

I think it is deplorable in 1976 when we are talking about people — we are not talking about buildings; we are not talking about machinery or equipment; we are talking about breathing, living, people and people who are disabled and crippled and a lot of it through no fault of their own. These are people who have made a contribution to this society — people who to a large extent have made us what we are today, and that we should offer them what I call a pittance of \$13.00 a week is scandalous. It says nothing for us.

Now look at the kind of salaries we are drawing! The hon. member for St. Michael West said that we should forego having dinner in here. He would like to make people in the Gallery and in the public sector believe that we are fed on steak and milk-fed chicken in here, when in truth and in fact what we get in here every Tuesday is cou-cou. He is saying that we must forego that — (*Asides.*) I am not saying that it is not good food. I like cou-cou. But you must not try to behave as though a lot of money is spent in here, and we are having wine and steak every day man.

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member must understand that if she has no respect for hon. members in this House — At least, like herself, we are hon. members, and we object to her addressing us as man. We do not want to address you as woman. We have more respect for the hon. member; so the hon. member will kindly contain herself and remember that she is dealing with hon. members and not men.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been taken.

Mr. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. The member for St. Michael West should have taken objection, if she had referred to him as a woman. I know him to be a lot of man. He may be a half of man now, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. It is a point of direct interruption.

Miss MILLER: Does the hon. member object to being referred to as a man? Is that what I understand, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. WALCOTT: If the hon. member does not understand that we have a decorum for the Chamber; if she thinks that I object to being referred to as a man and she wants to be facetious, she can refer to me as anything she cares to outside, but in here she has to refer to me as an hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point has been taken.
4.45 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Outside she can refer to me as anything she cares, but in here I am an hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point has been made. I will admonish the hon. member that in all instances all members of this Parliament are hon. members.

Miss MILLER: I accept the Chairman's admonition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: They are neither men or women, lawyer nor doctor. All are hon. members. The hon. member may proceed.

Miss MILLER: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael West would advocate that we do away with the ball of cou-cou that we get in here on Tuesdays, but at the same time would seek to defend \$13 a week, and this is the same hon. member who talked about not being hypocritical. Isn't the real truth that whatever is provided in here the hon. member cannot partake of it — all that starchy rice and cou-cou — so it does not make any difference to the hon. member whether or not he eats in here? But that is not the point. The point is that it does not behove anybody on that side to say that we spend \$5.3 million to standardise the bus fares which are paid by men and women who can get up in the morning and go to work and earn a living. Old age pensioners are exempt from bus fares. You can find \$X thousand to supplement this and supplement that, but when we come to supporting life, and I mean the bare life because so many old age pensioners live in scandalous and most disgusting conditions, we cannot find the money. I have seen them in the City of Bridgetown where there is no running water, where the houses are falling apart over their heads, and \$13 will still not feed them furthermore repair houses and what not. I would be happy if hon. members on the other side

would not for the sake of trying to defend something that cannot be defended try to paint a picture as though old age pensioners, because of the many other perks and privileges which they have like free bus rides, are enjoying a much higher standard of living and a more decent standard of living than is the real truth. The real truth is that they are the most deprived sector in our community, and it is a sad reflection and indictment upon us that we should consider in this day and age that \$13 a week should be sufficient to support life for any man, woman or child for that matter.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this debate much further. I believe the matter has had a lot of ventilation, but I would like to deal with some of the general aspects of it. The first thing that strikes me is that the Minister in introducing the Resolution dealt with this matter of old age pensions in its historical context, from October, 1961, and he showed the increases since then. Now the Minister's resume of the increases showed that old age pensioners are good candidates in an election year. In 1961 there was an increase. In October, 1966, there was an increase after four years. In four years the increase was 60 cents and they went from \$2.40 to \$3.00 and now there is an increase in 1976. There was a bye-election in 1969 and there was an increase then to \$5.00. (*Asides*) I am talking about the election years and I am not going to let the Minister of Labour and National Insurance and whatever else deal with my speech. What I am suggesting is that in each election year you can expect one or other of the parties which is in Government to come before the public with some scheme to assist the old age pensioners. I think we have got to have a more fundamental attitude to old age pensioners than this. An increase by 60 cents and in one case 75 cents and in another \$2.00 and \$3.00 is not meaningful. The Government must understand, and I believe they have understood since the last bye-election that there are two categories of persons in this country who are in constant need of support and whose interests have constantly to be monitored. I am speaking about the young and unemployed in one category and on the other hand the old.

The Government has a responsibility to the young who are unemployed and to the old who are infirm and unemployed, most of them, to ensure that in pursuance of its scheme of social justice, in pursuance of any legalitarian policies which the parties of Barbados profess to have, it does something for these impoverished and underprivileged groups in this society. If the

Government therefore considers that it has a duty to ensure on a continuing basis the proper welfare and development of these two groups — and I single out them because in the middle you find people who are working and helping to look after themselves — the Government has to be operating in a supervisory capacity in respect of these two groups and Government must constantly be aware of the need of these people as they arise from time to time. As part and parcel of that supervisory function Government must ensure that whatever contribution it is making to the development of these two groups, whatever it is doing for the welfare of these two groups, is part of an overall and integrated plan. I said it yesterday in relation to another matter. I do not believe in adhoc measures, and the hon. member for St. Michael West, socialist as he professes to be, knows as well as anybody else that there are certain basics which these impoverished persons must have.

4.55 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to find out.

Mr. SIMMONS: You are my friend too, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael West knew me from the time I was a boy and he has always been very good to me. He knows as well as anybody else that there are certain basics which these impoverished people must have. I heard today about old age pensioners needing water. I am sorry that the member for St. Philip South is not in his place. We have a number of people in St. Philip — I can call one right now in Thickets, Edward Knight, who needs water.

Do you know what is happening? There is no main. In Thickets they have a few "nay nay" galvanise pipes that everyone has to run into their own houses. I asked a question some months ago about running in water mains in Thickets. The answer has not been given yet. In Fordes Road which is another constituency, the same situation arises, that there is no proper main.

For the pensioner even galvanise pipe is too much for him at what he is getting. He was getting \$10 a week and the Government is offering him \$13; but the sales tax will hit him too. You will deny him the right to smoke and buy a little snuff, although I do not believe that there is too much temptation for that in the island now.

If you are going to be serious about this, we have got to be aware that the cost of living has increased to such an extent that old age pensioners cannot cope with it even with an

increase of \$3 a week; but I will take the Government's point and I will vote in favour of the Resolution because every little is a help, something is better than nothing and half a loaf is better than no bread at all; but they could get a lot more bread if the Government had different economic policies.

I will deal with that when we deal with the Resolution about teachers; and I have certain things to say about how the Government should involve the union in decision making and so on. I know that the member for St. Michael West, my friend, will shake hands with me on that.

However, some of the problems that old age pensioners have could have been relieved, if, for example this year, we had not been asked to vote in March \$5,771,000 for the Ministry of External Affairs. When the Prime Minister was Premier before Independence in 1966 he said that the Ministry of External Affairs would only cost us \$½ million. Now it is at the level of \$5.7 million. What are these external missions doing for Barbados? The Central Bank Report reveals that 340 persons were employed in Barbados for the whole year of 1975. That was net employment out of the manufacturing industries which the Industrial Development Corporation and these funny Boards are supposed to look after. They go abroad for bonanzas, fetes, bazaars and carnivals and good times, and in a whole year they can only bring in 340 new jobs in Barbados. Is this something that we can be proud about when we have had this policy of industrialisation since 1961?

I see that the Union is talking about the type of industrial development we need in Barbados. They should have been talking about that ever since. It is only recently that they have really been putting their feet down. In 1971 during that campaign when Elton Mottley and myself were talking about that, and when we were exposing certain statements about Operation Beehive, the Union was not taking that same position. They are becoming aware now, and I am glad to see that they are cognisant of difficulties which will face this country if we do not have proper and meaningful investments.

If the Government had channelled some of this \$5.7 million into social services and cut back on the external affairs scheme, and had saved the \$300,000 which was voted for the crematorium — which was said later to have been a waste of money, they would have been able to give the old age pensioners more. That would have been the case also if they would operate Statutory Boards properly instead of having them staffed

merely by yard fowls — I have borrowed this term from the member for St. Michael West. If they had proper schemes, then the old age pensioners would be able to get not \$13 but probably \$30.

I have not worked out the mathematics of it, but surely commonsense would dictate that they would get substantially more than \$13 because \$13 now is still meaningless in terms of purchasing power for old age pensioners. They still have to eat the same things that we eat, even if they may not be able to eat in the same quantities. A lot of these old age pensioners now stay at home and plant a little kitchen garden and grow things to supplement their diet. You know what is happening? They have to pay the 5 per cent sales tax even on the vegetable seeds.

This is bad financial and fiscal planning by the Government, and I submit that if they did otherwise, old age pensioners would get more.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I can just reply briefly, the question of old age pensioners raises the whole matter of social conscience in this country and is one on which there can be no end of discussion as to whether the level of assistance being given to the old age pensioners is enough or not.

As has been pointed out in here, spokesmen for the Opposition on this matter at one stage said that it should be increased to \$15; and when the Minister of Finance indicated that the level of pensions would be increased from \$10 a week to \$13 a week this year, with a further increase next year of \$16 a week, there was a further demand by the Other Side for \$25 a week. Whatever sum.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member said was that he wanted an immediate increase of \$15, but with the rate of inflation even that was too low. It was not a question of following the Prime Minister. It was a question of the Prime Minister following us.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: The hon. member for Christ Church West must have heard a different speech from the one I heard. The point was made by the member for the City that old age pensioners are the most deprived sector of the community. I will say that in all societies that I know of, including welfare societies, whether it is Canada or the USA, provision for old age people always represents a scar on the social conscience of these countries.
5.05 p.m.

In this regard Barbados is no exception in that if full provision could be made for the aged it certainly would be made. It is always a question of the financial capabilities. I for one would say I am not satisfied that the \$13 per week, the \$10 per week or even the \$25 per week which is being suggested, would be adequate to deal with the needs of the aged (*Aside*) That is not the argument. The argument is not whether it is adequate. The argument is, as indeed on salary increases generally, it is generally a question as to what is determined can be afforded at any particular time to meet the requests.

So we do not get carried away by that particular argument, but sometimes, Mr. Chairman, I really wonder. The Opposition behaves as though they never had the reins of Government. Now they are chiding this Government for giving inadequate increases to the old age pensioners in this country. From the statistics which I gave earlier when introducing this particular Resolution I indicated that the pensions were raised from \$2.15 to \$10 by this Government. Nowhere have I heard from the Opposition benches — they are getting on as though they never had the reins of Government of this country. Nowhere have I heard them say when they held the reins of Government in this country, how they treated the aged and what were the increases that they gave.

I would hope that at some stage they would get up and tell the people of this country on the basis of their record the great things that they did for the aged; that on that record they are the friends of the aged and therefore they deserve to be given another chance at the reins of Government.

Now the whole argument of the Opposition as enunciated by the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. Thomas, was that in fact the old age pension problem was a diminishing problem and that the number of old age pensioners was actually declining. I do not know if the hon. member has his own statistical service out of which he gets those figures. I have a statutory responsibility for the Welfare Department, and the statistics available to me do not indicate any decline in the number of persons requesting or receiving old age pension grants. Let me give some figures to this Honourable Chamber. In 1973 the number of persons receiving old age pension was 14,066 for the year 1973; for the year 1974 the number increased to 14,612 and in 1975 the number further increased to 15,029. In fact, far from going down the number is going up. It is increasing and not decreasing.

However, the whole gravamen of the argument by the Leader of the Opposition — and when he speaks on these matters he speaks with so much authority that you cannot contradict him because he gets up and speaks as though this is the law of the Medes and Persians, it is the law of the Prophets, it brooks no Opposition. These are the statistics. His argument about persons being paid from the National Insurance.....

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is not here, but if the hon. member would give way. The hon. member for St. Thomas was making the point that he agreed with the hon. member for St. John, the Minister of Finance, that it is a diminishing problem, because as people move over to National Insurance, the old age pension would decline. It is in that context that the matter is made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order. It is a point of interruption at this stage.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I hope you will give me some protection over this side. He is trying to gloss these features. I prefer to call them cosmetics....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am well aware of that.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Then there was the other argument that there were not many old age pensioners in the parish of St. James and that the hon. member for St. James — he was different from the hon. member for Christ Church West. The hon. member for St. James had no axe to grind in this particular matter.

The statistics available to me indicate that for the parish of St. James at December, 1975 there were 1,043 old age pensioners in the constituency of St. James. So we have got to be very careful in setting out the facts. I am not speaking with any emotion on this matter. I am just giving the facts as they are.....

Mr. FORDE: If the hon. member would give way. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Thomas is not in his seat, but the point which he made, again — if the Minister wishes to reply he must reply fairly. The point he made was that the hon. member for St. James represented a constituency in which his voters — there were more voters in his constituency who were young people than they were in proportion to people who were old, and in the constituency of Christ Church West it was the reverse. That is what he said, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely no point of order.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, that is a different speech altogether. That is not what the hon. member for St. Thomas said. He is hearing entirely different from what others of us in here have heard. I am dealing with the points that have been made.

As far as the assistance in kind is concerned, I would like to make it quite clear that the old age pensioners receive their pensions after the assessment by the Welfare Department, but in addition to those pensions they may be eligible on further examination, for national assistance grant. Some of the old age pensioners — I am not saying all of them — some of them are eligible for national assistance grants, which we call assistance in kind, and these can include the payment of utilities, water, and light.
5.15 p.m.

These can include the payment of utilities — water, light, the bus fares — they are exempt from the payment of bus fares, they obtain free medical services in the Government institutions, there is no charge for these services, but I am saying this, Mr. Chairman, not out of any desire to prove that the old age pensioners are well provided for or that they are being treated princely or anything like that. That is not what the Government is saying, what we are saying is that as our economy develops and as the total national resources become greater we make better provision for the old age pensioners, and I would hope that we would reach a stage where we can say that there is no privation, no want among the old age pensioners. I am afraid at this stage it is not possible to do it.

I do not wish to speak any longer on this particular matter, I merely wish to put the case quite strongly again that on the basis of the record this Government has made better provision for the old age pensioners in this country than any previous administration in the history of this country, and that we will continue in 1977, 1978, for the next five year period we will continue starting next year with a further increase for the old age pensioners to make the appropriate provision for them.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77

No. 4

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next Resolution is a Resolution for the sum of \$56,852, and it is

Item 1(b) on the Order Paper, and the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works will deal with it.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, the Postmaster General has advised me that the areas of Cave Hill and Rock Dundo are developing quite rapidly and are presently being served by the Eagle Hall Post Office, but as a result of the increased load this Post Office is now finding it difficult to cater adequately to the needs of the people in that area. Also there is a development occurring in the areas of Lodge Hill, Whitehall, Cave Hill, St. Stephen's Housing area, along the Wanstead and Eden Lodge Housing Areas, and a proposal has been forwarded by him and accepted by me that a Post Office should be instituted in that area to serve the needs of the people.

We have been looking at the question of whether or not we should have one provided in the housing areas now being put up by the Government, but bearing in mind that it takes some time before it comes to light, we have opted to rent some space for the time being to locate this Post Office. Part of the money which is being sought here will be used to pay for the rental of the space which is being acquired from Island Properties Limited Shopping Complex at Rock Dundo, St. Michael, and the area which has been offered to us is about 1,800 square feet and the rental being asked is \$750 per month. We are still negotiating the final price, because we have reason to believe that the owners may reduce the price.

I do not have to go into the benefits of a Post Office to people in any particular area, I think they are very well known, and therefore I move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I second this Resolution and reserve the right to speak.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, we agree most readily that the move should be made to provide the type of services that the Government seeks to offer at this Post Office they now want to establish, but we could not allow this to pass without hearing something from the Hon. Minister responsible about the long promised General Post Office. He very well knows that the plans were being turned and tossed and twisted and everything being done with them now for the longest time, and he must realise that a project such as building a new Post Office would generate some employment and relieve some of the unemployment which now faces the country,

and one would have thought he would try to set his priorities right and let us hear something about this new Post Office which has been promised so long. I believe they are still waiting to try to raise the money because these are the days of the borrowed coat. Every coat the Government puts on is a borrowed coat, so if they have to raise the money, let them set about to raise it, because it cannot be said that our General Post Office is being housed in conditions that make it amenable to staff. The conditions are cramped and perhaps even damp at times too; all these things are very well known to the Minister, and while we offer no objection whatsoever to establishing this branch in the Rock Dundo area, we must realise that the Minister should have it before him, because I believe he must have carried out a survey, I would say, at the Speightstown Post Office in St. Peter, and he very well knows that there is nothing in the surroundings there to offer the type of accommodation for people who have to go there, and just as he has set about to provide in this luxury area now these services, we would wish to see that something is done to provide us at Speightstown with a modern type Post Office where the staff can work under such conditions as we would wish for them, and the customers who must go there that they can be served under conditions which we would wish to know are being provided by the Government.

We would like the Minister to speed up on those things; these are very pressing matters. We realise that setting up this Post Office will certainly relieve some of the congestion and difficulty at the Black Rock Post Office. We don't see how it is going to relieve any of the congestion at the General Post Office, because we believe that whatever is going to go out they must first come here, unless it is a case where it is coming in from a branch to the Head Office, and I don't see much is really being done apart from the fact that people who will be served there by establishing this will be saved the difficulty of having to travel from Black Rock.

5.25 p.m.

One good service might be the registering of letters, because you know what has been obtaining in the past, Sir. If a letter was registered at St. James, it had to come to Bridgetown and then sent back to St. James to be delivered to the person to whom it was addressed. We would like to see a system operating whereby if a letter was posted at a particular post office in St. James, addressed to somebody in St. James or in St. Peter and registered, it should not be necessary to send it to Bridgetown to be sent back to St. James

before it could be delivered to the person to whom it was addressed. The same principle should be applied to other post offices.

Sir, we hope that in setting up this new service new ideas will come to the Minister and the Government to assist them in improving the service. The immediate surroundings at the Welches Post Office leave much to be desired. It looks like a fire hazard. I would like to see the Welches Post Office given a face-lift. It is badly located with our traffic system as it now operates. We would wish that the Government, in setting its priorities with respect to Post Offices, would give some consideration to this situation as it obtains up there.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that now there is a new Minister of Communications and Works — we have had several Ministers — I would like to suggest that a Post Office is a very important area, and it is one of the areas that has been very slow in becoming modern. I do not know exactly where the plans are to put the Post Office downstairs. We have outgrown this area for a Post Office. It is a poor reflection on Barbados as a tourist country. As a tourist country, a Post Office should be a decent reflection on the country.

Now, we were talking about a new Post Office for the last 25 years. The Post Office was to go where the Central Foundary was and that was burnt down twice. I have never seen a Post Office that was really posted. It was to go to the National Insurance Building and they could not find a place to put it. We will have to get a floating Post Office. Another thing the Post Master General was afraid of is the integration of the Mail Service and the Mobile Service. I do like the system. I would like to see the Postal Service being responsible completely for all aspects of the postal agents, and this idea of contracting out the Mail Service should be something of the past. No matter what it costs, my idea is that Barbados is too small not to have a proper mobile service. This idea that St. Lucy is all the way down in Pie Corner, and St. Joseph is so far away, should be got rid of. Half-hour away from any part of Barbados is the limit which you will have to travel; therefore, it is nonsense to say that any distance in Barbados is too far. You could say that in the days when we had jack-ass carts and mule-carts, but not in the days when we have motor vehicles. We must get away from that sort of mentality and look at things differently.

I hope that the Minister will undertake the task of making his Mobile Service into an

integrated one, so that the Post Office can become more efficient. The Postmaster General and the Postmistresses should get together at a progressive level. The people in the Postal Services are good officers and good people, but they are not aggressive people. They must be productive. I feel that because the Postal Union is one of the oldest in the world, they are very careful in how they fix the stamps and so on. They are going slow in a modern sense. I hope that the Minister will see to it that the Post Office show more mobility and be intensified, so that we will get a good Postal Service for the benefit of the community as a whole.

Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I will make a brief reply to a few of the points raised. We know that the General Post Office is long overdue. There have been a large number of reasons why this should be so, the principal one being that the architect, not a Barbadian, who was responsible for the drawing of the plans, made a lot of problems. The plans had to be abandoned, and we had to start all over again. That is nothing new. The position is well known to the country, and we are not hiding that.

What I would like to point out is that since I took over responsibility for the Ministry, the task of preparing plans for the new Post Office was given to a private architect. That firm promised to deliver the plans within six months, and I am in a happy position to state that they did keep their word and delivered the plans within six months. We are satisfied with the plans, but the drawing of plans is not the only thing in the establishment of a Post Office. We are now waiting on a Report from the Quantity Surveyor to indicate what it will cost, and after that we still have to wait on further advice from the architect who is responsible for this new project.

From the presentation delivered to me at my office on the architecture of the new Post Office, it is very pleasing to the eye, rather inspiring and revolutionary, and in the near future I will be in a position to produce a model of this new Post Office to hon. members of this Chamber. We anticipate that, if everything goes well, we will start construction of the new Post Office at the site in Cheapside somewhere in October or November this year. I am not going to give any more details about the new Post Office.

Now, as regards the Speightstown Post Office, we are aware of the difficulties which have been posed there, as referred to by the hon.

member for St. Peter, and I would like to remind him that not very long ago we passed a Resolution in this Chamber to acquire certain lands at Litchfield in St. Peter, a part of which will be used for the Post Office and other facilities in the northern region of Barbados. There are the usual procedures that have to be gone through, and they take a lot more time than we in this Chamber would like them to do. We can only appeal to the legal luminaries here and outside to do something to speed up the type of activity which the public expect them to pursue on their behalf.

In the area of Welches, we also are aware of the problems up there. There is an adjoining pile up of wood, congestion of traffic, and so on. One of the problems which we have in that area is to find a suitable site for the location of a new Post Office. Right now we are investigating the probability of acquiring some land in Tweedside Road. We are only investigating, and I do not know whether it will bear fruit. If it is successful, then we will draw plans for the establishment of a new Post Office in that area in the very near future.

Now, there are many improvements to be made in the Postal Service of this country. I have to admit that the Postmaster General is seized with the problem of the need for improvement in the various areas, and he anticipates that proposals, just like this one, will be coming out of his office one by one and we will deal with them. What we intend to do at the Post Office in this area will include the selling of postage and revenue stamps, the registering of letters, the acceptance of parcels, the issuing and payment of money on Postal Orders, Savings Bank transactions, and so on.

5.35 p.m.

We also intend to have national insurance business, payment of old age pensions, delivery of parcels and private letter boxes. This is the type of business that will be carried on in the post office to be set up in the Rock Dundo area, and I hope that on another occasion when matters pertaining to the postal services of this country come before this Honourable Chamber I will be in a position to give a lot more detail and some time phasing of how these proposals will be implemented.

The question that the Resolution for the sum of \$56,852 do now pass, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1976-77

No. 5

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the next Resolution we propose dealing with is that to grant the sum of \$487,000 for which leave was granted to deal with today.

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND
PLANNING (3) DATA PROCESSING
UNIT

*Head 10 – Ministry of Finance and Planning
(3) Data Processing Unit – was called.*

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, the notes are quite complete and this is merely needed to supplement this vote for the cleaning of the National Insurance Building.

I beg to move that Head 10 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (3) Data Processing Unit, stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would expect that the Minister should give us some idea of this contract and tell us exactly what is involved in it. Just to say that the data is sufficient is not enough. An amount of \$50,000 is a lot of money and the period of time for cleaning is very short. It is not only for cleaning the inside but the outside. How many times a week, how many people are involved, who is the contractor? These are items of information that this Committee is entitled to and I wish the Minister would tell us this. Could it be done cheaper, did it go out to tender? These are matters the Committee is entitled to before it votes on a matter of this nature. We may be all tired but certainly I would like to know that we are spending \$50,000 of taxpayers' money properly and that I can say that I am satisfied as a member of Parliament that the expenditure is justified, that it was on fair tender, that there is nobody who could do it cheaper and as efficiently. That is the sort of information the Committee is entitled to. Merely to say that you are spending \$50,000 between June 1976 and March 1977 for cleaning is not good enough. It is a lot of money. How many man hours are involved in this? What is the degree of profit to the persons involved? That is what I want to know.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, while the Hon. Leader of the House is searching his files, I cannot pretend that I can answer all the questions that the hon. member for Christ

Church West raised, neither do I believe that it is possible for anybody to answer all because the information would not be on file. For example, it would be impossible to know how much profit a person is going to make on a tender. That is not possible to know for the simple reason that we do not know what it is going to cost to carry out the cleaning. However I will merely state this: we have there in Fairchild Street a \$5 million project which we believe we should take care of; it is not \$5,000 or \$50,000. As a result of this we have decided that we should engage the services of a cleaning firm to carry out the cleaning operations on the National Insurance Building, and we followed as we always do the financial rules in that we advertised for tender the cleaning of this building, and I believe about four or five persons tendered. The matter was done by public tender. The hon. member is satisfied.

The question that Head 10 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (3) Data Processing Unit – stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 13 MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(16) CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Head 13 – Ministry of Education (16) Cultural Affairs – was called.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, this is the Caribbean Festival for Creative Arts holding their festival in Jamaica starting 17th July to 2nd August this year, and in which Barbados will be participating in various spheres of activity. In the CARIFESTA 1976 which will be held in Jamaica there will be exhibitions in music, theatre, dance, symposia, and there are the various artistes who will participate in the theatre, dance, symposia and there is the technical crew. Mr. Jean Holder is coordinator and a representative of the Ministry of Education, Community Development and Sport will be responsible for cultural affairs and will act as assistant coordinator. This sum is to meet the expenses involved in this CARIFESTA show in which Barbados will be participating.

I beg to move that Head 13 – Ministry of Education (16) Cultural Affairs, stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Some time ago, Mr. Chairman, the Ministry was negotiating for the services of Dr. Edward Brathwaite, a rather distinguished

Barbadian, who has contributed tremendously to the cultural development of this country and certainly is recognised internationally as one of the leading poets of the 20th Century. The circumstances under which these negotiations were broken off appear to be unexplained properly up to this day and it seems to me a great tragedy that a Barbadian of such outstanding worth and ability could not be attracted back to this country. I do not know whether a change of Minister had anything to do with this position, but I would like seriously to suggest to the Ministry that they do not pass up the opportunity, should Dr. Brathwaite be available again, of getting him to Barbados to assist in the cultural promotion of our art and culture in general.

I think it is a great pity when a few dollars should have caused such a great loss, and certainly there must be some way where there should be proper funding of circumstances such as this. This is not the year that I want to give the Government too many ideas; they are in a poaching mood, but I will still say that in countries overseas in particular, one finds that there are certain tax rebates given for the promotion of the arts in general, and it seems to me that the opportunity can be taken to improve the Income Tax Act so that people will get certain benefits in instances such as this, and it would be a way and perhaps a cheap way of encouraging the promotion of the arts in general. 5.45 p.m.

A country cannot live by bread alone. We have talked in here a lot about bread today. A country might also be conscious of its true identity and its cultural life, and certainly we have a duty to the future generations of Barbadians to encourage them to understand and appreciate their culture. More important, we also have a duty to Barbadians alive at the moment, not only to teach them to appreciate their culture, but to let them know what their culture actually is.

In this regard, it is a pity that the delay in building a national centre for the promotion of the arts is at the moment chronic. We need a national centre in this country for the promotion of the arts. (*Aside*) The member has indicated that we have one at Ilaro Court. I thought that that was going to be a training college. Certainly you will have to do quite a lot of changes at Ilaro Court if you are going to accomodate that kind of activity there, because although it may have been suited to the days of Lady Carter, it does not seem to me that acoustically or otherwise, it is suitable at all at present for this purpose.

Sir, I feel that there is a lot of room between Ilaro Court and Sherbourne proper where there can be the development of a proper cultural centre. This is the sort of activity in which the Government should match dollar for dollar with inputs from the business community and from the charitable organisations like the Lions Club and the other clubs concerned; and I would seriously encourage the Government to look along these lines for the construction of a proper national centre for the future.

Mr. WALCOTT: Sir, some time ago I pleaded with the Government when we were talking about independence. A country cannot be really and truly independent if you do not begin to build your culture around something. This bread and butter, old age pensions talk that we had today is only a play, but there is no depth in it.

You require something deep and lasting. It is a pity when we sometimes talk about Africa. They have a national building in Nigeria which is superior. I am not suggesting that we could build something like what they have in Lagos, but it means that you must do something here. I heard a *sotto voce* remark about Ilaro Court. I am not an old building man. I feel that if you are going to have a cultural centre you require something different. I was hearing about a convention hall. What you really require is something where you can get it over to the people. You do not need a Certificate in Art. Many people who can sing and dance in a general way are those people who have not been exposed in depth to those things as others have been. I feel that Art is something that should go up and across to the people.

In this community people are easy to get at. There is too much wastage of people's time from 4 or 5 o'clock in the evening. You carry out a survey. You ask people what do they do with their time and they do not know. It is a wastage. That is where I agree with the hon. member. You require a person of Dr. Brathwaite's calibre. There is no point starting this and getting any half-cent, half-baked person. You want someone who is inspired and who can inspire others in the Arts and in Culture.

You will have to have a man whom the Minister can respect, where there will be mutual respect; because at this level you require a man who understands what he is doing and who can get over to the Minister. I do not think in a general way that this is something that you can sell for a vote. It has no vote strength in it. You cannot sell little children, and people in the Arts in a general way are not politically motivated.

I am really very disappointed and grieved indeed. I do not believe that the schools themselves carry on enough of this within their own syllabus at an intensive level; because sometimes the parents believe that people who can sing and people who can dance are wasting their time. I believe that this is a worthwhile area and I feel that the money will be well spent.

What we want is a building that can hold about 2,000 people so that you can put on all kinds of things there. Trinidad has led the way there. We want a place that can hold people, a hall for all sorts of things. Trinidad has done a very good thing in the building of Queen's Hall, a place just above Governor General's house. It serves a good purpose, and we should do something like that.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to enter into this, I agree that charity begins at home. I would like to see Barbados establishing something at home in a bigger way than what we have seen. As regards the building in Queen's Park, Queen's Park was going on from the time I was a boy and I have been to see many things there. Queen's Park would be an apology for anything that would approximate the national theatre. You require something where you can invite people from overseas to come down here and expose Barbadians to this sort of thing; and I think that this is an area in which it is worthwhile to spend money.

That is one area which we do not have to fight over. I think that the manner in which the hon. member for Christ Church West spoke was obviously different from when he was talking about old age pensions. As I have said, this has no campaign significance. I think that we should get more of this in the community. I agree with the Resolution, and I hope that everything will be done to bring up these things.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, very recently the Prime Minister of Jamaica announced that there is now an indefinite state of emergency in that island. I see that 36 people who are nationals of Barbados are going to Jamaica, and \$37,000 is being spent. One other person is resident in Jamaica. That means that we have 37 participants and therefore the expense will be \$1,000 a piece. That is a lot of money, and I am hoping that the \$37,000 also means that, apart from carrying them there and bringing them back or whatever other tasks are involved, that great care will be taken in respect of Barbadian nationals who will go to Jamaica in the very near future.

This thing is coming off at the end of July to the beginning of August. There is every reason to believe that the state of emergency will still be in existence in Jamaica. In addition to that, I would very much like to endorse all the calls made this afternoon for a national auditorium. I do not think that it is necessary for us to have a building that is a national auditorium alone. There is no reason, in my view, why a national convention centre and a national auditorium could not be in one and the same building. The needs are very much the same, and the uses could be interchanged. We definitely need one in Barbados.

Cultural and artistic performances of any merit have got to be given in school halls where the acoustics are questionable, to say the least, where there are no backstage facilities, where there is no proper stage very often; and much as Combermere Hall is doing a very good stop gap job, it is not the best; and there is nothing more frustrating to a player or artist than to have his very art defeated by the place in which he is forced to show it.

5.55 p.m.

Harrison College hall sometimes has got to suffice for concerts. The acoustics there are almost non-existent. The Museum court yard has now been pressed into use and of course when the weather permits, that can be very beautiful, but again it is a very cramped area. I have been to concerts at the Museum court yard and I have been forced to stand.

There is a great thirst among our people, there is a very genuine interest in things artistic and things cultural; the fact that we can raise 37 participants for the second CARIFESTA in Jamaica is testimony to that, and I do hope that in the very near future we are going to have a national auditorium which at the same time can house other buildings or can have multi-purpose usage. It can be an art gallery for that matter with permanent exhibitions on show there and temporary exhibitions which need not interfere with any other function that is going on.

There is no reason why a convention coming here, say from the United States of America or from Canada, should not at the same time enjoy a permanent hanging of Barbadian art or a permanent show of Barbadian sculpture. So I do hope that this piece-piece attitude to things artistic and things cultural which are more than mere trimmings — they are a very important part of our national consciousness — would be given an overall and a very serious view by the

Government, and that in due course, as I say, we would have a place to which we can recourse and to which in fact for all we know, throughout this region it would be a kind of cultural mecca to which other West Indians might trek from time to time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I just gave way to the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown. I just want to cover one or two points. There seems to be some confusion over the designation of auditorium and cultural centre. Now one may run in immediately to a conflict of ideas. An auditorium normally is a place where performances are held and where you have to provide a certain amount of seating capacity arranged in such a way that a fairly large number of people will be able to view the performances which are carried on. This calls for a stage, it calls for lobbies, it calls for chair seating accommodation; and when I made my little subrosic intervention to the hon. member for Christ Church West I was referring to a centre not in the sense of an auditorium at all.

The Government has recently acquired and I had informed the House of this in the course of another debate — of our intention to acquire a fairly historic building next door to the existing site of the Community College at Sherbourne, a building which is known as Ilaro Court. Now it has the advantage of having good land — apart from the highway — on three sides. There are 99 acres of pasture land to the back under the supervision of the Ministry of Agriculture, seven acres of Sherbourne to the east, and the property itself contains, as far as I can remember, about eleven acres of fairly densely wooded land with a very large house which was built in the 1900's by the wife of a former Governor of Barbados, Sir Gilbert Carter, the same lady who was responsible incidentally for raising the money to purchase Queens Park which I think was the Brigadier's house or the General's house, from the British army when they evacuated or retreated from Barbados around 1906. It was Lady Gilbert Carter herself therefore who was responsible for giving us Queens Park by her efforts and public subscription.

Unfortunately a lot of other good premises were literally filched by the members of the Legislature and converted into the Savannah Club, the then Royal Barbados Yacht Club, and so on. The best buildings were offered to the Government, turned down by the Legislature; then the members of the Legislature comprised as it was in those days got together and formed clubs to buy the other existing buildings.

It is also very interesting to note that one of the properties, the Round House was the property where Mr Eddie Brathwaite grew up, and that was the guard room for the — where the Eye Hospital is was a sort of jetty, for the Adjutant and that round house was the guard room.

So we have a lot of tie-ups in this thing. Here it is we have Lady Gilbert Carter of Ilaro Court, Mr. Eddie Brathwaite, the Round House and I do not know what contributions the Lions or the member for Christ Church West is going to make, or what historic connections he will have with the Centre, but anything they want to give will be gratefully received in the same way that the Junior Chamber of Commerce made a fairly substantial contribution towards the National Stadium.

That brings me to another point. We have to be very careful. I went into the question of an auditorium some years ago when costs were much lower and we were thinking then of placing an auditorium at the site of the National Stadium. and it worked out then that the cost per seat would be at least \$1,000. So that if we wanted to build an auditorium then for one thousand persons it would cost approximately \$1 million providing we owned the land. I think it would be more than twice that figure today.

Now the occasions on which we have performances in Barbados are few and far between, and this is where we run into certain difficulty, because when you spend that kind of capital on an auditorium which is, I respectfully submit, cannot be multi-user by its very nature, unless you are going to lease it out to a cinema, the frequency or infrequency of performances would not really justify that kind of expenditure at this stage and in the light of the economy. What they have done in Jamaica is that next door to their Stadium they have built a large arena which does not have any tiered seating and which they use for boxing and other activities which are associated with the National Stadium in Jamaica.

Now there we have a problem. We are spending now a considerable amount of money at Dover in Christ Church, converting the Cable and Wireless Building which we exchanged for the land at Wildey, into a Convention Centre for approximately 500 people, and I believe that is nearly completed.

6.05 p.m.

But there again, a convention centre and an auditorium are not necessarily compatible usage, because I do not see anywhere that you can put on any of the performing arts at that convention centre or the convention centre which we have at Wildey next door to the Caribbean Development Bank. While I am on that, I think I might disclose that the main purpose of my visit last week to London was to negotiate with Messrs. Cable and Wireless for the taking over of the 72 acres and building at Carrington for a youth basic skills centre. I cannot tell you more than that because I do not know whether my terms have been accepted by them and I'm awaiting now communication from the Chairman and Managing Director of Cable and Wireless in England, but that was the main purpose of my visit, to try to see whether we could acquire at not too great cost to the Government the 72 acres and the buildings for the purpose of basic training.

One thing about an auditorium is that it has to be fairly centrally located. I have even been to look at what was known as the old Marshall Hall which is a large warehouse now in Hincks Street which was originally designed as a theatre. We had three theatres, we had the Albert Hall which is where the Telephone Company is, we had the Wilhelmina Hall which is that building over there formerly owned by the father of one of our former Speakers, Sir Theodore Brancker, and then we had the Marshall Hall, so we were well supplied in the early days of the century with centres where people could perform, and of course we didn't have the cinema and television in those days. Since the advent of film, the cinema, television and so on, the number of groups that we have in the country who are willing to put on performances for reward to the number of people in the general public who are willing to pay has dwindled significantly, although I do believe that there is in this country some residue of talent which has to be developed.

It is merely a question of priorities. I merely wanted to clear up that when I spoke about a cultural centre, the Barbados/Venezuela Cultural Centre will be located at Ilaro Court, and what we wish to do without letting loose Public Works — the Ministry of Communications and Works at all or for any period on the building is the minimum of modification and just a little cosmetic operation carried out by painters and so on to utilise Ilaro Court not only for the Barbadian/Venezuelan Cultural Centre but maybe for the headquarters of the Arts Council and the secretariat of all cultural activity, because it is a very large house and it has very beautiful grounds. While I am on the subject I think I

might also mention that one of the things I would like to see one of these days is that Farley Hill should be converted into an indoor and outdoor theatre, and I have spoken to many people who are prominent in the theatre movement in the United Kingdom and in the United States, and I do not wish to call names, but people who are in the film industry in the United States, about raising an appeal for converting Farley Hill into an indoor and outdoor theatre, and also at the same time we should continue to investigate the possibility of getting public assistance with an auditorium, but we must be very careful that we do not construct a white elephant.

Finally, I wish to say this, that we live in a reasonably warm, dry climate and I think that instead of going in for all these sophisticated Victorian European structures, that we should think more in terms of using the outdoors in Barbados for the performing arts as they did Greece and Rome and other dry climates in their days of glory, and there is no reason why Barbados should not have its open air amphitheatre instead of waiting until we get an elaborate building before we can put on a performance of *Midsummer Night's Dream*.

The question that Head 13 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 23 — LOANS AND ADVANCES

Hon. C. E. TALMA: As the note sets out, Sir, this is the amount that Barbados will be contributing to this Special Fund, \$10 million (Bds.) in the first instance to assist the Leeward and Windward Islands in emergency cases. This \$400,000 is subject to certain terms and conditions which all the contributing Governments will adhere to, and one of the terms, for instance, is that the making of the Barbados contribution is conditional on the other Governments referred to making their contributions. The money will be deposited and administered by the Caribbean Development Bank, who will be trustees, so the money will be quite safe.

Another point which I may draw to the attention of the Committee is that other Governments may subsequently contribute to the fund on terms and conditions to be agreed upon between such Governments and the Caribbean Development Bank.

I think the note is quite clear, and I beg to move that Head 23 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would have expected that the Government would have used this opportunity to inform Parliament about the recent arrangements made for bailing Jamaica out of her financial condition, but it seems that nowadays we are having Government by — television chats, fireside conversations, big four parleys and no proper report to Parliament. It is significant that when dealing with these matters the Governments of Jamaica and Trinidad seem to adopt a different attitude than this Government adopts to its Parliament. The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago saw fit not only to consult his Parliamentary colleagues, his Cabinet colleagues and get the consent of Cabinet, but to actually make a statement on the floor of the House about the financial assistance which Trinidad was giving to another Caricom partner who was in serious financial trouble. I readily admit that it is necessary to inform the public at large concerning transactions such as this, but it is of the greatest importance that parliamentary institutions should not play a second role in circumstances such as these, and I am inviting the Prime Minister, who is present at the moment, to report to this parliament and this Committee and this House on the negotiations which went on in Trinidad between himself as Prime Minister of Barbados and his other fellow Prime Ministers in the Commonwealth Caribbean, and explain to this Committee the total commitment of the Government and people of Barbados to Jamaica and try to let us know what are the direct benefits which we are going to get from the arrangement.

6.15 p.m.

He must try to let us know what are the direct benefits which we are going to get from the arrangement, whether or not our financial circumstances truly justify the agreement that we have entered into, and whether in his negotiations the *quid pro quos* which he had got are sufficient to justify the agreement reached. A part of the problem of this Caribbean exercise is that it is becoming a very personal exercise between persons who, obviously, know one another from, probably, London School of Economics days, and the people in Caricom are having lesser and lesser say in the development of Caricom as an institutional device for lifting the standards in this country.

I have said in this House before it is time that we move into having some direct representation of the people in the policy making

in Caricom rather than delegated through their representatives and no report is being made to Parliament from time to time. I am certainly not satisfied, speaking for myself as a member of Parliament representing a constituency and having some public responsibility, and being told of these things merely by a general interview. There are certain financial implications of the arrangement which should be explained on the Floor of the House and, if necessary, debated on the Floor of this House. Why is it that Trinidad should show a different standard of conduct in this matter than Barbados shows?

No matter how one may trust the wisdom of "Skippers" or father-figures, speaking for myself, I like to stand up to the captain of any team, or to any father-figures, and let them give a proper explanation, since we are all in doubt of their conduct. I want the Prime Minister to understand that it cannot be a satisfactory matter for people on this side of the House and to people at large that Parliament is being less and less taken into confidence on his negotiations and on his Caricom exercises. He must really get this straight; that we want to know beforehand what is going to happen rather than to wait until he brings down some general Act to Parliament. The Caricom Treaty, the negotiations which went on and all of these things we are not getting proper Reports on in Parliament.

We understand there is an exercise about the arrangement between BWIA and our alleged National Airline, and there is going to be a Governing Committee. This must involve us in some expenditure, however small, in which this Committee should know something about. They may have voted the money again; there may have been contingency arrangements for this, but it is right for us to know. Is the Prime Minister going to let us know if there is any substance in the allegation that ICA is in very grave difficulties? We want to know that. Is it really a fact that there is now to be an arrangement with BWIA which will be doing some of the handling services and bailing ICA out? It is a laudable thing. We have always asked to try to promote a genuine regional airline. I understand now that we are getting one by way of federation. I really must try to get more information on the financial arrangement that has taken place.

Is it true that we are borrowing \$20 million from Trinidad and lending \$14 million to Jamaica? If we look at it that way, we are lending Trinidad's money to Jamaica, but we are, obviously, having to pay Trinidad interest. I want to know what interest rate Jamaica is paying us.

These are matters on which there should be no secrecy within the Government's bosom. This is not a matter only for the LDC's school of politicians. The only thing I can say that seems to be common knowledge now is that the Big Four of the LDC's team seem to have all gone to Trinidad and made up their differences with the Doc.

There is, Mr. Chairman, a beautiful picture in the newspaper with a parody of people whom, I am sure, are not as handsome as the Prime Ministers concerned, kneeling at the feet of Dr. Williams. The implication here being that if the mountain does not come to Mohammed, then Mohammed will go to the mountain. My only comment on the exercise is that I am glad to see they are burying the hatchet. I hope that I will never hear any more criticisms in the tones that I have heard them of the attitudes and policies of Trinidad and its foreign affairs. I remember the same persons, or most of them, attacking Trinidad for its stand on Venezuela. I venture to say that Jamaica is now getting more out of this exercise than she ever got by running to Venezuela at the time of the oil crisis, and the something is happening here. I venture to say so.

Now, the Barbados Labour Party always took the attitude that the Federal exercise must be worthwhile, and it has taken external pressures and internal economic pressures to force these Prime Ministers to recognise the value in more than functional co-operation and that they are even talking about a federation of Airlines.

Now, there is the destabilisation argument, Sir. There is no attempt to destabilise anybody in the West Indies. These Caricom countries are crying foul when there is no foul. I have researched the statement since 1966, and, within a period of three to four months before every election in this country since 1966, there has been some statement made from the Prime Minister about somebody from overseas intervening in Barbados' affairs. He is in the House and he can reply. I want him to reply, if he cares to reply. In those days it was Guyana, mark you, Britain and the United States. He was warning them about intervening in Barbados' political affairs. I should not have said Guyana, because in those days the Premier or Prime Minister of Guyana came here and spoke on the Democratic Labour Party's platform.

As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, to lump Barbados with the internal problems of Jamaica is a mistake in judgement. Jamaica has its problems. It has serious internal

problems the light of which we have never seen in this country, and I hope we will never see. If there is one thing the Government could be satisfied on, it is that this Opposition has acted in a most constitutional manner every time it had to act against the Government. We have never at all condoned violence of any form, or any form of destabilisation by way of violence. We will destabilise the Government with a quick election and trust with the ballot-box that we knock them out. That is the only form of genuine destabilisation that we wish. To give the impression that they are giving, so far as Barbados is concerned – I am speaking on behalf of Barbados, and that there is an attempt to destabilise Barbados is something really fantastic. I do not accept that part of it.

6.25 p.m.

I do not believe that one can be serious about it. Certainly if it is, I am going to ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence and Security why didn't he have these persons arrested? What has he done about this? Why hasn't the evidence been given to the Director of Public Prosecutions? It would be a serious allegation if he did not do anything about it, and this is, as I said, a lead up to the elections. If one wants to know when the election is, read the Prime Minister's Statement on destabilisation. A different word was used on every occasion. The same approach and technique is there on each occasion and it is always a two hour or 90 minute interview on television, and on none of the occasions I have seen has anything come of these allegations. Last time it was Senator St. John whom they were alleging was talking to somebody from overseas. Whom will it be next?

I am challenging the Prime Minister if he has the evidence to prosecute whoever there is. But even assuming, without admitting, that the evidence of destabilisation in the Caribbean, the Caribbean people have themselves to blame a lot for failing to recognise since 1962 when they started to break up the Federation that it was only by proper long term planning and integration of things like your defence forces and proper integration that we could have provided against any threat from overseas or indeed from within our own borders which would upset the proper stability of the country. I trust we would not have any destabilisation that would be either internal or external on the basis of violence, but I certainly would welcome the Government being destabilised by the ballot box in the future.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I hope to deal with the matter which the hon. member who has

just sat down has touched upon, because this Resolution was strung upon us at somewhat short notice, but yet touches on a matter which has been in the news a great deal recently and about which it is time for public consumption if the Barbados Labour Party had something serious to say.

We have paid every little attention even though it touches on our Caricom relations, our foreign relations with the United States and our international standing, and our ability to attract tourist. We have touched very little on what the Prime Minister has said about destabilisation, but it would be impossible to conduct any debate on the theme of Caricom without referring to this particular subject, and I am glad that the hon. member for Christ Church West has opened the debate on this topic. We in the Barbados Labour Party have paid very little attention to it, because it appears to be no more than a cheap election tactic worthy not even of Senator McCarthy, worthy of a cheap politician when it first came about, and we felt that we had answered it satisfactorily when the attempt to smear the hon. member for Bridgetown was made in the process of a charge of destabilisation, but I want hon. members to recall that as far as we can find, the charges of destabilisation arose during the City by-election. They were given exceptional prominence and it was stated that several Caricom Governments, some of these Governments with whom we are supposed to be joining in this loan, had made the same complaints. On May 7 I think it was of this year, the Prime Minister said that the Governments of Jamaica, Trinidad and Guyana and Barbados would have joined in a statement condemning destabilisation of the region, but the Prime Minister of Trinidad refused to do so which I believe is absolutely accurate. Whatever excuse he used not to go along with our Prime Minister's foolishness — I admire him for it — I would like it to be stated that contrary to what the Prime Minister said in a press conference, there has been no public statement by the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago associating himself with the charge that the United States Government is seeking to destabilise Governments in this region, and that when the Prime Minister was asked he replied to the questioner on television talking about this and said "if I am a liar all four Prime Ministers are liars." It is very important to note that he is actually the only Prime Minister to say that the United States Government is seeking to subvert the Governments in this area in the manner in which he said so. This is important.

Now on May 11 the United States State Department gave a specific contradiction to what

the Prime Minister of Barbados said. They stated specifically that the United States Government is not engaged in any kind of destabilisation efforts in Barbados or anywhere else in the Caribbean. I am not suggesting that is final. I am not suggesting for a moment that because they say so it is so, but take note that the only person to contradict it was the Prime Minister of Barbados. His was the only allegation made by a Head of Government and he was making allegations that the United States Government was trying to destabilise Jamaica and Guyana and he said it was trying to destabilise all Governments which had dealings with Cuba.

6.35 p.m.

Apparently the Prime Minister had reported to the State Department when he alleged that Barbadian nationals were being used for this destabilisation — a very significant point, because if he had evidence that Barbadian nationals are or were being used in an effort to overthrow the Government of Barbados, why then, did he not do what the hon. member for Christ Church said that he should do, report it to the Director of Public Prosecutions?

This original destabilisation talk was associated with the filthy smear against the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown. We have pointed in and out of this Chamber that the book of little authority by Philip Agee — that such authority as he possesses — would far more involve the Barbados Workers Union in charges of C.I.A. influence than anybody in this House; because it goes out of its way to emphasise that the AIFLD is an arm of the C.I.A., and the union has gone out of its way to emphasise that AIFLD has helped it with the Mangrove project. The AIFLD held a party for Mr. Maurice King in Washington which was attended by the hon. member for St. Lucy; and we have not heard any charge made by the Prime Minister against the hon. member for St. Lucy for taking the C.I.A.'s money to destabilise Barbados; and it would be a stupid and absurd charge if it was made. The hon. member for St. Lucy might be inexperienced and misguided at times, but he is not a traitor. I believe that as far as Barbados is concerned, he is a decent, patriotic young man, just as the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown is a patriotic woman.

Now it seems that despite the efforts made to make it plain that this book is a little authority, the Prime Minister has returned to the charge of destabilisation and has associated the Government of the U.S.A. with it; and he has said that the Prime Minister of Jamaica agrees

with him; and the very night that he was saying so on T.V., Mr. Dudley Thompson, the Jamaican Foreign Minister, a man who is not known for noticeably right wing views, specifically denied that the Jamaica Government was accusing the American Government of destabilisation in Jamaica or anywhere else, so the Prime Minister was left alone.

Shortly after he was joined by Mr. Fred Wills, I believe at the Third World Conference in Algiers, Mr. Fred Wills achieved prominence through his prosecution of the Anguillans during the troubles in Mr. Bradshaw's time — his unsuccessful prosecution of the Anguillans. He has never been a person whose balance and whose talents have been so marked in inter-national relations as to warrant anything that he has said as being necessarily authoritative.

Now, a person signing himself as "Democrat" — I do not know if that has any signification, but he wrote a most sensible letter in the Advocate Newspaper pointing out that Guyana — he did not point this out — but he pointed out that the transition of Guyana through Jagan into Marxism has been carried out without any disturbance of any sort. He never said that when 120 lives were lost in the transition from Jagan to Burnham the USA did in fact assist to destabilise Guyana to put Burnham in power. Burnham has been able to bite the hands of his erstwhile friends, to bite the hand that has fed him, to nationalise the bauxite business and carry out other acts which the Americans now resent.

Let us compare their conduct. To get Burnham there, Africans and Indians were killed in the hundreds as it turned out in Guyana. When Burnham does a few anti-American things, nothing is done and yet there are now cries of destabilisation. While we have the Prime Minister speak about evidence implicating the C.I.A., there is evidence of the means by which the arms were shipped to Guyana — persons who went down as school teachers with big boxes supposed to hold school books, but which turned out to hold machine guns. When all of this evidence was exposed in London and New York why did not the Prime Minister say that the US was destabilising the Government of Guyana?

The conclusion is inescapable. They were destabilising it to put his friend in power. I am saying that all this destabilisation talk is no more than a getting together of the club, of people who feel threatened, and the Prime Minister of Barbados, the one who feels most threatened, is

trying to enlist the aid of the others in scare tactics to keep him in power.

The Union repeated on 23rd May, 1976 a statement made by the Barbados Labour Party and they say that our statement purports to associate them with the AIFLD. The Union has associated itself with the AIFLD. The Prime Minister's statement gives this spurious authority to a book which associates the AIFLD with the C.I.A., I have not said it. It is your Prime Minister who has said it. It is not the Barbados Labour Party. All along it could have been talked about. It has been in fact canvassed in here when I remarked some years ago that I had seen the General Secretary in the Barbados Workers Union having lunch with the gentleman from ORIT who went down to Trinidad — a fat brown skinned gentleman — at Paradise Beach Club and I said that I hoped (*Aside*) I must confess that if every member of this House who had lunch with a political attache from the US Embassy was a traitor, the first you would have to lock up would be the Prime Minister and me. If everybody who has ever had dinner with the American Ambassador, or who has attended a function at the American Embassy.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. I have never had lunch or dinner with any member of the US Embassy; and when he talks about locking up the Prime Minister and other members, he will have to go to jail alone, not with me.

Mr. ADAMS: I do not know if by that the Prime Minister means that he has never had dinner with the US Ambassador. I do not know, but I believe that foreign missions here have a system by which the Ambassador keeps contact with the Prime Minister and the First Secretary keeps contact with the Leader of the Opposition. I may be wrong, but that is the impression that I have.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: May I just correct the hon. member. The level of Ambassador in Barbados is equivalent to that of Permanent Secretary in Barbados in the Ministry of External Affairs. Let us get that straight. Even when there was some attempt by the US Embassy to contact my office in relation to the decision that we made about Cubana Airlines, I told them that the Permanent Secretary was the person for them to see, and I refused to see anyone from the US Embassy. The Permanent Secretary is the person who is in charge of Ambassadors, not even the Foreign Affairs Minister. They would have to be out of their cotton picking minds to say that they invited me to dinner.

Mr. ADAMS: If anyone wants to make us believe that the Prime Minister has really never attended a social function given by the American Ambassador.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I never said that I never attended a social function. I have been to a musical evening when there were several members of the Barbados Labour Party and several members of CBC down at the American Ambassador. I have never been to dinner at the American Embassy in my life.

Mr. ADAMS: If it comes to that, I suppose that all I can say is that all the public has to know is that diplomatic representatives accredited to Barbados do make social contacts with the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. It is nothing to be ashamed of. (*Asides*) I am trying to get on, Sir, but I have been interrupted a lot. I am trying to wind up.

The whole point is that I am talking about the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union and the point was missed. I am not saying, and none of us has said that he has sold out to the CIA. I was commenting that the man with whom he was taking lunch, perhaps unknown to him, had been asked by Dr. Eric Williams to leave Trinidad and that an American newspaper had said that he was given \$25,000 to get George Weekes out of the Oil Fields Workers Union. He spent it and he only got 4,000 votes for his candidate. George Weekes was elected, and Eric Williams was so annoyed that he put him out of Trinidad and he was trying to set up an office in Barbados.

All of this was aired in an American newspaper, and I believe that all of it would be found in the debates of the House, because I think that it might be wise to expose what may not be known to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union; but I made no smear on it. I did not get on a platform and say that Mr. So and So was an American spy because of this man, Silva, or whatever is his name. I do not think that there would have been any justification for doing that, anymore than there was any justification for smearing the hon. member for Bridgetown.

I do not want to keep members here for a long time; but these accusations have been repeated right up to June 12th, 1976. That appears to be the last time that the Prime Minister repeated them.

6.45 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order. The hon. member is entirely irrelevant and not dealing with what is before us. We are dealing with this Head 23 which is in connection with Barbados' contribution of \$400,000, to an emergency fund which has been agreed on and which will be controlled by the Caribbean Development Bank as trustees. That is what we are dealing with.

Mr. ADAMS: The affairs of CARICOM must be some part of and must have some relevance to this fund. It is not open for me to say we must not go into anything with Trinidad and Jamaica and Guyana because the Prime Minister says it is going to be destabilized. I am going to be very quick, Sir, but the more members interrupt the less I would be able to finish within my time.

The whole point in this. Barbados is less able to raise the money to contribute to these funds, if you go on talking about destabilization, because if you put Barbados in the same class as Jamaica for violence, and as Guyana, if you get unwanted publicity in the United States, United States tourists will see that the Prime Minister of Barbados is implying that Barbados and Jamaica are in the same condition, and you know you cannot go to Jamaica because you know somebody will shoot you and there is an emergency there, the same American tourist are not going to come to Barbados. The Minister of tourism must know that when trouble affects the region like this, that the side effects go all about. You do what you can to minimize them; you do not maximize them by putting yourself into the same news paragraph as the country where the Opposition is being locked up and even the Government is being locked up and people are being shot in the streets and babies thrown into fires.

It is the duty of the Prime Minister to stay above these things and not to engage in scare tactics. The person he means who had received money and is not in the American Government, I believe, is Sydney Alleyne, and Eric Sealy has had that story licking all over the place. There is nothing secret about it. I talked about it in the House of Assembly. If the Prime Minister has evidence that anybody beside Sydney Alleyne, or anybody outside the Sydney Alleyne circle has received money, then I really do challenge him; and more than that it has not been published in Barbados...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Time.

Mr. ADAMS: All right Sir, if you put me to sit down I will sit down but I am saying that the evidence of destabilization refers to Sydney Alleyne and that there is nobody but Sydney Alleyne — not the Barbados Labour Party, not the PDM, not the CPA. I cannot swear about Eric Sealy. I cannot say if you regard the money that Eric Sealy get as — I have never given him any money, here. Don't worry with that. *(Aside)* If Eric Sealy said I gave him money — I do not believe he said that. I do not believe he said it. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This completes the hon. member's time.

Mr. ADAMS: In a public house in St. George Richie Haynes said that was not wrong. I had a policeman in a public house at a shop keeper's residence to say Richie Haynes said that you are a sick man, you do not have long. I have a statement to that effect from a policeman and a shopkeeper, so you cannot take everything an idiot says in public, especially idiots like Richie Haynes and Eric Sealy...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I think as far as the hon. member for Christ Church West is concerned, I do not agree with a single thing he said...

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order. I just want to know if the Prime Minister is replying, because...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No; I am not replying.

Mr. GREAVES: Oh! Okay.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am replying to the hon. member for Christ Church West because although I think he is misguided, he does not understand the constitutional position, I think for the record it should be set straight. I just want to say this. The hon. member challenged me if I have evidence to give it to the Director of Public Prosecutions. I do not give evidence to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Attorney General gives it, and if he was giving it or had given it, it would be none of the business of the Leader of the Opposition because there is nothing in the Constitution of Barbados which says that we can intrust him with any of the secrets of Government. There are certain matters on which he has to be consulted but that certainly is not one of them; and I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition is so sensitive; but when it comes to giving money, I want to repeat here, no matter what lie he may tell on members of my

party I want to say that at a public meeting since he mentioned Eric Sealy, that Eric Sealy said that he was paid by the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and create a disturbance and bring this House into disrepute. Now if that is destabilization I do not know but I am saying this, that the Director of Public Prosecution will be giving evidence and he will take what steps he considers appropriate, no matter what kind of speeches the Leader of the Opposition might make in defence of the American establishment when they are not prepared even to defend themselves. I am not going to take him on, Sir.

When you talk about 'smear', I would like to say this; I am not going to say anything unparliamentary...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The Prime Minister said he is not giving a final reply, he was just saying something. Is that right?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have no right to speak now. You have already spoken.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, if the Prime Minister would just hear me. Now he has really said something about what Eric Sealy said at a public meeting. I am going to ask the Prime Minister, if he is a man, to reduce it to writing and undertake to give evidence, and I will undertake, if he so does, to bring an action for slander against Eric Sealy; and that is as man to man in here. Reduce that to writing, that you heard Eric Sealy say so, and I give you my word of honour that if you will undertake to give evidence I will bring a writ for slander against Eric Sealy.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is absolutely no point of elucidation. That is a point for the law courts.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is a point of incrimination. What I want to say is this; Sir, that I regard this matter of bringing this Parliament into disrepute — I am not going to bring any statement or write any statement myself. I am waiting to get affidavits and then when I get the affidavits from the necessary people that this act was carried out I will be bringing a motion in this House or one of my colleagues will be bringing a motion in this House. I will promise the hon. member that appropriate action will be taken because it is a very serious matter. The act itself of telling the police sergeant not to touch him, "don't touch him," which he admitted in here — he said he

was doing it to prevent a police sergeant who was trained to arrest people from being beaten by a little two-pint box, Sir. He admitted saying "don't touch him," but anyhow we will deal with that in the fullness of time.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. Is it the privilege of a member of the House not to have his actions misrepresented. Just let me make it absolutely clear. I have never given Eric Sealy money to come in here, to stay out of here to go out in the street, to lie down — and absolutely and categorically I deny that I was any kind of party whatsoever to his sitting in the Speaker's Chair, and specifically that I gave him money to do any act whatsoever; and I still challenge the Prime Minister, if he does not want to stand branded as a smearmonder, to reduce that statement to writing and he will get it in the courts faster. Come and give evidence for me, that he heard Eric Sealy say so...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now this is absolutely no point of privilege.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I said that we will produce affidavits and only affidavits, and I said that the hon. member admitted in here that he told the sergeant "don't touch him," and that in isolation perhaps is not incriminating but I would like to deal with the member...

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order. Sir, may I draw to your attention Order 28(2)...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat.
6.55 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, may I draw your attention to Order 28(2) which provides that a Member must confine his speech to the subject under discussion, and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto. I am drawing to your attention under that rule that the discussion about what went on in here and Eric Sealy is irrelevant.

The other point is that under Order 28 (7) no Member may impute improper motives to another Member. I am submitting that you must strike from the record any repetition of slanderous and libellous remarks which libels another member, and you cannot by quoting from what somebody says outside, regardless....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now!

Mr. FORDE: I am on a point of order, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must always determine what is a point of order.

Mr. FORDE: May I finish the point of order, Sir? Will you hear me? I am saying that if somebody came in here and said that the Prime Minister said outside that he was going to pay somebody money to dispose of the Leader of the Opposition, that that would be unparliamentary regardless of whether they said it or not. It cannot be repeated in here, and likewise I am submitting that the Prime Minister's remark on this point must be unparliamentary.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I want to deal with the hon. member. On this discussion I am leaving all of that aside, Sir, I have come in here to do the people's business. Don't forget, the hon. member should never forget, that I am the person who suggested that members of the House of Assembly should not possess any privilege that an ordinary member of the public does not possess. It is not necessary for us in doing the people's business to come in here and make any libellous statement about anyone. I was merely reporting what was said in public, the member himself did not take exception to it, he said that he would take appropriate action if he receives something in writing.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir, I have made a point of order and you have not ruled.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is nothing to rule on, you can't rule on nothing from a nothing.

Mr. FORDE: Sir, I understand the Prime Minister has been nothing from birth and will remain as nothing, but that doesn't mean you can't rule on him.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir, there is a Standing Order which says that one member must not make insulting remarks about another. To call a human being, as the member for Christ Church West is, a nothing is to say that he is not a person, and the Prime Minister himself has called him a non-person before, and I will not sit down here and hear these insulting remarks about other members on any side.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member now must take his seat; I am on my feet and the hon. member should sit. I have spoken too many times inside this Parliament relative to the behaviour of

parliamentarians who I feel are of the upper echelon, and it is most disgraceful when I could hear the legal luminaries in this Parliament, not one, all of them, with this kind of behaviour. Now I am ruling. The matter that I am prepared to hear now is something on the Resolution of \$400,000. All the other slander, outside slander and inside slander, nothing and nothingarian and nothing at all, would not go on any longer. I will use the appropriate Standing Order on the first person now who offends these Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, I am asking that what has been said — I mean the Prime Minister has been a long time from his books — but he knows perfectly well if he thinks about it that by saying somebody else said something you can't stop it from being slander.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled.

Mr. ADAMS: I am on a point of order, Sir, and I am asking for it to be struck from the record. It clearly infringes 28(7) although indeed the Prime Minister perhaps was saying Eric Sealy was imputing improper motives to me, and it infringes 28(9), and it is wise in all the circumstances. I can't recall my coming in here and saying — or any hon. member saying — that Eric Sealy had said something about an hon. member, and I am asking that as a matter of order it be struck from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled and no hon. member can tell me when something must be struck from the records of this House. That is my prerogative, according to the Standing Orders.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, a different point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am answering the member for Christ Church West. The longer he stays on the other side, not that he is welcome over here, deteriorates in so far as his appreciation for the finer points of the Constitution are concerned. I am being very parliamentary, I am not as the hon. member for St. Philip North thinks calling him an ignoramus, they are not ignoramuses, they know better. This is what really hurts me. If in a jocular way I call the hon. and learned member — not gallant, because there is only one hon. learned and gallant member in here — the position is this, in so far as saying that I go on TV and I talk to the public, I

said yesterday and I repeat it, my constituency is not limited to the people of St. John, my constituency is the whole island. There are some matters which are peculiarly within the prerogative of Parliament. The power to vote money is in the prerogative of Parliament. We need money for this particular Fund and we come to Parliament. There are other matters which are not within the prerogative of Parliament but which as a matter of courtesy from time to time when the occasion arises we inform Parliament about, but there is no priority in whether you inform the people first or Parliament first.

Let us get the position straight about the arrangement entered into by the four Prime Ministers in Port of Spain some two weeks ago. The Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago went to Parliament, as he informed us, the other three of us, for two reasons. It was his last session before Parliament was being dissolved, it was the very last sitting to be held within a few days of that meeting which we held on the Wednesday. 7.05 p.m.

As a matter of fact, if there is one Parliament that is never taken or seldom taken into confidence about matters and meets very seldom, this Parliament in Barbados meets more often than any other Parliament except the one in Jamaica. You will be surprised to know that the ones in the Windward and Leeward will meet sometimes only three times a year when they want their Estimates done and after that it is free-wheeling all the way down the hill. In Trinidad and Tobago you can use the *Guardian* from one month to the other without seeing any reference to the legislature in Trinidad meeting, but it just happens to suit the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago not to get parliamentary approval for the expenditure of the money, because basically, these are arrangements between the Central Banks.

Now, the portfolio investment of the Central Bank does not even have to have the approval of the Cabinet of Barbados. What we were arranging down there apart from the agreement which we had arrived at previously through the Caribbean Development Bank was deployment, a deflection, or a shifting of investments from certain areas in order to take out Government debentures in Jamaica, in the first instance. That is done by the Central Bank, and it has nothing to do with the Accountant-General or the Treasury of Barbados.

As a matter of fact, the Governor of the Central Bank, the Manager of the Central Bank,

and the Board of Directors of the Central Bank do not even consult me although they inform me about their portfolio investments which constitute our foreign exchange reserves. There is no question of the Treasury in Barbados being depleted. I will tell the hon. member this. In the first place, so far as the Trinidad loan is concerned, that was a direct Government to Government agreement and it was done between the Central Bank, and the rate of interest is the average of the Treasury Bill rate of the four Central Banks of the area which, as I said in here before, was something in the region of 4¾% or 5%, which is a very reasonable rate of interest.

In so far as the Central Bank's shifting of investments from the Morgan Guarantee Trust, or the Bank of Tokyo, or the Bank of International Settlements in Basle, or wherever they shifted that money from, it is going to be in United States dollars and the interest will be repayable in United States dollars, and furthermore the current rate of interest being earned by those investments of the Central Bank is in the vicinity of between 5% and 5½%.

I sent a letter today to the Governor of the Central Bank informing him that the rate to be charged on the Jamaican investment is 8.5% so that we actually came out better. I had to inform the Governor of the Central Bank formally of the decision that we made in Trinidad and Tobago. This is no concern of the Legislature. It is the concern of the Legislature in so far as you are citizens of Barbados and you want to know what is going on, but the power is not vested in this House or in the Other Place. Furthermore, the investment portfolios of the Central Bank are no part of the concern of the Legislature of Barbados. You cannot even ask for the Central Bank's Report until they are published at the end of the year. You cannot come here and ask me questions about them. I do not ask the Central Bank questions although I have discussions with them from time to time on their investments portfolio.

Now, the same thing applies to the National Insurance Board. The National Insurance Board has an investment portfolio and they work under my direction, and not even under the direction of the Governor of the Central Bank. He cannot ask me anything about that. He might suggest that the investments should have a certain type of security, but I would not come to the House and ask them whether I could take out Jamaican Government Debentures from National Insurance Funds. I have lent money to the Government of St. Vincent out of the National Insurance Funds

when they issued Government Debentures. The other Government used to take out in South Africa, Rhodesia, Nyassaland, when it was part of the East African Federation, Queensland, and so on. (*Asides.*)

Sir, let us go back to the Estimates of 1958-59 and see the portfolio investments of the Government of Barbados, and you will see that the Accountant General of Barbados loaned out money at 2¾%, 3 1/8% and 3 7/8%, and sometimes the maximum percentage that I ever remember was 4½%. They never came to the House of Assembly and ask to do that, because an English Colonial Secretary and an English Accountant-General used to send all of the money out there. I will tell you something worst. I once heard that they had \$19 million of the people of Barbados' money, which had accumulated, in the Revenue Equalisation Fund and other Funds in Barclays Bank and Barclays Bank was paying them interest on \$48,000. I went to the Manager of Barclays Bank and asked him why they were only giving the Government interest on \$48,000, and he told me that their policy was not to pay interest on deposits larger than \$48,000. I came in here and I said that it was robbery with violence, and I had no confidence in Barclays Bank from that time on as an instrument of the monetary and financial policy of the British Government. When we were.....

Mr. ADAMS: Will the Prime Minister state in what year was the \$19 million in the Revenue Equalisation Fund, and refer the house to the Estimates to prove it?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said and other Funds.

Mr. ADAMS: It was never \$19 million in the Revenue Equalisation Fund.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say the Revenue Equalisation Fund alone. I said that they had in and on behalf of the Government of Barbados from the Revenue Equalisation Fund and other Funds. (*Asides*) Bring the Estimates for 1950 or 1951 Price Stabilisation and Rehabilitation Fund and all of the Funds. Do not spend so much time screaming and shouting in here. I was in here before you, man.

The hon. member talks about Federation. Lord Hailles was the Governor-General of the Federation in 1966. Dr. Eric Williams called the Federation as the worst Government in the history of mankind. He said that they had to institute Treasury control over the Federal

Government because they wanted to pay out a lot of money to themselves for pensions and gratuities after three years in office. Is that what the hon. member wants us to return to? We know what we are doing in this economic integration. What I want, categorically, to state is that in so far as agreements are concerned, the agreements are entered into between Heads of Governments. We have already issued directives to out Central Bank. The Central Bank has portfolio investments, and the portfolio investments are not under the control of legislators, and they do not affect wages, salaries, or anything else in Barbados. That is their portfolio in deference to our external reserves. Therefore, we feel that in the Caribbean area charity begins at home, and in the same way that we repatriated all of the investments that the former Government had in Australia, in Manchester Borough Council or whatever it is, and in South Africa, we have repatriated all of those and deployed out investments in hard currency areas and in local investments. Therefore, we have a right to say, "Let us pull in some of the investments that we have in the United States and invest them within the Caricom areas." It is as simple as that.

Now, the hon. member said that it is an insult to Parliament not to come to Parliament and explain things. If you are a member of the general public of Barbados, and you get the same information that the general public is entitled to, why should you think that you are entitled to more information when the laws of Barbados do not say that the Central Bank has to get any permission to do that. If I tell you within 48 hours as a member of the public, you are part of the constituency. They think that by coming to Parliament now, particularly if they are in the Opposition, that the good Lord has invested them and given them special rights and privileges to which the rest of mankind is not entitled. We hear about a strong Opposition and the rights of the Opposition, like if the Government and the people of Barbados do not have rights.

I want to tell you, and you will notice that the leader of this Government has changed. We have sat down here patiently waiting to get the people's business done, but we are not going to let them get away with anything inside or outside of this Chamber from this day on.

7.15 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, when this debate began one did not anticipate that one would have got into the kind of unfounded charges which were levelled by the Leader of the Opposition as he did against me personally,

against the member for St. Michael West and against the Barbados Workers' Union.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, I have levelled no charges. He must not impute improper motives. I have stated a fact that as it appeared in the newspaper he went to Washington to attend a luncheon and that the AIFLD has contributed to the Barbados Workers' Union. I have levelled no charges unless he considers those charges.

Mr. GREAVES: Will the Leader of the Opposition deny that he said that no matter how misguided the hon. member for St. Lucy is in taking the CIA money and eating the CIA lunch that he is not unpatriotic? Is he telling me it is not a charge which is levelled against me and against the member for St. Michael West? Of course he said that. You know that you were telling a deliberate lie.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the Leader of the Opposition knows that he is lying.

Mr. ADAMS: When it appears in the debates it will be seen what I said and what he has said, and the hon. member would look ridiculous. I did not say he was misguided in taking the CIA money or eating the CIA food. On a point of order, it will appear that at one point I said he may be misguided, but he is a decent and patriotic man, and at a different point in my speech I said perhaps that I could say he was eating CIA food, but that would depend upon the spurious authority of a book quoted by the Prime Minister, and I was not saying it. He will look ridiculous when the two speeches are put next to each other in Hansard.

Mr. GREAVES: Only if you had any control of the way in which the speeches go in. Mr. Chairman, I want to challenge the Leader of the Opposition if he is going to talk about the CIA and I want to say that in any association or relationship which the Barbados Workers' Union or any member of the Barbados Workers' Union has with the American Institute of Free Labour Development we have nothing to be ashamed about because any business which we conduct with that institution or any other institution we do it in public and not in secret. The Leader of the Opposition, as I in a *sotto voce* remark indicated, and as he admits, has a very close relationship or indeed had a close relationship with the Political Attache Peter Lord of the American Embassy and I recall.....

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order (a) Peter Lord was never a Political Attache at the

American Embassy; he was First Secretary. (b) I do not know what the hon. member means by a close relationship, but I know Mr. Lord just as I believe the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union knows him as it happens. I know Mr. Lord and I knew him when he was here. How do you deny close relationship? I know the man casually so by meeting him at American Embassy functions.

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

Mr. ADAMS: But he is imputing improper motives to me and saying that I had a close relationship with the Political Attache at the American Embassy and implying that is something bad and wicked.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At what time did he impute that? The hon. member must take his seat and allow the hon. member to develop all he has to say so that I would be able to decide.

Mr. GREAVES: I think you are well aware of what the Leader of the Opposition is capable of doing and interpreting what people say. But if one is going to talk about the CIA money and this kind of nonsense, I want the Leader of the Opposition to deny that he went to the United States of America as a guest of the State Department of the United States Government, and if one is going to talk about CIA money, where did that money come from? The CIA is an agency, as I understand it, of the State Department. I want to know further....

Mr. ADAMS: He has asked the Leader of the Opposition to deny something. On a point of order, you cannot challenge an hon. member to deny he has done something dishonourable. The hon. member has accused me of visiting the United States on a State Department grant and suggested that this involves taking CIA money and that the CIA is an agency of the State Department.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member if he did not visit the United States of America on a State Department grant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I really thought when the hon. member got up on a point of order that he was going to say "yes" or "no".

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, let us get away from this.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, may I continue?

Mr. ADAMS: Sit down man, and behave yourself. Sit down.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You cannot shout at the hon. member.

Mr. ADAMS: I am sorry, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That kind of behaviour is ridiculous. (*Asides*) I am not in a mood for putting him out. The hon. member must take his seat. I am yet willing to hear the point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, on the question which the hon. member asked, the State Department had a system of things called Leader Grants. The hon. member for St. Michael North West, the Minister of Housing, Mr. Elliott Mottley, Mr. Phillips from St. Lucy, the Hon. Minister of Health, the Clerk of the House, the hon. member for Christ Church West, all of us on both sides of the House at one time or another went on these grants.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must take his seat because this is absolutely no point of order, and I do not want to hear anything more about it.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I was making the point and trying to point to the nonsensical approach which was adopted by the Leader of the Opposition in this matter relating to the charges he made, and I was merely pointing out that he himself, the member for Christ Church West, the former member for the City...(*Asides*) I am talking about members of the Opposition and you are free to call the others. I am not sure whether the member for St. Peter went. Of course he may not be accepted; but the point is, Mr. Chairman,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have accepted a lot today from both sides of the House. If you all are tired and want me to send you out without peacefully walking out and resting yourselves, I will do it. I will not be speaking any longer to any hon. member on either side of the house relative to the cross talk and interruptions to any hon. member when he is speaking.

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope I will be able to continue what I have to say without the rude interruptions by members on the other side. I was making the point that there is often a lot of emotional talk when it comes to this kind of matter and there are a number of people who by implication and insinuation try to create the impression which

would mislead people in a country as the Leader of the Opposition attempted to do this afternoon when he made his contribution on this matter about relationships which may exist between one organisation and another or between individuals in a particular organisation and another. As I have said, we in the Barbados Workers' Union do not conduct any business in secret or are not ashamed of any relationship we have with any organisation or institution. We do this in an open manner, we do this in a manner of equality, and as has often been said we are not particularly concerned with the set of matters which have been raised.

Now this same person who has been identified as writing the book, Philip Agee, made some slanderous and libellous statements against the ICFTU and the International Federation of Plantation and Allied Workers Union and was taken to court, and these organisations received damages as a result of the slanderous statements which were contained therein, but my implication and insinuation the Leader of the Opposition attempted to give the public and the House the impression that the Barbados Workers' Union and the General Secretary who is the member for St. Michael West and myself have had some dealings with the CIA, and I want to say that this is far from being the truth.

Mr. ADAMS: Sir, he must not impute improper motives. He is repeatedly saying that I am making charges that they have had dealings with the CIA. He must not go on with this. I am saying that they have had a relationship with the AIFLD and the book the Prime Minister produced said that the AIFLD is connected with the CIA. He must not impute improper motives because he is accusing me without evidence of saying that the Barbados Workers' Union has a relationship with the CIA. This must not go on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That was no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister is here. He made the statement already. Call upon the Prime Minister to carry out an investigation into the Barbados Workers' Union, because they always say they want an investigation carried out. Call for an investigation now, not next week. Say that you want an investigation carried out into the Barbados Workers' Union and on the General Secretary at any time. Go and ask and find out what my dealings are any time, don't wait until I am here.

I am going to deal with the hon. member specifically. This is not the first time he has said

it, and he had it written in the newspaper when he said it on the last occasion. You, Mr. Chairman, realise the CIA connotation and the hon. member for Christ Church West said that if you come in this Chamber and raise something that in itself was the subject of some litigation or slander... the man who wrote the book has already been sued in the High Courts in the United Kingdom and damages have been awarded, not to the Barbados Workers' Union, but he never named the Barbados Workers' Union, but you are now naming the Barbados Workers' Union and associating the Barbados Workers' Union with the names that you published in the Advocate newspaper some time ago without checking up about it. It is nothing to do with the Prime Minister; it is something to do with you.

So far as the Prime Minister is concerned, if he said that about me I would deal with him too. If the Prime Minister says I have CIA connections, let him prove it. Any one of you can say I have any kind of connections, but this is what I will tell you or any hon. member. Neither the Prime Minister nor you will even be able to tell me what kind of associations I am going to have.

7.25 p.m.

I have determined that for myself. So far as I am concerned, I have reached the stage where I can say that.

When the late father of the Leader of the Opposition was President of the Barbados Workers Union he went anywhere to represent the Union. Did you say that he had these kinds of connections? If you eat food at a function given by the State Department am I going to say that it was food given by the CIA? What ignorance is that?

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. I do not want to interrupt or to quarrel in any way with the hon. member, because he has a perfect right to explain that neither the Prime Minister nor I can govern his associations; but there is a distinction between the State Department and the CIA. You stopped me from finishing my denial, because denial I am going to make because the hon. member has said that other members of the House have already accepted the hospitality of the State Department but it does not mean that they accepted the hospitality of the CIA. The two are at variance. They do not have the same budget and are notorious for the inter-departmental hostilities which arise between them in the USA.

Mr. WALCOTT: What is the implication that if you accept an invitation from AIFLD you therefore accept an invitation from the CIA? The State Department is over all. The State Department does not say that the State Department invites you. When you are invited, you are invited by an agency within the US. Dr. Kissenger does not write you a letter and say "Dear Mr. Adams, we are writing you." Somebody from some agency will invite you. So what is the point of saying that?

The AIFLD is something that came up from the Alliance for Progress which was established when John Kennedy was alive. They did something for lawyers and something for the university. Phillip Sherlock is supposed to be chairman of a group that came to Barbados meeting groups dealing with culture. Was he eating food from the CIA? They gave money to Yoruba House. They gave them a grant. So far as the BWU is concerned it is affiliated to many international organisations, like the ICFTU, the International Transport Workers Union and the International Federation of Allied Plantation Workers. It is a general workers union.

I have said that nobody is telling me what to do. I told the seamen that I am not a man to be told by any general secretary in the U.K. what to do. I am not for sale. I do not want cheap money. Nobody can stay in the U.K. and send messages down here to Frank Walcott. They must know their place. I am not going to be in a position where any person in the U.K, especially a white man can tell me what to do. My grandfather and my great grandfather were slaves. I do not have any intention of being a slave, so do not come to us with that kind of talk about the CIA.

The CIA talk might be a good treat on a political platform; but I want to say that I am representing people, and when it comes to the question of my association with international institutions, do not tell me that we are getting money from AIFLD because it is associated with the CIA.

Go back to Barclays Bank where the interest should be 8 per cent, but we are paying Barclays Bank 13 per cent on a loan of \$800,000. Do you know something about what is going on in Barbados? The Government pays \$90,000 on something that costs \$1.6 million. When you talk about the CIA do you know what you are talking about? They just run their mouth.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation. Before the hon. member moves himself into any more passion, I am sure that he will want me to put as succinctly as possible the point that arose in his absence; because he clearly has misunderstood it. I have to make it utterly clear that the entire CIA thing was not introduced by us, and we have said over and over again — and I will repeat — that the book was of alleged spurious authority and was cited by the Prime Minister in attacking the hon. member for Bridgetown when she was still Miss Billie Miller and campaigning. (*Aside*: That is a speech) Of course it is a speech, but I am elucidating a point which I have made.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. ADAMS: I am asking the hon. member to hear me.

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way on that. It is not a point of order. The hon. member spoke yesterday about nastiness in a debate. This would be the essence of nastiness to be accusing us...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. He cannot say that I was guilty of nastiness. I object to the words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will take his seat.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member made remarks about nastiness. He introduced this word into the debate.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The hon. member said that my speech was the essence of nastiness. I object to that. He said that I introduced nastiness into the debate, and that my speech was the essence of nastiness.

Mr. WALCOTT: Check with the reporter. It was nastiness because he knows that the CIA has a connotation of something that is improper. To say that you have an organisation operating in Barbados connected with the CIA, not only is it nasty...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I say that both hon. members must take their seats. (*Asides*). I am asking both hon. members to take their seats. (*Asides*) I am on my feet and all hon members in this Chamber must remain silent.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me hear your point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: The hon. member has said that my speech was the essence of nastiness. When I was on my point of order and you were on your feet he was shouting for 30 seconds and you could not make him sit down. So you do not have to check with the reporter. He said it, and I am submitting that it is unparliamentary. He cannot say that an hon. member's speech is the essence of nastiness.

7.35 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member said openly today that the Barbados Workers Union went to Washington and was eating CIA lunch.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to entertain this type of behaviour, and according to Standing Order 28(5) "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House". Note Standing Order 28(7) "No member may impute improper motives to another member."

I am going to ask the hon. member to withdraw the word "nasty".

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member imputed improper motives — do you realize when he tells us we ate CIA lunch that that is provocative behaviour? As far as I am concerned I am not withdrawing the words.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well the hon. member must leave the Chamber.

Mr. WALCOTT left the Chamber.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, let us bring this thing back to some sort of rationality. The only contribution I want to make now is that, as I understand the member for St. Lucy and the member who has just been sent out, their argument is that the mere fact of having been the recipient of funds from the AIFLD which organization was alleged in the gentleman's book to be an arm of the CIA does not *ipso facto* mean that they are CIA agents. Let us assume that that is the argument, Sir, and that it is correct. In similar reasoning it shows the serious nature of the Prime Minister's allegation during the City by-election campaign that the fact that.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have sat here very, very

patiently and listened to all the misstatements which have been made. I do not think that this debate is on the City by-election. I had intended to make a statement to clear the air here, and when we are going into a detailed examination of something to do with the CIA, that is absolutely nothing to do with the subject matter of the debate, and that is why I refrained from getting up. When I get up I would say what I have to say but I did not think it was relevant or that anything they were saying was relevant to the debate. I think it was an unnecessary introduction, I think it was — I don't have anything parliamentary to say, Sir, so I better sit.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both sides.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: And I think you have to stop the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And this is what I am prepared to do. I have given sufficient latitude, and at this stage I am prepared to deal with every hon. member inside here on the merits.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, everybody else has had an opportunity to speak.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes; and.....

Mr. SIMMONS: I belong to the minority group and I understand your function is to help protect minorities, and no Prime Minister or anybody else is going to deny me my rights in here to speak. Now get that clearly understood.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But you will speak now on the Resolution for \$400,000 and.....

Mr. SIMMONS: All of them had their say, and all I am saying.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And what I am saying is this; I have given both sides all the latitude and I have just asked the hon. member to leave for disobeying the Chair, and if any other hon. member disobeys the Chair I will ask him to leave, regardless of which side it may be. So I want all hon. members now to stick to the Resolution for \$400,000.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, what I was saying was that if anybody said in relation to an outside organization that the mere fact that you belong to a grouping like the International Federation of Women Lawyers and it was written in a book that that was an arm of the CIA, that shows the serious nature of the argument, having

regard to what was said by the member for St. Lucy and the member for St. Michael West. That is all I have to say, Sir.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I very much want to follow up what the hon. member for Christ Church West said earlier here this evening. We are told in the newspaper and on the other media that the Big Four had a meeting at the home of the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago — a very chumsy chumsy thing. I stayed in Dominica and heard how we were lending Jamaica money and how Trinidad was lending us money. This is the same Jamaica that turned its back on a Federation in the early 60s; the same Jamaica which found that it could not hold hands with Barbados and Trinidad comes now to Trinidad hand in hand crawling to beg for money to keep them from crawling over the brink of bankruptcy. They have not well gone home a week with this money, than we hear that Mr. Michael Manley the Prime Minister of Jamaica has declared an indefinite state of emergency.

7.45 p.m.

They haven't well gone home a week with their hot fists tied around this money than we hear that Mr. Michael Manley, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, has declared an indefinite state of emergency. All of this scenario, all of this is all the more reason why the Prime Minister must come in here and let the people of this country know what is going on. There is a lot of talk about destabilisation; how is it that we don't know that all this "whizzy-whizzing" in Trinidad wasn't destabilisation talk between the four of them? We don't know that, money is passing hands. Is it a fact that ICA is folding up? Is it a fact, Mr. Chairman, that BWIA is to become the national carrier and that is the price that Eric Williams is extracting from them? Is that a fact? All of that we have to be told in here, and he comes in here and says that in the bad old colonial days nobody had to come to the House with it, we are not concerned with that, the bad old colonial days are in the past, this is today and we are here.

This is a Resolution which deals with CARICOM, and it is my view, Mr. Chairman, that the island of Barbados might will have been told in the sixties to throw in its lot with the Little Eight — this is a pittance they are handing down to the Little Eight, the big millions they have shared out between themselves and there is no accountability for it. I have been down in those island recently and I know how they feel down there about this Big Foursome, I know they are not happy about the attitudes the MDCs are taking

with them. Barbados, of course, is posing as an MDC when in truth it is not, but I feel that it would have behaved us better in the sixties to throw in our lot with the Little Eight and maybe today we might have been self-sufficient in these islands that maybe we could have been feeding ourselves in a way that now, 1976, with all the big talk among the four big Heads in the Caribbean we cannot still feed ourselves.

Jamaica is on the verge of bankruptcy, virtually gone over the edge now with violence, because that has put a full stop to their tourist trade, and as the hon. member has said before me, it is like throwing a stone into a pool, there is no way that those ripples are not going to come back from Jamaica and but on to our tourist trade here, irrespective of what the Minister of Tourism might have you believe. Some kind of public accountability has got to be made. For three years there has been no proper accountability, the man in the street does not know when last there was a proper budget in this place, where is the budget? We are moving into the bottom of June and they are coming here now for \$10 million to put into the hands of the LDCs for a Special Fund. We have been told nothing about it, and the hon. member for St. John is trying to suggest, they don't have to account for anything in here. They can only give old age pensioners \$13 a week and now they can come and tell you they want \$10 million.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: On a point of order, Sir, the hon. member apparently hasn't read her papers. It is \$400,000 we are dealing with, the total Fund is \$10 million comprised of various contributions.

Miss MILLER: The total fund is going to be \$10 million, and the \$400,000 — I can read, which is more than can be said for everybody out there — (*Asides*). Mr. Chairman, do I have to take heckling?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members on my right.

Miss MILLER: I would like to see these questions answered. I want it put in its proper perspective, this whole talk about CARICOM, because CARICOM has one meaning in the LDCs, it has another meaning in the commercial sector right through this region, it has another meaning when the Big Four get together and "whizzy-whizzy" at "So-and So's" house in Trinidad and Tobago, and that kind of thing. All of this destabilisation talk we have had before in my view is nothing but a colossal smoke screen

to distract the attention of people like me and like you, Mr. Chairman, from the state of disaster and chaos that they are all trembling on, and I say that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister of Barbados must account.

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

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, the Resolution for the sum of \$487,000 was passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. E. TALMA, seconded by Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this concludes Government Business for today's sitting. I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until Friday, 25th at 10.30 a.m.

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.
7.55 p.m.

On resumption —

Mr. SPEAKER: The Sitting is resumed.

RESOLUTION RE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1976

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item which the Government proposes to deal with is No. 15, and it is to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order, 1976.

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

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This is a Resolution, Sir, to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order, 1976, which has been made by the Minister responsible for Establishment on the 11th June, 1976, under section 2 of the Civil Establishment Act, Cap. 21. It is set out in the Order itself that the officers specified in the first column of the Schedule are established. It deals with the under-mentioned posts:

Police: Medical Officer District 'A', Medical Officer.

Prisons: Medical Officer, Chaplain.

Government Industrial Schools: Medical Officer, Chaplain.

Ministry of Health; (a) Queen Elizabeth Hospital — Dental Surgeon, Visiting Surgeon, Visiting Obstetrician, Visiting Ophthalmic Surgeon, Visiting E. N. T. Surgeon, Chaplain.

(b) Mental Hospital — Chaplain.

(c) District Hospitals and Outpatients' Clinics — District Medical Officer, Dentist.

(d) Maternity Hospitals — Visiting Medical Officer, Oistin, Visiting Medical Officer St. Andrew.

Ministry of Health — Ophthalmic Surgeon.

Fire Service — Medical Officer.

Those are the posts which have been established, and by this Order, under para. 3, there are attached to the offices specified in the first column of the Schedule the emoluments set out in the Schedule in relation thereto, so that all the various amounts opposite in the first column will relate to the salary increases which these officers will get. For example, in the case of the Medical Officer District 'A', the proposed salary will be \$8,844 this year, and next year it will be \$9,552. In the case of the other Medical Officers, who are part-time, the salary will be \$2,640 this year and \$2,940 next year. The Order sets out in detail what we propose doing in respect of the emoluments specified in the second column thereof, with effect from 1st April, 1976, and in respect of the emoluments specified in the third column thereof with effect from 1st April, 1977.

The Governor-General may appoint to the offices specified in the first column of the Schedule such part-time officers as he considers necessary, but in any case he cannot exceed the total number which is set out in the Order itself.

Where the emoluments of an office established under this Order are on a scale divided into segments by the symbol “:” an officer holding any such office is not entitled to any emoluments of that scale beyond the point at which the symbol appears except on such conditions as the Governor-General determines in relation to offices of that class.

This is in connection with part-time officers. I do not think we have any union intervention in this case. That being the case, Sir, it is a straightforward matter, and I beg to move that this Resolution in relation to the increase in salaries for Part-Time Officers as the Order sets out, and as I have explained briefly, do now pass.

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

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am in a different position from the members of the Opposition because they only have a political interest in this debate. My interest is more fundamental. This is an industrial matter, and I am afraid what the Hon. Leader of the House has said cannot square off with the position.

Mr. ADAMS rose —

Mr. WALCOTT: I am not giving way. The hon. member has not spoken. He is wasting time all the time.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: But I am standing, and I think that means some significance. Do not start anything funny in here today at all. The hon. member for St. Michael West caught my eye and got up to speak. I want to hear him. What is your point of order?

Mr. ADAMS: From the time I have been in here, when an hon. member has been sent out for the remainder of the day's sitting that extends to suspended sittings, and I would be glad of Your Honour's ruling on it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, just one minute. I was not the presiding officer. I was told, or I was made to understand, that the member was to leave the Chamber — nothing more. I did not hear the words “for the remainder of the sitting, for the day or for the session.”

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out that, as far as my recollection goes, the hon. member left the Chamber. It was intimated that he would have to leave the Chamber, but the question of time was not made clear at all.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have made that point quite clear.

Mr. LOWE: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make my position clear in this Chamber when it comes to disorder. I have already sent the hon. member for St. James out of this Chamber asking him to leave the Chamber, and he came back in the very same day. I did not send him out for the remainder of the sitting. The same thing has transpired with the member for St. Michael West. I asked him to leave the Chamber. That is all I had asked him to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: Point made. The hon. member for St. Michael West may continue.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This must be dealt with. Standing Order 40(2) says:

“The Speaker or the Chairman shall order any Member whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the House during the remainder of that day's sitting.”

There is no power in the Rules to order out somebody temporarily.
10.40 a.m.

If the hon. member was not ordered out properly, I am going to ask...

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to discontinue.

Mr. ADAMS: You cannot tell me that. I am really very sorry. On a point of order, you cannot tell me that a member cannot make a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I have ruled on this and you can make a substantive motion.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, when the House was sitting earlier in this sitting, the hon. member described my speech as being the essence of nastiness and he was ordered to withdraw it. I would now ask that he be asked to withdraw it again. It has never been withdrawn and he is here again and I am asking you to order him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to make the point clear. I was not the presiding officer. I will consult with the Clerk at the Table to know whether or not that took place.

I am advised that a ruling was taken on that already by the presiding officer and we are not going back on that.

May I hear the hon. member for St. Michael West?

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, when the time comes for us to go into Committee I may have to make some appropriate remarks, but as you have rightly indicated you can see how the debates of this house are starting again. It is not unusual for the hon. member to challenge the Chair and delay a meeting of the House repeatedly at the beginning when they do not have anything to say on what is currently before the Chamber, and I do not intend to engage...

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the Rules say...

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, you allowed the hon. member to speak on a point of order already.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will determine whether it is a point of order.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, the Rules say that no member may impute improper motives to another member. The hon. member has just said that it is not unusual for me to challenge the rulings of the Chair so as to delay the proceedings of the House when I have nothing to say, and I submit that is imputing improper motives to me. It is imputing the motive of delaying the proceedings of the House, that I have nothing to say, and if that is not an improper motive, nothing can be, and I ask that Your Honour ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not hear the hon. member say the Leader of the Opposition, and I will ask the hon. member for St. Michael West to continue his speech and desist from talking about rulings of the Chair, because the Chair is going to make its rulings known today to everybody; so get on with the things before the House.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I am the first person to speak and you will notice that I have been interrupted three times.

I was dealing with the matter before us and I was saying that the Order that is before us is one of the Orders dealing with the total matter of the Civil Establishment, and I was making the point that my interest in this matter is not a political interest, and for that reason I will have to take a different stand from the members of the Opposition. Their interest in this Order is not the same as mine. But I should point out to the Hon. Leader of the House that this Order for Part-Time Officers is a consequential Order relating to the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, because you could not have arrived at a settlement for the part-time officers without having a basis for determining what you are going to pay them. This is not political and I am afraid that the civil servants are not served in the best way when you throw this matter into Parliament, because on the other side they are not going to get any debate on this matter that can do justice to the cause of industrial relations.

I have a letter in my possession to show that the Courts deal with matters in a different form, if not we would not set up these other institutions in the community. If you want industrial relations to be dealt with so that you can go through bit by bit and piece by piece, you must submit these things to close and constant negotiations so that they can be dealt with. I am afraid that this is part of the same General Order that I am objecting to, and I cannot support the method of arriving at these conclusions because there must be more scope and time for discussion on these matters.

When we were discussing the Order the Prime Minister said that collective bargaining is a pious phrase. I do not know if that is what the lawyers feel about collective bargaining, because it is true that the lawyers, when it comes to collective bargaining, are very weak. You must have something in the four corners of the law for them to be able to negotiate, but collective bargaining is fundamental to our industrial relations and the Government of Barbados itself has ratified two Conventions, very important Conventions, Convention 88 and Convention 98 which specifically deal with the freedom of association, the right to organise and collective bargaining. It is a Convention; it is not a recommendation, so if the Government of Barbados subscribes to Convention 98 there can be no question that it is a pious phrase. I have been in industrial negotiations for over thirty

years and I do not need any prompting on this matter; I do not need any political grist on this matter. What we do know is that the basis for arriving at an agreement must be a basis that is acceptable on a general ground.

Now I do not have any quarrel with any Government or with any employer if the employer disagrees with the Union when we are meeting and he cannot go any further and states that he cannot go any further. We have that daily, but then within your collective bargaining structure you make provision for that.

10.50 a.m.

Now, the Government as an employer is no different in the collective bargaining system from any other employer; and as I have said here publicly, the Government has in its own structure, an officer, the Chief Establishment Officer, who is the Government's Chief negotiator. He is an excellent officer. I believe that if we had within the industrial sector of Barbados, in the private sector, men or women of the calibre of the Chief Establishment Officer, his outlook and broad knowledge collective bargaining would become common place and very easy, and industrial disputes would become something of the past; because you have an officer of his intelligence who can appreciate your point of view and at the same time represent the case of the Government sensibly and with clarity and lucidity. There is no question about that.

Therefore we have within the Government structure an officer of high calibre; and there is no question about that officer's integrity. It has nothing to do with the union asking the officer to do anything for it or anything that would smear the officer's character. We in the Union do not have to go to the officer and ask him to do anything outside of negotiating. We do not meet him until we have these occasions for negotiating.

You, Sir, have heard from the Chair the suggestion, the sly statement that was made, that the Barbados Workers' Union was willing to negotiate with private employers on one basis and with the Government of Barbados on another basis. That statement was made by the Leader of the Opposition. I challenge the hon. member to prove that we negotiate with the private sector on one basis and when we go to negotiate with the Government it is on another basis because of our association with the Government. That is a smear on our character and I will deal with him today. That is a figment of some person's mentality and he is the only man who will sink to that level.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order. The hon. member has referred to the Leader of the Opposition. He has misquoted me. I said that the hon. member has only himself to blame if people say that he negotiates with private employers on a different level. He can get up and rant and struggle against the tranquilisers, but he must not talk about sinking to a level or about smears made by me.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member spoke about tranquilisers. I have never gone into his bedroom to see if he has tranquilisers. Do you think that I need something to get me asleep?

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will get on. The hon. member knows that if you are a hypocrite — that is why I was waiting — he said that the union asked private employers for 60 per cent and then asked Government for 35 per cent. The hon. member for Bridgetown in another debate repeated the word "hypocrisy". Mr. Speaker, I am not going to bother you in any debate by rising and asking people to withdraw statements like that. I can speak in reply.

The hon. member insinuated that I am a hypocrite in asking for 60 per cent and that is what he repeated. He is a lawyer and he knows when you repeat something that is vulgar and say that people said it, but he is not saying it, he is repeating a slanderous statement in saying that somebody else said it. If you say that somebody called someone a thief, but I am saying that you are honest, you are repeating the slander. No person with any modicum of intelligence and integrity will repeat a slanderous statement which they know is a smear on someone else's reputation and character.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to justify my character and integrity to members on this side or that side. I can stand before any tribunal any time. What we say is that we have looked at the whole economic matter, the whole financial matter, and we do not feel that the proposals in general — and I will deal with them specifically later — justify the Government in not accepting the proposals of the Barbados Workers' Union. They were reasonable and they were just.

If there is something reasonable and just, the community will accept it. Again, Mr. Speaker, we do not subscribe to the view that there is a battle or conflict between the taxpayers and the public servants. The public servants are taxpayers, and we do not believe in this system of subtracting

some of the community from the rest of the community. From time to time they like to subtract what they call supporters of the Government from the community. You cannot subtract people from a community and produce a community without them. The community of Barbados is the community of all Barbadians, so the taxpayers of Barbados are taxpayers who include public servants. The taxpayers of Barbados are not taxpayers minus the Civil Servants.

When you are examining salaries, wages and conditions of employment, these have to be examined within the context of what is fair and reasonable within the wage index of what has taken place in the last three or four years, not only on a global basis, but an individual basis that exists in the community.

We say that our proposals were reasonable because it compares favourably with proposals for other sectors of the community. We can further say that the Government must be a model employer and set an example.
11.00 a.m.

The Government must not only follow but in some area the Government must lead. For example — and these have been taken into consideration — the Government of Barbados in a general way is the only single employer which in itself provides a non-contributory pension for the majority or nearly all of the people it employs; and the taxpayers now, outside of the people who are public servants have to subscribe to that. That has been going on now for the last seventy five years because it has been taken for granted that all public servants are entitled to pension and that the pension need not be contributory. So that is one of the systems we have. Therefore, that is an advantage the public servant has over the other community members; but you never withdraw it from them based on the fact that the other sections in the community do not get it. So we do not accept raising these issues at this stage; it is a struggle between the taxpayers and the public servants.

On the other hand, we do not accept the argument that has been adduced on purely economic grounds that the cost of living — because the cost of living is not the sole factor of determining increases, but if the cost of living rises extraordinarily in any given circumstances you could not pass that cost of living throughout the whole sector of the community, for obvious reasons. You do not have to be a John Maynard

Keyles to understand that — like the time with the oil crisis. It would be impossible for Barbados which is a highly important community, finding itself with a high import bill from oil and the factors which would cause oil to increase, that if oil would raise you up a 20% increase suddenly, that you will be able to pass on the 20% increase throughout the total economy. The money would not be there anyhow. It would not be there so you would not have it, because as an automatic arrangement a 20% increase — and these are only examples in the cost of living through an extraordinary position like oil is not in itself going to produce a 20% increase through the community that the growth is going to increase by 20%. Far from that, it is going to be a net deficit in that you would be paying out more money and everybody would be paying out more money for receiving the same product. For that reason we in the Union have taken a reasonable view that we are aware that we could not absorb the total increase in the cost of living. As an example, the cost of living rose by an amount of something like 80% to 82% from the time we last met the Government and from the time we went forward again.

When we met the Government we had no intention of submitting a proposal, or we did not expect that you would get an increase that would be equivalent to a cost of living increase on a general basis that would increase the total wage bill by 80% or 100%. That would be understandable. So we negotiate; but your proposal would form the basis for negotiating a new contract. But now when you reach an agreement—and the Union was the organization that put forward the proposal to have two-tier arrangement — it was the Union who put forward the first proposal that there should be a three-year agreement. The Government never had any agreement. Every five years we used to meet. We said that was not fair, you should have a terminal arrangement. Therefore the public servants knew that the end of three years — before it used to be five years, and people waiting, until there was election time and somebody was beginning to prance up looking for a seat in the House of Assembly and using the public servants as a political football for their onward march into the House of Assembly, and they are left to stew in their juice for the next five years.

Now the Barbados Workers' Union is a continuous organisation. We are not an election gimmick. We do not function on the basis of every five years. If we used to function on the basis of every five years we have disappeared like

some of the politicians have disappeared; but we operate on such a basis that instead of disappearing we have grown. Therefore the insinuation that we are taking money from outside sources, we demonstrated the last time we met — anybody can look at the value of our assets. The Auditor General of Barbados, he by law has to audit the accounts of the Barbados Workers' Union. We employ a chartered accountant and we do not ask the chartered accountant to which party he belongs. We do not tell professional people 'show me your voting card.' He may be a member of the Barbados Labour Party, but we have confidence in the integrity of the officer, that our business is our business when he is performing the business, and when he comes into the Union he has no special cubby boy to hold me down to ask me — as some people think — 'let me see the books that you keep and the one you send to the Auditor General.' We do not have Auditor General books and books for ourselves.

The hon. member for St. Lucy performs the duties as Senior Assistant General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, and I have no keys. I do not have to lock up anything from anybody. My office is open, so we do not even — when they talk about the CIA, anybody can come into my office at any time; CIA, AIC, CAI, anybody can come and even the Leader of the Opposition can come. Far from that the Leader of the Opposition wrote me a letter sometime ago when he was in some problem in settling a matter in St. Thomas; he wanted the union to get 27% adhoc bonus — regarding the union as such an organization that the union is the best organization for him to write this letter to; and I have no doubt about it that he would not deny it because I have a copy of the letter here written on 9th February, 1976.

Why write us a letter as recently as 9th February, 1976? What have you to be associated with an organization when you are not even sure if the person you are writing was a member of the union. Why are you asking the union to go into matters like this? Now this shows that if there is something wrong with the integrity of the Barbados Workers Union where would we get 20% as an adhoc bonus from? And it is known that the Barbados Workers Union — and to show and to demonstrate the lie and the viciousness of statements like these — the Barbados Workers Union refuse to be associated with a Committee that the Government set up in the Port because we objected to the person who was made Chairman, set up by the Government. We say we have nothing against Mr. Ward as a person but we

objected to an employer because the employer was consultant and was becoming Chairman of the Board and for that reason we said we were not going to serve. Nothing to do with the person as a person, nothing to do with his integrity, but we said we could not serve under those circumstances.

If we agree with the Government on any matter we have the freedom to say we do. We support the Government on National areas.
11.10 a.m.

We do not have to make any excuses for that, but where we do not agree we say so also, and that is the only way we can survive as an independent organisation with integrity.

When it comes to the individual, when it comes to me as a person, I do not need to say anything about myself, I have been in public life too long for at this stage anybody to be saying they do not know where I stand. As I said earlier, I started as a worker and will go out as a worker, I have no compunction about that. I have no inferiority complex, I have no bitterness for anybody, I am not one of these people who worry about people's circumstances and where they were born and how they were born, I do not make those kind of ignorant references to people. How you were born is an accident for which you were not responsible, so if you were responsible for your birth I was not responsible for mine. I am not going to challenge any person about theirs, what I am going to challenge you about is your behaviour when you have grown up; your commitment to what. I am not a latter day commitment to socialist philosophy and to the workers' cause, every increase that has been made on behalf of public workers in the last 30 years I have been engaged in, and I am in the forefront of the battle to see that they get a fair and reasonable break.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the hon. member, not that there have not been interruptions, but I'm giving you two minutes more.

Mr. WALCOTT: I will not take as much as two minutes, Sir, I will take one. I would like to say to the Hon. Leader that this is part of the total Resolution. I could not support it on the grounds that I would be supporting by definition the others that I do not agree with, and for that

reason I will have to make the same statement I made on the Resolution for the Part-Time Officers.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have heard a long reasoned speech by the hon. member for St. Michael West, and one which many hon. members may feel does him greater credit perhaps in any intervention we have heard from him in the House for months, perhaps indeed for years, and I am glad to see that he has come down unequivocally on the side of the arguments which I put forward yesterday, that the abandonment of collective bargaining represents so great a departure from proper principle that results reached by such an abandonment should not be supported by members of the House who have their own integrity at heart, and the interest of the workers also at heart.

The General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, I sometimes think, speaks as though he is living in a city under siege, as though the Fascists are at the gate. He sometimes speaks as though every remark which is made is a remark which condemns the integrity of the Barbados Workers' Union. He must understand that although everything he says is true, that you cannot escape the consequences of slander merely by saying that you don't believe it but somebody else is asserting it, yet in a debating assembly such as this you must expect that criticisms which are generally voiced are going to be repeated in here so that they can be dealt with adequately or inadequately as the case may be. That is one of the reasons for having the privilege of free speech in Parliament, to allow people to deal with the underground rumour, if they can, and deal with the accusations of lack of integrity in Government, and so on, and therefore the hon. member must understand that the public interest demands that statements which are gaining widespread currency on public issues of the day can be ventilated in here. I would have thought his remarks would be better directed towards an hon. member who can get up and say that Eric Sealy said on a political platform such and such. I would have more thought, since that statement was desperately untrue and totally irrelevant, that that statement would more deserve the strictures of the hon. member for St. Michael West.

Mr. SPEAKER: And I feel so, too, because I want to hear about the Part-Time Officers, not Eric Sealy. I agree with you, but let us get more closely to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I am making a speech, I can speak in here until 2 o' clock, and I can come

back again and start at a quarter past three, and if necessary I can speak on this particular Resolution all day.

Mr. SPEAKER: We know that, but please stick to the Resolution.

Mr. ADAMS: I want to make my speech, Sir, because I haven't come in here to be contentious, but we have seen a lot of things go on in here. We have seen day before yesterday in my very respectful submission to you and to Mr. Chairman, a lot of very ill-judged and improper remarks made, and I see the Advocate puts at the end of some report that the Prime Minister said that certain affidavits will be made and he will take action, and so on. This is the first chance I have had to deal with that, and if the hon. member was in order to say that you must not repeat slander merely putting it into the mouths of other persons, I believe that the sentence I uttered — and I had finished at the time of your interruption, Sir — I beg your pardon, Sir, your intervention — I believe that I was entitled to say that.

Now, the hon. member has spoken, as obviously he must in these matters, about the role of the Barbados Workers' Union. He has taken an example, the facts are not entirely properly recalled — there is a very slight error which he made — but he has taken an example of the role that the Barbados Workers' Union still plays in our society and pointed out indeed that the Leader of the Opposition has had recourse to the Union to deal with certain matters, but I think he draws the wrong conclusion. The whole point is that the Barbados Workers' Union is one of the major institutions of this country and it has a role in public life which everybody has to respect. It cannot, however, think it is above criticism, and a man is not insincere if on behalf of a Union member — she lives in St. James, by the way, not in St. Thomas — if on behalf of a Union member who said that she worked at Bagatelle Plantation or Norwood, wherever it is, a plantation controlled by the owners of Bagatelle and Norwood, and she has been deprived of her just and lawful rights, any politician far less a lawyer must write to the Union to say that this is one of your members and she claims that she has been mistreated as a worker. I will say this to the hon. member, he seems to me to be more proud of that letter than of any letter he has received since I have been in the House, because he refers to it often. I would like him to frame it, don't put it up in the place where the picture of my father used to be, but put it up somewhere else, because it will always be a testimony to the fact that I have a respect and regard for the Barbados

Workers' Union, and for its General Secretary from time to time too. Even then he lets himself down a little bit in the displays which he puts on in here. We have for a long time got accustomed to thinking that the hon. member who has just spoken is going to get up and spend two or three minutes saying he is going to be vehement and when he is finished with the Leader of the Opposition or the hon. member for St. James — he never says the hon. member for St. Peter — or as the case may be, he will not be able to hold up his head again, and that turns out to be the whole of the speech which he makes.

11.20 a.m.

That is why I am glad that he has spoken as he has spoken today, so that we in the Opposition can welcome him in the No Lobby when this Resolution is, eventually, divided, but he has to understand that nobody can have total support at any time. He knows that he is attached to the Democratic Labour Party, but nobody on earth could accuse him of giving total support to the Prime Minister. The very fact that he has been able to make the Prime Minister break his pledge to the employers to limit the right of industrial action in the Port shows that he will stand up where necessary. The withdrawal of the Shops Act under threat shows the same thing, and the repeated hints and murmurs which you get of disagreements with the Minister of Labour all point in the same direction. If he disagrees with the Prime Minister, he cannot expect the Opposition always to agree with him. If he is in that Party and falls out with the Government, he cannot expect that the Opposition, who owe him no political loyalty whatsoever, are always going to agree with him; therefore, the Barbados Workers' Union will have to be criticised at certain times, whatever its position as an institution.

The Speaker's Chair is not above criticism, Sir, if you do not mind my saying so. I can go outside on a platform, Sir, and say that I believe I have seen incompetent rulings in the Speaker's Chair and the Chairman's Chair. You cannot do me anything except sue me for libel, and then the judge will decide, I can give the examples and say that only an idiot can rule like that. I am not suggesting you are. I told this to Speaker Maxwell. I would even more deal with Mr. Maxwell because he behaved as if he thought he knew better than the Deputy Speaker, the Clerk, or anybody else. Any institution can be criticised, Sir, at any time. Even Parliament itself, no doubt, falls to be criticised by the very public who vote for it all the time.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael West has put a good part of the case for the Opposition, and put it with some authority since he was a part of the negotiations. When we say that the collective bargaining process was not pursued to its proper conclusion, we are speaking from hearsay upon the outside. We may have seen notes; we may have been told things, but when you hear it from the fountain-head you must agree with it, and, therefore, I will not expand at any greater length on that particular aspect of it. I want to deal now with the substance of the Resolution, and not the principle that caused the Resolution to be brought before the House, but the actual details of the position and salaries of the particular Part-Time Officers embraced in it. For that reason I am very glad to see the Minister of Health back in his seat, because I am going to ask the Minister of Health if he would clarify a number of facts which have been bruited around in connection with the position of Part-Time Medical Officers, so many of whom are provided for in this Resolution.

Now, in the matter of health policy, it is quite clear that there is a division of opinion between the political parties on the provision of Health Services for Barbados. The Barbados Labour Party believes in a free National Health Service supplied to patients at the consulting rooms of doctors of their own choosing, and not at Health Clinics, or at the Casualty Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, or at District Hospitals. We believe that every patient, or potential patient, which in fact means the whole population, should be able to register with a doctor of his or her choice, that that patient should be entitled to receive free medical service at general practitioner level from his own general practitioner without having to go to a multi-purpose Health Clinic, Casualty Department, or otherwise. I have put it forward in here that the amount of money used to subsidise the buses would more than pay for such a service.

We believe that Government should, progressively, work towards the reduction of prices of all drugs, no matter where prescribed, not limited in other words to drugs prescribed at the General Hospital, or prescribed to National Assistance patients, and so on. The ultimate goal, of course, would be to provide free medicine as well, but this is a goal which has proved beyond the capacity of many countries. Therefore, at this level, our Party have to content ourselves with pledging that, if we are elected to power, by the Monday of the following week, there will be no

5% sales tax on drugs. That is a positive, unequivocal pledge. It is a part of our pledge to abolish the 5% sales tax altogether, and we stand on this. These are our policies.

The policy of the Government appears to be to provide a wider measure of free health care at multi-purpose clinics throughout the country, and some steps are already being taken in this direction. To this end the Part-Time Medical Officers now in the service of Government have been circulated with a memorandum setting out the Government's new plans for its medical service in the form of proposed new conditions of work for Part-Time Medical Officers. I do not propose to go over all of them, although they concern the Medical Officer District 'A', the Police Medical Officer, all of the Part-Time Medical Officers, and the Visiting Medical Officers mentioned on the second page and so on. I do not propose to go into all the details of the memorandum.

Sufficient be it that different salary scales are proposed — different even, I believe, from those proposed in here for a greater attendance of Medical Officers at the multi-purpose Health Clinics, and I believe there are also different proposals for District Medical Officers who go out on night calls, and so on. Some District Medical Officers do go out on night calls, Sir. I believe that one of them accounts for, perhaps, 2/3 of all the night calls made by District Medical Officers in Barbados. One by himself makes twice as many night calls as all the others put together. These are little infelicities of which the Minister may be able to enlighten us when he deals with the general conditions of service, if he cares to. This proposal has been around, and it is my information that several of the District Medical Officers have rejected the new conditions of service.

It is my belief that memoranda are in the hands of the Minister which indicate that doctors say they should be paid better than bus drivers, and so on. This is a matter of social policy, and no doubt the Minister would like to say something on that. The average wage of a coal miner in Russia is higher than the average wage of a medical practitioner, or a general medical practitioner. Three-quarters of our Russian doctors are women, and they are paid amounts of money which do not amount to the earnings, or do not reach the earnings of heavy industrial labourers in that country. That is Russia, but in Barbados we have a different attitude for our doctors. Our doctors build themselves Fort Knoxes, and do very well, indeed, out of the physical ailments

that beset our population. I am not going to say anything about a particular doctor, Sir. I know you may be looking forward to having to stop me from going too far. I will not deal with any doctors, whether in St. George North or otherwise, Sir. It is social policy in Barbados that the medical profession be well paid, probably in financial terms, for the top-rewarding profession. In other countries it is not such policy.

11.30 a.m.

I will ask the Minister to make a statement as to whether these amounts in this general service Order represent an interim stage in the Government's plans on its way to a new health policy, or whether they represent a final stage, because the District Medical Officers have rejected the Government's plans or are in the process of rejecting the Government's plans for the operation of multi-purpose health clinics. Certainly I would also be glad to hear from the Minister of Health whether he is satisfied with the fact that it appears that of Barbados' institutions the Queen Elizabeth Hospital seems to command two-thirds of the medical profession in this Island. Is it really satisfactory to him that if there are 120 doctors that probably 80 are connected with Government providing medical services and only 40 are general practitioners, because this is a most unusual condition in any country that does not have a free health service.

In Barbados you have consultants with their own waiting rooms who see patients at general practitioner level and take their money without reference, matters which I believe in Britain and in the United States would come under the band of the appropriate medical associations. You have practitioners who are consultants at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital drawing some of these part-time wages in here who use the Intensive Care Unit and who then treat patients admitted to the Intensive Care Unit privately outside in their own facilities and charge them very large sums. It is suggested, not always making it clear to them that the services provided by the Intensive Care Unit were free so that the patients pay up the inordinate bills thinking that perhaps they are paying for some of what happened in the hospital. The Minister may be aware of a complaint which was made that a lady attended at the General Hospital and sought to pay for the services of a part-time consultant and insisted, even though she was told by the cashier of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital that she owed the hospital no money, yes, here is Dr. So-and-So's bill and he sent the bill as soon as I came out of the Intensive Care Unit.

All these matters I submit are also matters that should be dealt with in the debates on this particular Resolution because this deals with the condition of service of doctors. They are the part-time officers who are here mentioned.

I am not going to deal with the Chaplains, but Your Honour will observe that in this vote there is a vote for four Chaplains at the Government Industrial Schools, the Prisons, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Mental Hospital. I am not going to deal with that. If some other hon. member wants to ask about whether you should not have interdenominational Chaplains and shuffle them around, that would be up to hon. members interested in ecclesiastical affairs.

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

The real burden of this Resolution deals with the doctors and I am looking forward to hearing something from the Minister of Health. I cannot expect him to agree with our policies, but at least I think that we and the public would better be able to judge the respective programmes for health of the two political parties if the Minister could find it possible today to address his mind to the themes which I have raised.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in conclusion perhaps I would like very briefly to advert again to the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael West and the remarks which were made at that stage. I think we have started off very well in here today, and I very much hope that we can carry on the debate on the level of issues and policies and what was done rather than who was who, and let us have a little honesty and decency in what was carried on.

In so far as I can defend myself in final words from the charge of slander by insinuation, I will remind hon. members that some time ago I had occasion to speak on security and I said that Sydney Alleyne had told a member of this House that another hon. member of this House had asked him to murder me. That is in the records of his House. And he showed me two fire arms at the same time. I did not mention who Sydney Alleyne had said and there is no doubt whose name he called. I did not mention which hon. member Sydney Alleyne had told me had commissioned him to murder me. I did not mention it because it would not have been decent to mention it and I hope that all hon. members will try to avoid the example of the Prime Minister yesterday in repeating wicked, vicious

and slanderous accusations made by somebody else, not by him, if they were really made, because my information is that they were never said. I hope all of us will try to keep this debate out of the gutter. It is clear that hon. members have come this morning determined to debate on principles and ideas and serious issues, and I very much hope that the high level which we have managed to achieve so far will be maintained and that when we go into Committee the intimation given by the hon. member for St. Michael West...

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know if you realise what the hon. member has said. He said that Mr. Sydney Alleyne told him that he was commissioned by an hon. member of this House to murder him. That is a statement he is making about 23 members of the House. You cannot sit down there and allow a member to say that one or all of us are acting in concert or separately to murder somebody. You cannot permit that. This is where we run into problems. You cannot get up in the House and say, because you have privilege, that somebody told you that one of the other hon. members was going to murder you, because the class is too small. People went to court already and a libel case was won and they had to pay a lot of damages. The class is so small that you can identify that one of the 24 members in here wanted to murder you, which could include one of your own members. It is an imputation on all of us. The hon. member should not be saying that.

Mr. ADAMS: I am still not going to say who the hon. member was. It is a remark that was made in here already and it is on the records of the House, and I am saying obviously it is not an improper remark in my submission because it is put forward to say something about Sydney Alleyne, not about the hon. member. That remark was made to show what a wicked and dangerous person Sydney Alleyne is; that remark was not made to put any imputation on hon. members. The point of my drawing the analogy is to show that we must not make these imputations.

11.40 a.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. That is exactly the point that I am making, that the Standing Orders provide that the moment you decide that the remarks are offensive, withdrawal must be instantaneous. Now, all of this debate has gone on. Further, Sir, you held out a promise, so to speak, to the Leader of the Opposition that if the remarks were so withdrawn, what you would have done. This is not the way that we would hope to see

our Chair functioning, holding out a promise to an hon. member.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is automatic that when a statement is withdrawn it will be withdrawn from the record. That is what I said.

Mr. HINDS: I am not challenging the Chair, but it is not automatic. It is a discretionary matter on the part of the Presiding Officer to have matters expunged from the record.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member has made his point. I am still in the Chair, and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw the statement complained of and let us get ahead with the people's business.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would withdraw the statement, but I must know what the statement is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The statement where you said that Sydney Alleyne stated that an hon. member of this Chamber has commissioned him to murder you. It is considered to be offensive, and in my opinion it is offensive, and I am asking you to withdraw it.

Mr. ADAMS: I am not in any way challenging your ruling, but I have to know what to withdraw. Have I got to withdraw that Sydney Alleyne made a statement to me that a person commissioned him to murder me? The person was you, you know. He said that you did it. He told the member for St. Philip North that it was you. I never said it because I did not want to smear you. So let it be clear. He showed the hon. member for St. Philip North two guns and said that you told him to kill me. In withdrawing, I want to have it made particularly clear what I am withdrawing because the statement is already in Hansard, and I can read it out any time under the Standing Orders.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking that you withdraw it.

Mr. ADAMS: I will withdraw any reference to the fact, or any.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has drawn to my attention Rule 28(5) which says that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House. I consider the statement by the hon. member where he said that Sydney Alleyne said that the hon. member of this Chamber commissioned him to murder an hon. member as a reflection on all

hon. members; and since an objection has been raised, I will ask him to withdraw that statement, and I will have it expunged from the record.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this morning the member for St. Michael West made a statement which would have been out of order had it referred to somebody in here. He talked about people sitting in here and the Speaker said I did not hear the Leader of the Opposition ask him to withdraw it. It is obvious that only the individual at whom it is pointed can ask for it to be withdrawn; but there is something else.

With great respect to Your Honour, this is not a matter of libel. I do not believe that the House of Assembly is so small a class as to have class libel. I cannot conceive in any parliamentary assembly in the world that if a man is going about saying that one member was paying him to murder another that it could not be ventilated on the floor of the House. I am not imputing those motives.....

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. I just want to draw to Your Honour's attention that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has been called upon to withdraw certain remarks, and that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are entertaining a speech from the Leader of the Opposition. If you entertain that speech, and even mine, you cannot then call on the hon. member to withdraw.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There has been an objection by an hon. member to the statement made by the hon. member for St. Thomas. He has drawn to my attention remarks which in his opinion are offensive. In my opinion, the remarks are offensive to members of this Chamber, and all that I am asking, the hon. member to do – he may not agree with my ruling, but I think he will have to abide by my ruling – and my ruling is that objection has been raised to those remarks, and in my opinion – I may be wrong – they are offensive, and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw them, and let us get on with the work.

I would like hon. members to observe Standing Order 28(2) which says that an hon. member is to be heard in silence. I do not want to call on hon. members again, on either side, to adhere to the appropriate Standing Order. I would like all hon. members to be heard in silence. That is why in this Chamber, because of asides, we get disorder and I would like the hon. member for St. James.....

Mr. CRAIG: Are you addressing me by saying that I am interrupting? I have a right to

make an aside to my colleague on the left or right. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will go down in history as the person who always interrupts when you are not in the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I still maintain that while I am in this Chair, hon. members must be heard in silence and this warning goes to hon. members on either side.

Mr. CRAIG: With great respect to you, if we are going to really stick to the Standing Orders, you will have to call on members on the Other Side not to read newspapers. Let us observe all of the Standing Orders. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are prepared to carry out your wishes and what you demand of me when I am in here; but you cannot use one yard stick here and another one there. You will go down in history, just as the Hon. Minister of Education, as an interrupter of proceedings.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you have sat there under the most gross insults and have said nothing. It is a pitiable thing, and I would like to rescue you. Standing Order 28(5) — if you want my assistance, — says that it shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about Members of the House. All that I am saying is that the hon. member in making a statement said that he was informed that an hon. member of the House was going to pay somebody to murder him. I am saying that that is a reflection on the 24 members of the House (*Aside*) if he is doing it for nothing it is even worse. It is a serious thing to say.

I do not know if the hon. member has realised what he has said. If you allow this, I can get up after all of these vapid statements and say that he told somebody to shoot me if I did not do so and so.

Mr. HINDS: Sir, the point at issue is the time. As far as I can gather, if Sydney Alleyne did tell someone, if Sydney Alleyne was alleged to have made the statement, as far as I can gather the member who is presently representing St. Philip North was not then a member of Parliament. (*Asides*)

Mr. ADAMS: I withdraw everything that is wanted to be withdrawn. I cannot withdraw it from the printed Hansard of the debates of another session; and I am not going to stand on the Standing Orders which say that I can refer to a debate of a previous session. I am sorry that this has gone so far because I find myself in the same position as the Prime Minister calling a

member's name about something which is obviously untrue, because nobody would honestly believe that you would take your money and give it to Sydney Alleyne to kill anybody.

11.50 a.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am a very independent person. I have had reason already (*Aside*) Sir, I am speaking on this Resolution for the part-time officers. I was only prefacing my remarks by saying that I am a very independent person and I do not succumb to the whims and fancies of anybody. I made that clear already since I have been in here. I was doing little work here and I see my name getting dragged into the debate on the Civil Establishment (Part-Time Officers) Order. There are two things I have to say about this, Sir; that I notice in respect of the Government Industrial School and the Prisons that there is provision for a medical officer and Chaplain but I do not see any provision for a psychiatrist.

I think that during the Estimates I did make a plea to the Hon. Minister of Health that he should really look at the need for attaching to these two institutions, both the Prison and the Government Industrial School, somebody who could give psychiatric help to those at the Government Industrial School and the Prison. Part of the function of the prison service and the Industrial School is to rehabilitate and make worthwhile citizens again in society of those who have strayed from the norms that are generally accepted in society for certain types of behaviour and I think the country would be making some sizeable step in a progressive and meaningful way if on a regular basis both of these institutions could have attached to them somebody who is able to offer them psychological and psychiatric assistance. In my submission the money would be well spent. What we have, of course, as we well know, although there are no immediate figures available, is a substantial portion of the junior social inmates of the industrial school graduating as it were into other crime and ending up in the prison. (*Aside*) I am not giving this as a total explanation at all. I am suggesting that probably one of the concomitant reasons for this graduation process is that while they are at the industrial school they are not getting that assistance which could prevent them from graduating to Glendairy.

So I am asking the Minister, Sir, having regard to the fact that we are early into the financial year for 1976–77, to see if in conjunction with the Ministry of Education some plan cannot be worked out for the treatment of these inmates at the level which I have suggested.

So I would just like to say in conclusion, that is all I wanted to contribute to this debate, and that we all in here are outside from time to time and have come across Sydney Alleyne. The member for St. Michael West was with me in London in 1966 during the Constitutional crisis when Sydney Alleyne was parading up and down, and if you had not met Sydney Alleyne before then, Sydney Alleyne would have put the fear of God into you. Sydney Alleyne walked around this country and said all kinds of things publicly from willing to lock up, tie up, and then put in the bank the member for St. Philip South. That is well known, Sir. He boasted that he was to go to Penny Hole and tie up the member for St. Philip South and throw him in the bank. He boasted that he had guns all about town; he did not have to hide, Sir.

12.00 (Noon)

He made allegations about each one of us in turn, from the Prime Minister back down. He showed cheques that were allegedly passed by former members of the House of Assembly. All of these things he had no compunction about whom he cursed, whom he alleged criminal acts against, and so on. I don't know anything about the allegation that I murdered anybody, or that you murdered anybody, or the member for St. John or anything like that, I say a lot of things have been said, I believe each of us is aware of what Sydney got on with when he was in Barbados, and if he alleges things about me, well I feel that he alleged recently that there should be a national consensus Government and that I should be a part of that, so what more do you want to be argued, Sir? I am not taking him on or any allegations brought in here about what Sydney Alleyne said, Sir, they are frivolous as far as I am concerned.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this debate on the Part-Time Officers a lot has been said particularly with regard to the negotiations which were conducted on behalf of the workers who are employed in the Government sector. As a matter of fact, I think it has been established that the rates of pay and the salaries which we are now looking at for the Part-Time Officers employed in the Government Service bear some relationship with the proposals which the Government is seeking through legislative measures to institute on behalf of the members of the public service. I want just to make a few

points on the matters which we are discussing, because I think it is necessary for me to do this. I was hoping that at a later time during the discussion on the overall matters I would have been able to do so, but inasmuch as the issue has been ventilated here, I think it is important for me to make my contribution on these matters at this point.

Let me say that the Leader of the Opposition this morning made a very interesting and undoubtedly apologetic speech. His whole approach to the position which was taken and which apparently he had taken before was definitely apologetic. Let me say that the Barbados Workers' Union which is one of the Unions negotiating this agreement on behalf of the workers in the public sector, and I form part of the negotiating team, had stated very clearly from the time an impasse was reached and from the time that it learnt that the Prime Minister and the Cabinet of Barbados had taken the decision to bring these matters to Parliament for legislative approval, that we could not agree or could not support this method, so that one is rather amused to hear the Leader of the Opposition saying that he was heartened by the fact that the member for St. Michael West has come around to support the Opposition's view about collective bargaining. We had stated long before the Leader of the Opposition made a statement on this particular issue that we did not think that the Government of Barbados should pursue this matter in this way, because we felt that it was an attempt to erode the principle of collective bargaining which has been so firmly established and has become a part of the industrial life in this community, and this is fundamental, because he would try to give one the impression that only after he and the members of the Opposition had taken a position on it that the Barbados Workers' Union has now come along and is following their lead. In truth and in fact, what has happened is that because the Barbados Workers' Union has taken this view in this particular matter they are throwing in their weight, because they feel that they are on good ground. Let me say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that as the member for St. Michael West has pointed out, we do not have any political axe to grind, we are not looking for any political kudos out of any position we have taken, we have taken this position based on what we consider to be a reasonable and just position, and what we also consider to be relationships which exist in the society relative to increases which have been taking place in the private sector and in the Statutory Boards which are operated by the Government, so that when the Barbados Workers'

Union makes a proposal on behalf of any worker in any area of employment in Barbados, some research has to be done and some rationale has to be established for proposals which it puts forward to any employer, whether it is Government or whether it is a private employer, so I think it is important that we make that point very, very clear.

We are definitely opposed to this kind of method, because what in truth and in fact would happen if a situation like this were to go unchecked, and where it is not stated in any clear way the position of the Barbados Workers' Union on this matter, then as far as we are concerned the flood gates would be open for any employer in Barbados to adopt a similar attitude and approach towards any kind of negotiations which are conducted by the Barbados Workers' Union on behalf of any other category of worker in this country, and we would find ourselves in a very difficult situation, because it is our contention that when once the process of collective bargaining has been eroded, then you are creating a dangerous situation within the society, because workers and the representatives could not sit down around a negotiating table with an employer and his advisers and reach an agreement on behalf of workers without having recourse to strong tactics, and you would therefore be creating a situation where an employer would make a proposal and say that that is that because my Board of Directors has told me I cannot go any further and you can do what you like. What has evolved in this country is that through collective bargaining we have been able to negotiate, and negotiation implies compromises and settling different positions and making alterations and what have you, so that I just want to say in this particular matter — and I think that this is very important, because there are a lot of insinuations and a lot of ideas which at this time which seemed to be pushed around the place.

Only yesterday in the Advocate newspaper there was an editorial in which reference was made to Union Leaders — not necessarily the leaders of the Barbados Workers' Union — but union leaders generally, and the way in which they should fight when it comes to negotiating an agreement. For example, if I might summarise one of the paragraphs which appeared in this editorial, they put the view that if members of the Union want a particular increase, whether it is 80%, 90%, 100% or 120%, then the leader is in duty bound to go and press for this kind of increase, otherwise he would not be satisfying the wishes and demands of the workers.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that one has to be very clear about this whole question about leadership. Leadership does not always necessarily mean, and particularly in the Trade Union field, giving way to all kinds of demands from members of a particular organisation, because if this is so, this will not work for the benefit of all concerned. I will cite an example. At present the Barbados Workers' Union is negotiating with the Advocate-News a wages agreement and conditions of employment for workers at the Advocate-News, and if we were so unreasonable and so silly as to include all of what workers say they would like to have, because you know workers come up with all sorts of fantastic things, then the Advocate would close down tomorrow, but we could not adopt that unreasonable position, we have whenever we are making negotiations for workers we try to relate it to what is happening within the society, so that in spite of what appears in the Advocate-News we would not adopt the kind of attitude or take the position which they are suggesting that any Union should adopt in any negotiation with the Government. So that, as I said, the position of the Barbados Workers' Union is what I consider to be a very reasonable one.

Now if you were to look at the position which we have reached on this matter, and I think the point has been made by the member for St. Michael West, that the Barbados Workers' Union represents essentially the workers in the Key Scale.

12.10 p.m.

I think the point has been made that the Barbados Workers' Union represent, essentially, the workers in the key-scale. We also represent teachers at the Community College.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am glad he said that. Many of the members who have spoken, so far, have spoken not on this Resolution as such, which deals with doctors and chaplains, but they have dealt with another Resolution for which a properly-prepared speech, apparently, has been made. It deals with casual employees and the unestablished staff. The hon. member in his own words says that they do not represent the people who we are now considering: the doctors and chaplains. That is what is now before us. The speech is really out of order, Sir.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the Leader of the House took the point earlier on that what we are discussing for part-time officers

and the rates which appear here did not just drop out of the sky. They bear some relationship with the proposals which are also before us for other categories of workers in the public sector. You just do not come here and say, "As from this year we are going to give part-time officers \$X, without establishing some kind of relationship. What we are saying, therefore, is that this particular Resolution has the same basis and the same connection as all of the other Resolutions which appear on the Order Paper: the General Order, which has already been debated, and the others which will come up for discussion. Any position which is taken relative to all of the other Orders which appear on the Order Paper must, necessarily, be taken on this particular one because there is a direct relationship.

As I was saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Barbados Workers' Union represent key-scale workers, teachers at the Community College, Postmen, Messengers, and other categories of workers. The position we have taken on this is very, very, clear. We made the proposal, after a series of compromises at the negotiating table, and not compromises in the light of the suggestion which the Leader of the Opposition made the last time we were here on Wednesday to the effect that the Barbados Workers' Union's position is somewhat compromised because of its association with the ruling Party. This is certainly not so.

In industrial negotiations we talk of compromise. We talk of compromise from the point of view of attempting to reach an agreement, recognising that a position which is put up by a Union as an initial position is not necessarily the position at which a settlement would be reached. In the same way a position which is put up by an employer as an initial proposal is not necessarily the position which will be accepted by the Union. This is what has happened. Originally at the negotiations the Government put up one position, and we were able to get them to come even a little closer to us. I am submitting that it is a pity we have reached this stage, and it is a pity that we have reached a position where it would seem as if attempts are being made to really make nonsense of the collective bargaining processes. This, as I have said, has made a fundamental and very important contribution towards industrial peace in this society.

Now, reference was made of the fact that during negotiations there were 18 meetings held with the Unions. I just want to say that, as far as the Barbados Workers' Union is concerned, we

had four meetings with the Chief Establishment Officer, and two meetings with the Prime Minister. I believe the 18 meetings would, probably, be an accumulative position where a total was made of all of the meetings which were held with the Union, but it is not, therefore, that one union held 18 meetings with the Chief Establishment Officer. This may probably be the position of all of the Unions which were negotiating with the Chief Establishment Officer.

We consider that the position we have put up in these negotiations is a reasonable position and one which, when all of the factors are taken into consideration and in view of the compromises and adjustments which we have made in the course of the meetings with the Chief Establishment Officer, our position is one which we can support. We, therefore, are in no position to support this particular Resolution and the decisions which have been made for which legislative approval is being sought. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in introducing the Resolutions on this particular matter, the Prime Minister said that in any event, at least legislative approval had to be sought. We recognised this, and I think he even challenged any hon. member to vote against it, and then explain the matter to his constituents.

There is a question of principle which is involved. When I vote against it, it is not that I do not want, and I am sure the member for St. Michael West does not want, any member of the Public Service to get the money. We have to make this distinction very, very, clear. They can have their money, but we have to distinguish between a point of principle and voting against a particular matter like this. Any vote which is cast against this is not cast to prevent people from getting the money, but against the principle which is being employed in these very serious and important negotiations. As I have said, they will have very, very, serious ramifications throughout the length and breadth of this society. If we want to maintain a society where there is relative industrial peace and quiet, then I think a word of warning regarding the position which has been adopted by the Barbados Workers' Union in this particular matter is one which should be heeded. If it is not heeded, then you could see, as I said earlier, that you are creating an opportunity for employers in this country to adopt the same attitude, and one can never tell where one will end in this matter. You could have a lot of unrest which could, probably, lead to bloodshed and all sorts of other matters associated with this kind of situation.

I am sure that those of us who care for our country would not like to have a situation like this developing. I would suggest that the Government take heed of this warning and try to bring some measure of reason and some measure of reasonableness to these negotiations, and to the approach which is being adopted in this very important matter.

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just wish to intervene in this debate briefly. I do not think myself that this is the occasion on which to launch a discussion on the health policies of the Government in contradistinction to the policies being developed by the Barbados Labour Party. As far as this particular Order is concerned, this is the Civil Establishments (Part-Time Officers) Order, 1976. I would like to make the point that this Order is making provision for increases in salaries for the Part-Time Officers listed in the Order are on a similar basis to the officers being given increases. This is not a proposal to revise the Establishment of the offices in the Government Service. It is not a proposal to provide additional Part-Time Officers; so in this particular Order there will be no question of provision of Psychologists or Psychiatrists at the Prisons, or in the Government Industrial Schools, or for any other place; so that matter does not really arise as far as this particular Order is concerned. I would just say that for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Philip North who is now in his seat. There will be no reference at all to any additional posts or positions, whether full time or part time for the places which he mentioned.

12.20 p.m.

As far as the multi-purpose health clinics and the conditions of service of the District Medical Officers are concerned, here again I would like to make the point that the proposals in this Order and the Schedule to the Order do not relate to any revision in the conditions of service as such of these officers. It is merely an upward revision of the salaries of the officers listed on similar bases to those granted to the officers who are being given increases under the other Orders which we have dealt with and those which we are still to deal with.

My Ministry has made certain proposals to the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners relating to their terms and conditions of service. We are not going into detail on those proposals because this is not the occasion on which to do it, but merely for purposes of the record and in order to clarify the situation we have made

certain proposals which amount to proposals for the revision of their terms and conditions of service in pursuance of our policy to provide health services on a much wider and comprehensive basis for the people of this country. Included in those proposals are the removal of the welfare checks which the District Medical Officers now operate, and by the removal of these checks these officers would not be limited in their service merely to the old and indigent. The proposals in this Civil Establishments (Part-Time Officers) Order, 1976, are without prejudice to the proposals for the revision of conditions of service for the officers referred to by the hon. member for St. Thomas. I just thought I would make that clear. I do not know about any rejection of the proposals made. My Ministry is awaiting the response from the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners to the proposals that have been made. We have had no response to those proposals and I can say nothing further on that matter.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I find myself having to rise as a result of some of the things said by the Hon. Minister of Health. He wants us to feel that the salary revision that we have before us in respect of these part-time officers has nothing to do with conditions of service and what not, but that this has been arrived at on the same basis as the other increases. I think the burden of the argument here this morning has been for us to be told in some form or fashion how these other increases have been arrived at. Now he speaks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about these conditions of service and proposed matters related thereto, but the Minister must be aware of the fact that many of the present part-time officers have not been turning out for duty when they were expected to, but that nevertheless their pay cheques did not reflect their absenteeism from duty at any particular time.

The Minister ought to concern himself with the fact that these part-time officers use the facilities of our institutions and some of them have been able to use their part-time positions as such to get benefits through the Customs and the like for equipment which in truth and in fact never goes to assist the health service proper from our Government institutions where they are paid to serve, but that the equipment so imported goes elsewhere. Now these are things that we would like the Minister to address his mind to because they relate somewhat to conditions of service and perks and so on.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are all very much concerned with the principle in this whole

matter of bringing before the Legislature a matter of this sort, because we are asked more or less to settle a question of salaries, and as we have heard from the Prime Minister, when you come to the negotiating table and you find that you cannot get any further — to use his own words — what else must you do? It is clear that the private sector engaging in negotiations with the Unions cannot adopt the same principle or rather lack of principle as we find having been adopted in the present situation, and this is only because the Government happens to be one of the negotiators in the present context. No private sector has 16, 17 or 18 seats to rely upon in Parliament to carry a matter like this through. There are, established by convention, procedures for dealing with industrial matters of this nature. Why is it when the negotiators on behalf of the Government found that they could not reach agreement with the workers' representatives that the matter of the dispute was not reported to the Labour Officer? The private sector would have had to take their matters there, and we would have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that a new method for the continuation of discussion at the industrial level would have been bound to take place and an agreement arrived at at some point therein.

We do not have industrial courts as in Trinidad to take such matters to, but our problem must be based on a principle and the Government ought to be showing itself in an instance such as this being willing to set example to the private sector if we are not to witness what the hon. member has said, that this type of behaviour on the part of the Government can in truth and in fact lead to bloodshed and perhaps worse in the future. Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both you and I have seen enough as to convince us that what Government is asking us to do here today is to throw principle through the window for Government to be able to get on with its business. And what is Government's business? Imposing upon sectors of the community nothing they wish for, but conditions which are totally against the wishes of these people.

12.30 p.m.

Now, the Leader of the House has spoken on this matter. It must be observed that the Leader of the House has not found himself in a position to tell this Hon. House that these part time officers are in agreement with the Government over this. All that we are being told is that this has been arrived at on the same basis as other proposals because up to the present that is all that has been said. There has been no acceptance by any of the aggrieved parties, and that is something that has to be watched very carefully.

We realise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in any negotiations their must be areas for give and take; but that has not been so throughout the entire process of these negotiations because the unions, we understand, have had in addition to the meetings with the Government negotiator, two meetings with the Prime Minister who is Minister of Finance, and it was on the second occasion that the Minister turned up with a draft of what he intended to take before Parliament. He did not turn up on the second occasion to report back to the unions involved that the Government had acceded to their request whether in part or in whole and that the Government would be willing to negotiate further or on any basis at all.

These negotiators found themselves being brought to the point where the Prime Minister turned up with his draft as much as to tell the unions representing the workers involved that you so not even have a chance now of leaving, much more talking. In other words, when he turned up with his draft of what he proposed, it was to inform them that he was taking the whole matter into his hands.

That, Mr. Speaker, is very bad indeed, because it is a case where Parliament or the power of Parliament is being used not in a good cause, not in the best interest of the workers involved, but it is a clear indication that dictatorship in this country has got to be stamped out immediately if not sooner.

It is perhaps, Mr. Speaker, much to the credit of the negotiators on behalf of the workers and the workers involved themselves that they have not up to the present time adopted an attitude that would have been equal in response to that adapted by the Prime Minister on the last occasion when he met with them for what we would have thought would have been negotiations. There has been, as far as we know, no unrest; no civil disturbances or anything of the sort. There has not been, as far as we know, any real threat of strike action. In this case, Mr. Speaker, why has the Minister of Finance taken it upon himself to actually demand or cause us to be here to debate this matter this morning?

Collective bargaining is nothing new in this country, and the Prime Minister has told us of his own contribution in respect of the principle. He now finds himself acting contrarywise. These are matters on which we must not be silent. The situation as it stands at the present time must not be taken in the light of the fact that people need money, and that anything you throw out to them, because they are hungry and so glad for it, they will accept it.

It must not be taken in the light as the Hon. Prime Minister has suggested that when these measures are passed he is willing to bet that nobody will leave their money in the Treasury. This is the type of background against which all of this has to be taken. It is bad. In our view it is rather unfortunate that the other unions that are representing workers are not in a position to speak in this Hon. House; but we have heard from members who represent some of the workers involved say in no uncertain terms that they are totally against the principle of having this matter legislated in the manner and for the purpose for which it is before us today.

In the light of this should not the Government in truth and in fact take warning and try to show itself as wanting to do good? Why should a Government, bearing in mind the principle involved not be ready to return to the negotiating table and negotiate at this time in the light of what has taken place in the interim?

Mr. Speaker, if by these measures today or any other day we fix wage increases in one sector of the community, what is going to be the true position at a later stage when the unions set themselves up to be in a position to match the action now taken by the Government? Could anybody suggest that they are wrong? The Government has set this bad example, and what you see is that if the Government has the effrontery, the shameless boldness to demonstrate its total disregard of the wishes of the unions on the matter of wage negotiations, the Government is leaving the door wide open for the entire public service to join hand in hand with other sectors of the community and do likewise; because when the Prime Minister talks certain things he does not always talk foolishness and the Prime Minister told us in this Hon. House that if we want justice, keep out of the law courts.
12.40 p.m.

I am to wonder what relation that type of utterance is going to bear upon future industrial relations and future industrial disputes that must of necessity take place in this country, because remember, Sir, the public servants must adopt a new stance on matters of this sort. The public servants must know now that they cannot look to the Government for justice when it comes to negotiating wage increases.

The public servants must know this, that they cannot now look to the Government, their employer, for justice. If this is the case and the public servants feeling that they have a just case — because we have heard the members of one

union state that they were satisfied that the proposals they put forward to Government were reasonable and just, and if on this basis you put forward a case feeling deep within that you have a case that is reasonable and just and find the Government adopting this kind of attitude, what do we expect?

We appreciate that the Government's chief negotiator was given a mandate that he must go so far and no further; do so much and no more. We understand that he performed his task admirably, with credit to his profession, credit to the service, credit to himself, but Mr. Speaker, the public servants involved cannot take this to the supermarket. They cannot take this to pay their debts.

The proposals put before Government, we understand were reasonable and just. Why is it since they were so reasonable and just, since they were quite reasonable and just, that the Government could not of necessity have seen the point and show itself as being reasonable?

We have been told Mr. Speaker, about our economic position not affording this and not affording that, but there are certain things Mr. Speaker, which must receive priority treatment regardless, and the Minister of Finance must not throw himself in a position of acting in the way that Government prefers to be acting, and hoping to be able to depend on all types for the fullest cooperation of a public service that Government has dished out nothing but total dissatisfaction thereto.

We believe that the unions that are involved — we believe that the total public service that is involved has yet an opportunity to demonstrate its unwillingness to be bogged down by the Government because it has a majority in this Honourable House. I want to say, Sir, that the mind boggles at Government adopting its present attitude towards the public service and public servants who must continue to serve the country regardless of whichever Government is in power. Why is it that the Government is doing what it is presently doing? One must see and understand and try to appreciate if the Government is willing or has shown itself willing at any stage in the negotiations to bring an arm of reasoning or if it is not a case in which the Government has shown itself to be high-handed from the word given 'go'.

We do not have to suggest to the Government that if we were to reduce as we can the high expenditure on our foreign service that permits officers to be riding and jolly riding up

and down to the extent that some now do. We do not have to suggest the various areas where Government could have carried out a considerable amount of pruning to reduce unnecessary expenditure and to meet the just and reasonable demands from the public service; but the case is this, that as far as we are concerned the Minister of Finance never had any intention of entertaining anything that the unions consider reasonable and just. He was to have had his own way in a matter of this magnitude and this is what we are seeing here before us today.

I would hope and pray, Sir, I would be happy Sir, if the Minister of Finance examines the situation in the light of what is taking place and is likely to take place, and to lay a sure foundation that the process of collective bargaining in industrial matters be strictly adhered to by everyone who is bound to be involved at a future date. We want no bloodshed, we want no unrest, we want nothing in this community that can set us further back than we are at present.

Let the Minister of Finance come to grips with reality, let him come face to face with the situation and act not necessarily gently, as this is beyond some people, but act reasonably in the light of the present situation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, we have listened this morning to many speeches and even lectures, as such, in relation to the principles of collective bargaining and the trade union movement generally and various methods adopted by way of negotiations, etc., in respect of wages and salaries.

12.50 p.m.

Let me say this at the outset, that the speeches which appear to have been very properly prepared in some instances, with few exceptions, were made not on the Resolution dealing with Part-Time Officers, because who is going to tell me that any of the Trade Unions represents the doctors or the Chaplain? I will get to that later on, but we are dealing with medical doctors and Chaplains.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the House must understand that one of his own Government Ministers has stated that the figures arrived at in respect of these Part-Time Officers have been arrived at on the same basis as that arrived at in respect of workers for whom the Trade Unions have been negotiating.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a point of elucidation.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: What I am saying specifically for the benefit of the hon. member is, which Union represents the medical doctors and the Chaplain? That is what I ask. The Barbados Workers' Union, the Teachers' Union, or the NUPW? Which Union as such represents these people?

Mr. HINDS: On a point of elucidation, Sir, what we are telling the Leader of the House is this, that if the Government had no basis upon which it arrived at a decision in respect of those workers represented by the Unions, the basis upon which they have arrived at the matters in respect of Part-Time Officers would be non-existent, because when you had the Unions negotiating on behalf of a particular sector, you could produce no real effective basis upon which you would arrive at your decision, and it would be less in respect of those not represented by a Union.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The Hon. member is very well versed in many subjects, but in this case he is way out of his depth. Let me say this, he knows absolutely nothing about the particular point we are on now. The medical doctors and the Chaplain are merely receiving in the regular, normal process of increases what they normally would have got. They were consulted and asked to submit their proposals, they have not done so, and they have no Union representing them as such. We listened to several speeches here this morning, some very good, but they were made on a different Resolution and would have been very effective.

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

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I cannot be interrupted like this all the time.

Mr. HINDS: On a point of order. It is not what we know from what we don't know, Sir, but I made the very point that the Leader of the House has just made, that there was no agreement reached with these Part-Time Officers.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I have been in this game too long. He can jump up every time he likes, he wouldn't interrupt me at all, I will continue. We listened to very good speeches here this morning on the principle of collective bargaining and the Trade Union Movement as a

whole, of which I know a great deal, and I must say that the Union Leader, the hon. member for St. Michael West made a very good speech, but he made a good speech on a different Resolution dealing with workers that he represents, casual workers and unestablished staff, which is not before us, but of course he made a general speech dealing with collective bargaining and all the rest of it. A very good speech, but we are dealing with a specific Resolution dealing with medical doctors part-time and Chaplains, and they have been consulted and have not submitted any recommendations or proposals at all.

Mr. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, is the Minister exercising his right of final reply?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Yes.

Mr. ADAMS: Is he stating as a fact that no memorandum has been received from part-time medical staff relating to their emoluments?

Mr. WALCOTT: I rise on a point of order. The hon. member said that I made a speech, but at the beginning I made it clear that this is a Civil Establishment Order and you could not isolate this Civil Establishment Order from the general isolation order, because Order No. 2 has the same principle. If it were so then, you need not give them an increase from 1st April, 1976 and one from 1st April 1977, so the basis for giving them on a two-tier basis was the same for the general service, so it is part of the general agreement which was reached for the others.

Mr. SPEAKER: That point is well made.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: I am amused, Sir, to see that members are jumping up by way of clarification and things of that sort. The bare bones of the case are simple. These people do not belong to any Union as such, so that no Union can jump up and represent them. They are not represented by any Union, so like that they have stepped on their rights, Sir, they have not submitted proposals and they have not joined the Union. That being the case, a lot of pretty speeches were made, but the speeches are not really effective as such and are not even dealing with the Resolution which we have before us, they are dealing with the case of the casual worker and the unestablished staff, which I do not have to touch here, because if the negotiations are what they are I don't believe I have competence to deal with that, but I am competent to deal with this one, the Part-Time Officers, who have been consulted and have made no proposals and have been found wanting. They

have been sleeping on their rights and they are satisfied then, that is the inference you would draw. You would have to draw the inference that they are satisfied.

Mr. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, while I was rising to correct him he corrected himself. I was just going to ask that he does not mislead the House by saying that they have agreed, but he is asking us to draw the inference that they are satisfied. That is a different matter.

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

AYES: Dr. the Hon. R. B. CADDLE, Hon. C. E. TALMA, Hon. A. MORRISON, Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD, Hon. P. M. GREAVES, Mr. W. R. LOWE, His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. J. B. SPRINGER, Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES and Hon. P. G. MORGAN — 10.

NOES: Mr. F. L. WALCOTT, Mr. E. E. GREAVES, Mr. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Miss B. A. MILLER, Mr. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. W. C. B. HINDS and Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS — 7.

ABSTENTION: Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND — 1.

1.00 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next item which Government proposes to deal with is Item No. 3. It is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the lease to Aero Services Barbados Limited of approximately 65,340 sq. ft. of land situated at Seawell International Airport. This is very straightforward, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Has it been seconded?

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

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

RESOLUTION RE ~~THE~~ LEASE OF LAND TO AERO SERVICES BARBADOS LIMITED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, this matter is noncontroversial, as far as I know. It is simply a Resolution to seek the approval of the House of Assembly to lease to Aero Services Barbados Limited by the Minister responsible for lands of the hereditaments. That means ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land (forming part of the lands of Seawell International Airport) situate at Seawell in the parish of Christ

Church in the Island containing by admeasurement 65,340 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on all sides, on other lands of the Government being other lands of Seawell International Airport or however else the same may abut and bound. That is the description of the land, Sir.

Aero Services Barbados Limited operates a general aviation maintenance facility at Seawell International Airport and at present operates on lands sub-leased from the Barbados Light and Power Company. The rent will be the usual 10 cent per square foot per annum, and the plan is available for inspection, if necessary. The position is that, owing to the proposed erection of the new terminal building, those people have to be removed from the land they now occupy in order that the new terminal building may be sited there. They will now be accommodated in another part of the area, and they will be having such more land on which to build in order to extend and expand their facilities for the servicing of planes, etc. That is the whole thing in a nutshell, Sir. I have all of the information here. I have given the salient points of the matter.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative with division.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. C. E. TALMA: At this point, Sir, I think it is convenient to adjourn. I beg to move that the sitting be now suspended until 2.15 p.m.

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.
1.06 p.m.

On Resumption:

Hon. L. E. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that there is no quorum present in the House at this time.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the bell be rung.

The Bell was rung and a quorum was obtained.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. C. E. TALMA: The next item we propose dealing with, Mr. Speaker, under Government Business, is standing in the name of the Minister of Housing, Lands, etc. It is a matter relating to the Airport which, in truth and in fact, falls under the Prime Minister's portfolio. I am asking leave to deal with Item No. 4, which is to move the passing of

the Resolution to approve the lease to Seawell Air Services Limited of approximately 81,000 sq. ft. of land situated at Seawell in the parish of Christ Church, in the absence of the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the House has sought leave to deal with Item No. 4 in the absence of the Hon. Minister. There being no objection leave is granted.

RESOLUTION RE THE LEASE OF LAND TO SEAWELL AIR SERVICES LIMITED

Hon. C. E. TALMA: This is a Resolution, Sir, similar, more or less, to the last one which was approved here just before we rose for lunch. It is a Resolution seeking the approval of the House of Assembly for the lease to Seawell Air Services Limited by the Minister responsible for lands of the hereditaments. The hereditaments are set out in the Schedule, of course. ALL THAT certain piece or parcel of land (forming part of the lands of Seawell International Airport) situate at Seawell in the parish of Christ Church in this Island containing by admeasurement 81,000 square feet or thereabouts Abutting and Bounding on all sides, on other lands of the Government being other lands of Seawell International Airport or however else the same may abut and bound.

The lease will be for a period of fifteen years at a rental of ten cents per square foot per annum with an option for renewal and the rent payable on renewal shall vary with any rise in the cost of living, including the increased value of land. There is very little additional information in this case, Sir. The whole point is that Seawell Air Services Limited are performing a very useful role and function. The rent or the rate is the usual rate. The plan is available, everything is above-board, and everything is being done for the development of Seawell Airport. I know that hon. members, in their wisdom, will all agree with this. It is non-controversial.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

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

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

2.20 p.m.

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Speaker, the next item stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance to move the second reading of a Bill to provide for the grant of maternity leave to female employees and for the protection of the employment of those employees during such

leave. This is a matter of the I.L.O. Convention which the Minister will explain in detail.

I beg to move that Order No. 6 be the next Order of the day.

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

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

THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN (MATERNITY LEAVE)

BILL, 1976

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, first of all I regret that I do not have my files here on this particular matter. However I think I can remember sufficient of this matter to make a reasonable presentation to this Honourable Chamber.

This is a matter that had been engaging the attention of the Government for quite some years now, and then with the introduction of national insurance the matter had not been pursued as vigorously as it had been at earlier times. I mentioned national insurance because with national insurance working mothers or working women who had become pregnant became entitled to certain maternity benefits. That is still the case today. However we felt that the time had come when we should provide full protection for these women who had become pregnant and in their jobs. We know that employers do not like their work to be interrupted by illness whether it is illness for a short time or illness for a long time as in normally the case with a confinement; so it is the intention of the Government to offer protection to these mothers or these women if they are not yet mother who do become pregnant on their jobs.

The kind of protection is set out clearly in the Bill now before Parliament and this Bill will show that from the time that a woman supplies her employer with a medical certificate attesting to her pregnancy right up until the time about six weeks after confinement that the employer is debarred from dismissing that worker or serving notice of dismissal on that worker. A worker would be entitled to this kind of protection according to the Bill during a number of pregnancies with any one employer not exceeding three. In other words, she would not be able to carry on indefinitely, but of course if that worker is severed from that employment and is subsequently reemployed by that employer, the whole thing starts all over again so that the worker would be entitled to another three children. There are other ways in which the work of the worker is protected. An example is that the worker's seniority is protected. When the worker returns to her job she must be employed in the same employment or comparable

employment at no less pay and must not lose her seniority rating with that employer.

I think this is a fairly important piece of social legislation providing for the protection of the women of this country, and it is with the greatest pleasure that I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

I want to say that in one respect it is my intention in Committee to move an amendment to one of the Clauses of the Bill.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I would like first to say that a move in the direction of offering some measure of protection to female employees in Barbados, particularly in respect of maternity leave is definitely a move which is welcomed by any person who has had any relationship with the working situation as it stands in Barbados and the attitude which is displayed by employers towards female employees who have had to go on maternity leave. Only last week I had a situation where an employee was working at a supermarket in Black Rock who had a baby as recently as February of this year, and her job was lost as a result of this. When she went back from maternity leave her employer indicated to her that the job was filled. I am sure I can provide you with a whole set of examples of this nature, and it is welcome that the Government has seen fit to move in the direction of offering some protection to the female worker as far as maternity is concerned.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, however, that I am a little taken back and indeed worried about the fact that the Bill talks about maternity leave to female employees and I would have thought that in moving the passage of a Bill of this nature some provision would be made for ensuring that the employer guarantees some kind of income towards the female employee during the time she is on maternity leave. I know that the argument will be advanced that she will be getting benefits from the National Insurance under the national insurance arrangements, but I want to say that within the agreements which are negotiated by the Barbados Workers' Union on behalf of employees of various sections of industry, provision is made not only to guarantee income under the National Insurance, but employers have undertaken to make up whatever losses a female employee would suffer as a result of going on maternity leave. In short, if my memory serves me correctly the National Insurance would pay up to about 60% and the arrangement which we have in our negotiations is that the employer would make up the 40%. As a matter of fact there are some situations where the employer would pay the worker the whole salary and when the worker collects the money from the National

Insurance Department this amount of money is paid over to the employer, and in truth and in fact the employee does not suffer any reduction in the wages during the time she is on maternity leave. I would have hoped that in discussing a Bill of this nature one would have seen some provision contained within the Bill to ensure that the worker concerned does not suffer any reduction in her income.

I know the argument is going to be advanced that if a female worker goes and gets pregnant that is her business, but we have a certain social responsibility towards people in particular situations and I think that pregnancy is a time when I would think that a woman or mother needs as much income as she possible can get to see her over this very difficult period. I would hope that in looking at this particular area the Minister would give some kind of commitment towards this.

2.30 p.m.

I want further to state that the question is extremely important because as the Minister has said there have been instances where female employees have been given maternity leave, and when they go back they have to start at the bottom all over again. I think that this discourages a lot of people who have talents and who can be more deeply involved in the life of the society. If working mothers go out to work they should be given some protection that when they go home they will have a guaranteed job.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go a little further than the hon. member has gone on this matter in that maternity leave should be looked upon in 1976 somewhat different from how the medieval employers looked at it, that if you made provision for maternity leave for women they would have more children. That is ignorance because the women who have the most children are women who are not working at all, not the women who are working in a general way for a good salary.

You hear this idiotic talk. You do not pay a carpenter when he builds a house for you. Will you go and sleep in the grass? You have this idea that when you give a man a job you are doing something for him, something more than he is doing for the community. Some of these employers should not be here at all. If I had my way I would banish them. Some of them have crude ideas when it comes to maternity leave. In Malaysia a man gets maternity leave. They get it when they go to tap rubber because that is the only way that you can get rubber. It does not mean that a man is carrying a child. His wife is carrying the

child but he has to attend to his wife who is carrying the child because in tapping rubber he is too far away from the town. It would be no use asking people in Barbados to do that.

The question of payment for maternity leave is not something that is burdensome. It is a question of outlook. What is the point of talking about building schools? Whom are you building schools for? Old age pensioners? They cannot have children. Only young women can have children. The women who are having children in Barbados are those between 16 and 20 years of age who work for low wages. The ones who are better educated have children when they want them. They know what to do. The ones working in factories do not know what to do. Their parents have told them that getting children is an act of God and not associated with a man. When they get children the parents put them out. They reach the stage where the child bearing was not a natural process. We have to educate people that child bearing is a normal thing. At some stage employers would not pay maternity leave. They said it was an illness. If it was not an illness the person would still be at work.

If you use the example of National Insurance, this is a percentage that women get. Let us be frank. The amount of 60 per cent of \$30 a week is what? We have heard members talking about old age pensioners. We have people working today for not much more than old age pensioners get when you think in terms of \$30 a week. I do not want to be uncharitable, but \$40 a week is still above what some domestic servants in Barbados get. Those are the facts of life.

The Minister who brought in the Resolution knows the problems. I believe that lawyers in Barbados are making more money out of severance payment than people are getting because the fees that the lawyers get represent more than people would have paid if they had paid severance pay. I think the lawyers are making quite a lot of fees from saying that you do not have a case. I understand that it is a very complicated Act.

I feel that the time has come when this question of circumventing the law by not employing women because you will have to pay maternity leave should be examined because there are not enough men. In fact I think that women should be taught other jobs. I have gone to countries where women drive buses. They are, generally speaking, polite and they have a charm which maybe, because I am a man, that a man does not have, notwithstanding the hon. member for the City's reference to me wondering if I am a man or not. Women do

have that kind of charm when you see them in areas where you are accustomed to seeing only men. I hope that in this Chamber you will get more of them and that they do not follow the behaviour of men in all of their habits.

It is not a question of substituting a man for a woman because of maternity leave. It is something that is fair and right. This is something that should have been on the Statute Book a long time ago. I hope that the Minister does not wait until election year to see the benefit in some legislation. We could have done a lot of these things earlier in the session so that we could have had the experience in implementing them.

There are women working at the hospital and in other low paid services and if you take an analysis you will find that they have three or four children. We have them working at the industrial parks. Those are the ones who have children and where employers are bringing North American habits into Barbados, because in North America people do not have children until they want them

2.40 p.m.

But here women wake up and find themselves like that and they do not understand how it happened. Sometimes people have to explain to them how it happened but they do not understand how it happened. The people in North America are more wide awake; you have to save people from themselves. There are lots of women in Barbados who have unwanted children. They are not ready for children; they do not have any support for them. They do not have any regular father to support the child because the father did not come along looking for any child; the father came along an evening for entertainment and therefore he paid another visit and now he is inflicted with a court order and somebody is running him down. Every Friday evening now Rita or one of them is running him down; these are some of the problems we have. It is a fact.

Only coming into the House not long ago I heard a woman talking to another woman saying that the last child father — not the first — but the last child father, which means that the first child father is not the child's father. This is the sort of society in which we live. When you talk about maternity leave you talk about maternity leave in a general way. Our wives and our sisters and our relatives are not facing this problem. It is the ones who are more or less indefensible. So I feel that if you put alongside of it not only the protection from dismissal but also all the other facts, I consider the time is gradually coming that the payment of a person should be the full wage. When a woman is going to have a child there is

no — this is serious business. When she is going to have a child she does not have a whole lot of time to do it. There is a specific period and within that period this must take place, or trouble is on. Therefore for that reason the six weeks before confinement and the six weeks after confinement are very serious problems for women. Some women meet problems even before the six weeks before confinement and the six weeks after confinement, and some of them do not have any proper medical attention.

These are some of the problems and complications. They cannot get back to work within the prescribed time. We should be willing to help women in this matter. I do not subscribe to the view that because you do this you are going to have more children. The Medieval stupid argument is that if you introduce workmen's compensation then a man is going to cut off his finger, or an agricultural worker is going to push a fork in his foot in order to draw compensation. We do not hear anything like that happening. Far from that, Barbados is a place in point because as we do not have a lot of heavy industries and a lot of other industries going — for that reason the Government has taken it over and it is, if I may say so, one of the most profitable insurance businesses in the national insurance because the amount of money you have to pay out for industrial injury is really minimum.

For that same reason the question of a woman having a child — I feel that if we give the women this sort of thing it is good. One thing I must say is distressing here is, there is too much the idea that we are doing a favour in social legislation and we are not doing something that includes our whole thinking. The question of orientation — our whole thinking must be brought up to date that there is nothing wrong in a woman getting 100% during maternity in these cases as this is not a question of the woman going on a holiday and having a nice time and you are still paying her. It is a question of paying attention to very important social matters.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see this Bill here. To be quite honest I really thought for a long time that Government had such a bill, but we the Barbados employers for years now have been granting maternity leave — six weeks before and six weeks after. I am not sure if all employers do it but this is a principle; six weeks full pay and six weeks half pay regardless of what national insurance benefit they get. However, it is not too late for Government because it is really necessary that women should be provided for in this way when they are making babies.

What I would like to see is that when the woman goes back out to work after having her

baby, that the husband or the man who is father of the child, if he is in a job, be granted six weeks maternity leave to get to know his child because men are shirking their responsibility. Men do not have the nine months pregnancy, they do not have the labour pain, and I think it is time that Government make the way whereby men can spend some time with the young child and so get to know the young child and realize their commitment to the child or children.

If you are looking again at controlling the population in this country, I would like to see that put through. Two pregnancies for any woman in this age should be paid by the employer full time. If the hon. member for St. Lucy thinks that they should be paid for the six weeks full pay, and the six weeks after, full pay again, well naturally to do this one has to employ staff to accommodate the pregnant person, and I would think that two pregnancies would be quite adequate, but when he states three, well naturally there are some people who would perhaps say let us take the chance, and say let us go ahead: they are being paid, so what is the point in worrying? That is one of the things that I would like to see; instead of the three the two, and the responsibility of the men because we need to make more men responsible in this community. 2.50 p.m.

Apart from that, it seems to be a hurried Bill because there are other things that need to be injected into this Bill, but I suppose with amendments later on they will reach perfection. I know of other countries which are making provision for men to have maternity leave to help the women and get acquainted with their children.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to pick up the thread by the hon. member for St. Michael North East. It is very interesting that this Bill has come as part of Government's social legislation for 1976 in the form in which it has come before the House. I believe the Minister will have to agree with me that in 1975 in England there was a whole comprehensive piece of legislation passed aimed at the greater protection of employees on a very wide and comprehensive basis. I have sent to the office to get certain information, Sir, and the hon. member for Christ Church West will deal with that, but what this Bill appears to do is to lift a very small section almost verbatim from the English legislation of 1975 and thrust it before us as a piecemeal, *ad hoc* piece of legislation which is not in the most comprehensive terms.

I am saying, Sir, that we on this side will support the Bill, obviously, but we would still like to see the Bill as part of a larger piece of legislation of very far-reaching consequences

aimed at a wider totality of employees. For example, I do not understand why in clause 8 the Bill purports to exclude employees working at home for wages. The Minister did not have his file, perhaps he may be in a position to explain this in his reply, but it seems at this stage a little discriminatory to exempt employees working at home for wages, and one would want to hear the rationale behind this, because you can be working at home and still be paid by somebody else. What about the people in the smocking business? Will the Minister explain that?

If we believe in the Biblical injunction that people must go forth and multiply, then even though we are not asking people to go forth and multiply to such an extent as to continue any over-population of Barbados, and we are asking them to have a responsible attitude to their sexual habits, then this Bill in its principle must obviously aim at bringing home to the employers very seriously that child bearing is just a fulfilment (a) of the Biblical injunction, and (b) of man's natural desires. I understand the hon. member for St. Michael West made reference to the men in Malaya being given maternity leave, although it is a little hard to understand the men in Malaya where rubber is so popular being encouraged to go on maternity leave. I don't have to go any further on that, I'm not explaining the rubberised aspects of this at all, as men we would understand, Sir, and I believe the ladies in here would understand what we are talking about, but seriously, I believe that one has to look at this piece of legislation in the context of all legislation. That is why I say I would like to see it as part of the larger legislative framework. For example, this, even though in its terms is not directly relevant to the severance pay legislation, it is one bit of legislation which could fit in that whole group.

There are problems with the severance pay legislation, that for example there is no time limit within which the employer must pay severance. There is a time limit within which you must give the employer notice of your intention to claim, but as far as I am aware — and I'm speaking from memory because I haven't checked the points — but I'm sure that I am right, that there is no time limit within which the employer must be made to pay severance, and this will probably call for an amendment in due course, because as we go along we see the flaws in the laws, that lacunae that appear and we try to close them, so I hope that something will be done to amend that aspect of the legislation.

In terms of illness generally, Sir, I know of a case now where a lady working with a co-operative in Barbados was in hospital for a legitimate operation, was operated on, and before

she was due to go back to work — she had an extended period — she was dismissed. Somebody would obviously have to pay damages for that, because that is scandalous that in 1976 there are still employers, co-operative or otherwise, who have this attitude to labour, and I am with the member for St. Michael West when he implies that employers today must think as progressive employers of 1976 and not of the 18th and 19th centuries. I will support any piece of legislation which comes in here to give people in this country a sense of right and wrong and what is proper in relation to labour and working class people.

I am going to support this legislation, but I still say that it is a pity it has not been part of a more far-reaching and all-embracing piece of legislation. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I believe it was in February or late January, a teacher from St. Philip, Mrs. Reece, was dismissed quite peremptorily by the Ministry of Education at a stage when she was then very heavily pregnant, at a most sensitive stage when she could very well have been affected in a traumatic way by the interruption of her employment. Further, the Minister got on television and radio and treated the lady and her qualifications in the most off-hand, and I would say, brutal fashion, in a way that I cannot believe that the Minister was cognisant of the implications of this Bill at the time. (Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I did no such thing, I introduced this Bill). Sir, I am not speaking about the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance and whatever, Sir, I am speaking about the Minister of Education. If the Minister of Housing, Lands, Labour and National Insurance misunderstood me, I want it clearly understood that I was referring to the way the lady was treated by the Minister of Education, Youth, Cultural Affairs, Sport and Community Development, so I don't think there will be any further confusion. What I was saying was that I could not believe from the way he behaved on television as an employer (in inverted commas), that he really knew that this piece of legislation was in the offing, late in January; or if he knew that it was, then I still say that he was behaving in relation to this lady as an 18th century employer like the ones the member for St. Michael West referred to.

3.00 p.m.

Sir, employment in general in Barbados needs substantial revision. One aspect of employment I hope I will see the unions pressing for, in due course, is a Contracts of Employment Act in Barbados, like the one they had in England ever since 1963, where the employer is in law bound to give the employee written notice

of the terms of his employment. Today we have a situation where you come to work, and some people write on a sheet of paper a set of terms telling you that your salary is so and so; give me one month's notice and I will give you one, and at the bottom they ask you to sign, if you accept, and return. That is supposed to be the contract between the employer and the employee. I saw one up to yesterday. We want something more far reaching than that. The minimum standards that the representatives of the employees in Barbados should call for is that every employee should have access to the terms of his contract by having the terms of the contract permanently displayed at some conspicuous place on the work site.

It is difficult to get Regulations, sometimes, from the Transport Board. It is difficult to get to know what are the terms of a contract when a man takes you on. You just apply to him for a job, and he takes you on. He does not tell you what you are expected to do. He just tells you to go and join the others and Mr. So and So is in charge of you. Some of them do not even tell you how much you will be paid, and we experience great difficulties in court because of this. There is a loose form of employment between the employer, who will just trot out orally some basic obligations to you, the employee, and you are expected to comply with them. If his business is doing badly, that is the time when he will have no compunction about dismissing you and claiming all sort of things. You see it in the construction industry all the time. I have known them to write letters to the employee saying:

"We thank you very much for your services. You have been a good employee, this, that, and the other."

Total praise, and then refuse to pay redundancy money. You have to carry them — it used to be up in Marine House, and now it is in the National Insurance building — before the Severance Tribunal in order to get the just rewards for these people who have been treated scandalously by employers whose only interest is the profit margin.

Sir, I am speaking on employment generally. In relation to the question of severance pay, I believe the Government has taken steps to publish a booklet once. I saw a booklet once. I do not know whether each employer has a copy of this booklet, but I feel that in the same way as shopkeepers must have copies of the *Official Gazette*, Notices, Orders, etc., each employer, in Barbados should have, as an obligation, a copy of the Severance Pay legislation and have it permanently displayed so that his workers would know the position. People get dismissed — I am

using dismissed in the widest possible sense of the Severance Pay Act, Sir. They get dismissed from their job. They may have a good entitlement to severance pay. They do not know, for example that they must give an employer notice within so many weeks, or within a year, or whatever the particular relevant section requires. They do not know that they must give the employer notice in writing. When they come to you after a year, you have to tell them that they have no case.

I hope that as part of its public relations, the Government will see to it that employers do certain things. It is not enough for the Government, merely as they did when the Severance Pay Act was being introduced — I think one or two meetings were held with the Confederation, and there was a lecture at BIMAP given by Mr. Humphrey Walcott. That is not good enough because the employees do not go to such a lecture. The Act is designed to protect the employees. They do not go to BIMAP and the Confederation. The employers hear what is told to them by the Director of National Insurance or whoever is the relevant civil servant. I know of a case where it was given in evidence by an employer that he attended one of these meetings and he heard that you could dismiss an employee for inefficiency. After having told the man that he had been satisfied with him, he dismissed him because he did not have enough jobs, and he turns around the next week and wrote him a letter — (*Asides.*) I am talking about a construction firm, and I will tell you the name later. He said in the letter, "On reflection, I am dismissing you for inefficiency." Of course, that is an easy case to win. Some employers are so ignorant that they will do those things.

I am hoping that the Minister will consider making it obligatory on employers to have copies of relevant legislation, or booklets simplifying the whole thing displayed. That is probably even better than legislation, because lawyers themselves cannot understand, sometimes the Severance Pay Act. It seems to me to have been drafted the wrong way although it follows the Redundancy Act of 1965 in England. It seems to me to be too confused. The booklet simplifying the whole thing could be sold to them. Each employer should have one, and he should be called upon to pay a small fine if he failed to purchase one. The employees have to be told their rights, and they have to be protected. Has my time expired, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: No! I am only wondering if you are coming back to the maternity debate. I was hearing so much about severance pay. I could have stopped you long ago. You had a little leverage, but you are taking too much.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, as a racing enthusiast, I am very thankful that you have

brought me back on the rails. You will understand that I was making the running on the bridle, Sir. (*Asides.*)

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for anybody to waffle at all about this Bill. If I were in a charitable mood today, I would, on behalf of the women of Barbados, acknowledge the crumbs from the table of the masculine masters of this House, but I am not in that charitable mood, and this pittance of a concession so late in the second year of the decade of women is certainly not satisfactory for me. Reluctantly, we may have to vote for this Act, but it goes nowhere at all answering the necessity for proper legislation concerning the protection of women's rights in this country.

Hon. members do not recognise that the common law has been ambivalent concerning the rights of persons to be paid for their labour during their sickness, and it was only in the 1960s or thereabout that in a case called *Orville V. Saville Sports Wear Limited* it was decided that they may not even imply, but they may be, in circumstances where the contract was silent on the matter, sufficient to imply that during sickness an employee would be paid for his or her time.

3.10 p.m.

On the other hand there is nothing in the law to prevent the implication going the other way or indeed to prevent an express agreement that during sickness, and sickness includes maternity, a woman or a man would not be entitled to payment. I would have thought that if the Government was conscious of the need for proper legislation in this field they would have done a definite thing in this Bill, that is, to have put the position at law beyond doubt where during maternity leave and indeed during the sickness of persons in particular such persons would continue to have the right to be paid for that period of illness or maternity leave. This legislation does nothing of the sort.

If the Government were good copiers they would have done their home work and have read the Employment Protection Act of 1975 of the United Kingdom at least in which in dealing with a similar situation legislation provides for a fund and weekly contributions are paid in by the employer to get a fund to compensate women who are on maternity leave. None of this has happened in this Act so that the so-called protection that is being given has fallen behind a practice which one finds being pursued, as the hon. member for St. Michael North East said, by some employers in this country.

Now I have in this House when introducing Resolutions on women's rights drawn to the Government's attention the defects in protection

rights that exist and have existed for too long in relation to women's rights, and it hurts my heart that the Government in the first instance did not accept these Resolutions because by now we would have had proper legislation on the Statute Book dealing with a matter of this nature. I am going to invite the Minister who is in charge of this Bill to do the only proper thing, and that is to send it to Select Committee so that we can improve the provisions of this Bill to give greater protection to women during their maternity period.

The other point I wish to speak very strongly on in this Bill is why should it be obligatory that the periods of maternity leave should be six weeks before confinement and six after confinement. "Except where an employee otherwise desires...." (*Asides*) It does not matter that it is flexible. Some women are in need of maternity leave for longer periods of time. Perhaps this is difficult for the Government to understand because they have now lost the benefit of the only lady member they had who would explain these things to them. It is difficult for them to understand that the post effects of child bearing can be such that a lady can go off her mind, and it would take her six months to come back to any rationality and be able to resume her occupation. (*Asides*) The Bill does not cover the whole situation. The Minister must read his Bill completely. I am not talking about her right to reinstatement. She can only get it where she has been granted maternity leave under the Act, but let us assume that the lady had exhausted the six weeks period post her confinement, section 5 does not cover her because she must resume her position at that stage. Will the Minister please read section 7?

Hon. C. E. TALMA: If the hon. member would give way, being such an astute lawyer as he is I thought he would have studied the provisions of this Bill more accurately. Provision is made under the Act for an extension to be granted in such cases. If he can look it up he would probably find it before he rises again.

Mr. FORDE: If the Minister would have a look he will see that even in Clause 4(2)(b) the period of confinement shall if the employee so desires be extended so that the total period of leave does not amount to less than 12 weeks. Would the Government try and read their own Bill? Because if the period is more than 12 weeks in these circumstances the situation will occur that she will lose her reinstatement rights because she must resume the contract. It is not my business to teach the Government the law. They may well find out that the very section they are relying on does not bear the construction they are asking. (*Asides*) I am not going to be heckled in

my time. I understand that the lawyers over there have gone to sleep today; so they are really not following.

Mr. SPEAKER: Over there where?

Mr. FORDE: On the other side of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: There are no lawyers in here, only hon. members.

Mr. FORDE: I accept your statement that there are no lawyers, but I want to get back to the point. This Act is deficient in that respect, and I contend it has to be strengthened if the position is to be clear in this respect. I go a bit further and say there is no reason why the only condition which should be laid down in this Act should not be the provision of a medical certificate with the right of the employer to ask for a review by a medical board where the purpose of confinement has been because of maternity. If the woman has to be on her back for six months during the period of them, in my view she should not lose her employment or lose her seniority rights, and if the Minister will look at the legislation properly he would see that it makes no provision for that situation, and that is the point I have been making. It has taken a long time for them to understand that is the point I am making. Let us look at it again. Outside the period of 12 weeks at the maximum there is no provision which will continue her right to be reinstated in her job. Can I put it more clearly than that? That is why I am saying that the Act is deficient in some respects. Firstly, no proper provision to secure her rights to be paid; secondly, no proper provision for the cases where her confinement is longer than twelve weeks; thirdly, a limitation in relation to those women to pursue their employment at home for wages, and there is no reason why there should be that limitation, and fourthly, the failure of the Government to recognise the necessity to have legislation dealing with unfair dismissal.

I will tell you why this is particularly necessary to women. There is nothing to prevent an employer prior to her confinement, as soon as the woman starts to show signs of pregnancy — in the third month for instance — to give her notice. Let us say she has been working with him for five years or over two years, he can say I do not any longer wish your services, I am going to bring in someone. He has to assign no reason despite the presence of the Severance Pay Act. Hon. members must recognise that tomorrow the hon. member could go back to his place of business, his shop or his office, and look at his employee and say, I am giving you four weeks' notice; I will replace you by Miss X; and that person has no entitlement to severance pay or to any damages at common law. So that this

legislation that pretends to give some protection is totally deficient and I cannot for five years get this Government to understand that the reason why I have been pressing for greater women's rights is because of deficiencies like this that exist in the system, and those of us who follow what happens in this Island know of many cases where people are victimised and dismissed for unfair reasons and they have no resort at common law to get any benefits at all. This is supposed to be this great socialist, progressive, advancing Government. We are supposed to be, according to them, dyed in the wool people without any ideas, conservative then, but when you examine their attitudes on matters and when you listen to the refurbished Labour Party's views over here, when you listen to the Labour Party that has grown up in the last 15 years since we have been out of power, you will see that the contrast between ourselves and the Government is startling.

3.20 p.m.

If you want to see progressive thinking, look for it over here. We have given this country a solemn commitment that we are going to equalise women's rights, and a further commitment that every worker in Barbados is protected against unfair dismissal and that there will be a model labour statute within three months of our taking office.

Now the worst category of workers who are provided for are Government workers. The Government should look at what is happening with people and conductresses of the Transport Board who are being victimised because of their change of unions, and who are given flimsy excuses for being dismissed in circumstances where they are getting these four weeks and six weeks notices, and there is no protection at all for them. So the quasi Government bodies are the worst employers when you come to matters like these occurring. Why does not the Minister of Labour investigate the Transport Board as to how it has been possible for these people to be chased away on all sorts of flimsy excuses, and get no proper redundancy pay or severance payment? I am against that.

The Government is also a terrible employer when it comes to dealing with people, even the Civil Service. Civil Servants have very little protection — and I am serious about this — in view of the provision that they are dismissable at the pleasure of the Crown. Hon. members must know of many contracts in which Government believes that they had the right to give someone four weeks notice after they have been workers for two or three years.

I want to know if this legislation too is to bind the Crown. I want to know what the

Government is going to do about its conservative attitude towards the public servants of this country who come in by way of contract and otherwise as far as giving them added protection is concerned. It bothers me that we have accepted concepts that are no longer tenable in the movement towards fundamental freedoms and human rights and that after 15 years of Democratic Labour Party rule they cannot see these things staring them in their faces.

It is no point saying that we were there before 1961 and all that. I want to know why it has taken them 15 years — when I was just a young man in university — in these circumstances to give women a pittance or crumb of some sort of protection. I want to know further if the Government is only now aware of what I said in a debate in another session of this Parliament, as to how badly off women were and one of the reasons I advanced for introducing my Resolution was that there were employers in Bridgetown who when women went home on maternity leave and they came back, they found that they had lost their seniority and they had to start all over again.

The Government side got up and said that there was no justification for women's rights. You heard them say that women are their worst enemies. That is a classic statement of even some of the leading female members of the DLP — the present and future candidates. That statement which I heard being bandied about here is untrue. What has happened is that women have been dominated too long by us, and because of economic power they are totally dependent on us.

Women know that they are badly off in this country, and they intend to do something about it. I am asking the Minister, if he wants to have the benefit of partisan co-operation even at this late hour — I do not believe that this Parliament has two more months to go — if the Government is serious, let them bring this Bill before a Select Committee and we undertake from this side that we will co-operate fully with them, and if possible draft legislation for them. If the Government wants us to write in by way of this Act a complete sex discrimination Act, we will do so.

I want to go back to this Act binding the Crown. What I want them to do is to go further and put in provisions about unfair dismissals which will also bind the Crown and make it illegal to give persons what at present is an illegal notice in circumstances where the dismissal is an unfair dismissal. That is the point I wanted to make.

I do not want the Minister to feel that I am pounding him as a person. I am pounding the principle behind not even half measures or

one-millionth measures. The member for St. Michael South has reminded me that there are two lady members on this side. I always like to be among women and I welcome strongly the presence of the two lady members in this Parliament because they know that I have always been a stout supporter of women's rights.

Neither came here by tokenism. You have heard the member for St. Michael North East making her contribution on this Bill and pointing out in her quiet, but forceful way, some of the points that I have made. You have heard the hon. member for Bridgetown. If there is one thing that can be said for the Labour Party when it comes to women is that there is no misunderstanding about our attitude towards them, Sir. We consider them our equals, and indeed we have been recruiting to the ranks of the Labour Party some of the most useful women from all walks of life in this country, and by the time that elections come we will be able to prove clearly to the Government that not only the women are behind us but the men who are behind the women trying to get alongside of them.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation, in my view, is ridiculously long over due and too limited. It is symptomatic of the hurry come up legislation that we have been seeing in here since the 18th May. What we need in Barbados is a comprehensive piece of legislation for the protection of working women. This is purely a bit of something here and something there, a piecemeal bit of legislation. I am pleased to see that women can elect how they can have their 12 weeks. Some women prefer to work as close as possible to the last day and then go home for three months. I heard it said in here today that because pregnant women are paid during their confinement it would encourage women to have babies. I do not think that hon. members properly understand the terrible disadvantage under which working mothers have to operate in this country.

The first thing is that when a mother has had her baby, and is literally forced under this Act to go back to work as soon as maybe six weeks after, at the most three months after she is forced to have someone to look after that baby and many of these mothers would have to put aside those wages to pay a nurse to look after her baby.

3.30 p.m.

Otherwise she is going to have to put her baby in a nursery school which again she is going to have to pay a fee for because there is such a

dearth of Government day nurseries and nursery schools to accommodate these children.

I would very much like to see a situation where there are day nurseries especially in high density areas like in the City of Bridgetown, within walking distance of a high density area like the Orleans, within walking distance of a high density area like Chapman's Lane, within walking distance of a high density area as it obtains between Kings Street, Hunte Street, Green Park Lane, Lightfoot Lane and those lanes. That is preferable to a situation where you have — and I see that Government is indulging in this — a situation where day nurseries are being placed adjacent to industrial estates and industrial parks. That is not desirable, Mr. Speaker, because you are forcing people into a situation where they have got to drag their little children or their babies in arms along to work with them through rain or shine, in the bus in most cases, and this has to happen in the early hours of the morning when everybody is rushing, and it happens again at peak time in the afternoon when everybody is rushing away from work. That is not a desirable situation.

All of this is part and parcel of the comprehensive legislation that I am talking about — of a proper policy towards working mothers in this country. There is an Act the amendment to which still lies unproclaimed. I have spoken about it time and time again outside of this Chamber, I have come in here and I think I have made mention of it already and I am going to make mention of it again today. I am talking about the Married Women Separation and Maintenance Act whereby married mothers are under a serious disability in that they are still a situation where if they are deserted by their husbands and they have children who have got to be fed and clothed, they are getting a maximum of \$5 a week in the Magistrate's court.....

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order. Sir, this has absolutely nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thank the hon. member. I was just about to speak. Anyhow, let the hon. member for the City proceed. We will find out who deserted who soon. Just give her a chance.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member seriously suggesting an increase from \$5 to \$10 for a deserted mother — married woman? Many of them are deserted while they are pregnant.....

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I drew your Honour's attention to the fact that what the hon. member is debating does not concern this Bill before the House today. I am not suggesting anything. I am suggesting that it would be dealt with under an appropriate Bill but not this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already drawn that to the hon. member's attention. We are dealing with a Bill to provide for the grant of maternity leave to female employees and for the protection of the employment of those employees during such leave. So I would like the hon. member for the City to debate that.

Miss MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am on a matter of comprehensive legislation for the protection of working women. I am making the point that this sort of piecemeal legislation is not good enough, and that this is no big thing which women in Barbados are going to hurrah about, because the Minister at this stage — I insist that a situation where a married woman is left pregnant, deserted by her husband — a working pregnant mother, those are the people I am discussing here. Every piece of legislation which is going to redound to the benefit of working pregnant mothers is relevant to this debate. I want to see the Act proclaimed and it can only be proclaimed by somebody on that side, and that is why you do not want it debated in here. Get up and do it.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member should know this. Under Standing Order 28(2) — we have to draw the hon. member's attention to Standing Order 28(2). We are dealing with a specific matter before the House and it is a matter for Your Honour to determine if 28(2) applies to cock taxes or hen taxing. I prefer hen taxing.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order; a point of elucidation. Anyhow it seems as if the hon. member has completed her speech.

Miss MILLER: I definitely have not.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh! I am sorry. I saw you take your seat.

Miss MILLER: It has come out, you see; that is the point. This is election year and that sort of thing is not popular with men who are going to be expected to vote for this Government. That is why the hon. members on that side do not want to hear it debated in here. They do not want the ball shoved into their

court again. They do not want to be reminded that this has been hanging for too long. If somebody on this side could have done it it would have been done. (*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, was I hearing that the Government intends passing legislation to put taxes on cocks. Is it game cocks or what sort of cocks?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order. It is game cocks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that it is no point of order; and I am sorry to see my Deputy jumping to his feet. When I am speaking, take your seat, or you cannot be my Deputy then.

I would like the hon. member to continue.

Miss MILLER: I am nearly finished. Sir, I just want to reiterate what I said before; that this piecemeal legislation is not good enough; It is not impressing anybody in here or any women outside of in here. This is another gimmick in the year of the gimmicks, to catch at the female votes. What we need is comprehensive legislation. 3.40 p.m.

There are too many areas in which working women need to be protected which have not even been contemplated, considered, thought of by this Government, and it is just not good enough. A little piece of legislation which is not, properly speaking, even ten pages long cannot look after the interests of the working woman in Barbados, and even if we are going to confine it to pregnant working women it is still insufficient and inefficient. I have spoken here today about married, working, deserted mothers. They are not looked after in this. There is something else on the Table in here which should all be incorporated in this, this is a little piece of thing to catch at working women; women on the ground outside know what this is all about, you are not impressing anybody with this, this is no big thing the Minister is doing for us.

I would like to add my contribution to what the hon. member for St. Philip North said about clause 8 of this Bill. I think it is grossly discriminatory for the Act to expressly exclude employees working at home for wages. There is a large number of women in Barbados working in all sorts of cottage industries at home and I do

not understand what the reasoning behind this clause can be. I do not think that the draftsman or the Minister or whoever can be so stupid as to be thinking for one moment that because an employee working at home is already home, that this should not apply to her. That is not the purport of the Act at all, the purport is that the pregnant mother should be remunerated during the 12 weeks either before or after her confinement, however she pleases to have it or however nature forces it upon her to have it, and I do not see that the mother working at home in whatever capacity, in whatever guise for whatever kind of employer is any different from the mother who has to come out and go to her trade or to her shop or a bank or wherever, and I really do not see why she is being discriminated against in this fashion. I would very much like to endorse the member for St. Philip North's remarks in that respect of that clause 8. It is a nasty stain on this little bit of legislation. It is bad enough, because it is so scanty, and that it should be discriminatory as well will only make bad worse. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those hon. members who is satisfied that this piece of legislation falls far short of the requirement for the protection of women in employment generally. I believe that if the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill would give some consideration to sending this Bill to a Select Committee, there you will find an opportunity would prevail where, let us say, in our sugar industry proper, just in the cane harvesting season, the crop season just ended, if he could carry out a survey to let us come to grips with reality, if he could carry out a survey to find out how many pregnant women had to be climbing ladders with canes on their heads — and when I say pregnant women I mean women in an advanced state of pregnancy — trying to eke out an existence.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does not make ample provision for matters relating to the situation which I tried to bring to the attention of hon. members. There has been a case in my own constituency where during the crop season just ended a married woman whose task was the tying of canes conveyed to the Manager of the estate that her stage of pregnancy did not permit her to carry out the bending operation, it was too inconvenient for her to be continually bending, and asked that she be given something not so exacting. The Manager accommodated her for three days by giving her something lighter to do, but at the end of three days he said he was done with that, she would have to tie the canes

or go away. As you would understand, this married woman had to go her way because she could not continue tying the canes. What protection is there for this woman in legislation such as this? She was ready and willing to work, she was on the job, a married woman, but the bending operation was too much for her, she could not tie the canes, and if she couldn't tie she had to go. Is this in itself not something that behoves us to legislate comprehensively for the protection of these people?

Let us bring ourselves back to the point of some of us who say we want to take the women out of the field. Do not let us take them out of the field yet, let them remain until we can do better for them, but once they are there, for God's sake don't let us see women in an advanced stage of pregnancy having to climb ladders with the bundles of canes on their heads. If the women have to earn a living, if they have to work under such circumstances, we know their economic situation demands much, but we too must realise — and there are no two ways about it, a mother is a very special type of person — and as such we have to see that all we do, however we legislate that we legislate to accommodate mothers, and when it comes to the question of a working mother she needs extra accommodation.

This brings us to the point where we have to look at the overall aspect of their working conditions, their economic circumstances, and in truth and in fact try to relate thereto the responsibility that is thrust on a mother-to-be as in the case with these mothers in a state of pregnancy. But what is more — and the point I am going to make now I am surprised that some of those who are more familiar with the law didn't seek to make — at present a married woman who is not supported by her husband voluntarily if she is not able to pursue her cause in the High Court, all she can get in the lower court is \$10.00 per week from her husband. That is all she can get.

Mr. EDWARDS: I remember as Minister of Social Services increasing it to \$20.00.

Mr. SPEAKER: What was that? A point of elucidation, order or interruption?

Mr. EDWARDS: I wanted to draw it to the member's attention that it is \$20.00 and not \$10.00.
3.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we like to go by the statute, or what is set out here before us. If the means of communicating what the hon. member for St. Andrew is now trying to bring before us has broken down; if the Attorney-General, or the proper authority, has not sought to convey it to the courts, I think I am right in saying that it still remains at \$10.00 and not \$20.00 as the hon. member is trying to tell us.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the Act was amended to make provision for \$20.00 as the maximum for married women. I did it myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act makes provision here for \$10.00. What I now gather is that a wife would have to make an application for the variation, but it is set down in the law that it is \$10.00. The practice is that the wife would, after getting \$10.00 from the Clerk of the Court, then make an application to get a variation thereto. (*Asides.*) We have to go by what is in the statute. In doing so, the hon. member for St. Andrew must remember that the wife, in making an application for a variation from \$10.00 to whatever it is, would have to satisfy the court that the employment condition of her husband has improved. She has to show that his earning ability has improved.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think I can be so dumb. In 1963 I brought into this Chamber an amendment to the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act making it \$20.00 when we increased the children's from \$1.20 to \$5.00. I carried the married women's maximum to \$20.00, and I increased the age at which a child should be maintained from 12 years if it was illegitimate, and 14 if legitimate to both 16 years. All of this was in a comprehensive piece of legislation introduced in this Chamber by me in 1963. I did not print the laws, but I know it was passed in this Chamber at \$20.00. If there is a typographical error in the Act, then let us get our records straight. I know it was passed at \$20.00 in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say that you have broken the Rules by making a speech. It was not a point of order. You made a speech. I want to hear about the maternity leave. I do not want to hear about the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act. That can come another time. I see that all hon. members are debating that. Do

not let me have to warn hon. members who have not yet spoken about it. [*Several hon. members rose.*] When I am speaking, I want every hon. member to take his seat, or let me tell them that they can take the outside. These young members, who have just joined the House, must learn the Rules. I want to hear about the maternity leave and not the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Your last remarks refer to me. You know that out of respect, I would get up as soon as you have finished speaking. I think you should give hon. members some latitude for the simple reason that the hon. member for St. Peter is trying to make a point on the state of the law as it now stands and relating it to the subject under debate. There is great confusion in the laws of Barbados as he has pointed out, and there is, indeed, a contradiction. If I may explain it very briefly so that we could get on with the debate, in relation to only if the married lady who had an order in 1963 came for a fresh order could she under Section 11 get \$20.00, but any person applying for the first time still gets the \$10.00 because of the manner in which the legislation is drafted. If the hon. member would look at Volume IV of the Laws of Barbados and read Sections 2, 5 and 11, he would see that that contention is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the hon. member has given a full explanation. I thank him for doing so, but that is also a speech, having spoken already. We want to hear about maternity leave.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, what I have said and what other hon. members have said all relates to this question of maternity leave, because maternity leave as is contained and explained in this bit of legislation is applicable to women. When we discuss maternity leave, we are discussing women, whether married or single. The reference that has been made refers to conditions relating to women.

Now, Sir, you will understand that enough has been brought to Government's attention in this very short debate to let Government realise, as the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown has said, that this is really no big thing as such. We are just touching the border, the hem of the garment, in this case. We have to do much more to satisfy the issue, and the sooner the Government addresses its mind to this, the better it will be for all concerned.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a possibility that we must give consideration to the fact that there are many employers who, the moment they get the hint that there is a mother-to-be in their employment, will try to hasten to bring an end to such employment to protect themselves. We need, Mr. Speaker, more certification by a medical practitioner. To protect these same women, it ought to be stipulated that the moment they are certain of their pregnancy, a doctor's certificate ought to be presented to their employer and not leave it to the employer to gain information by the way, and take appropriate action.

My reason for saying so is that it brings us to realise that the moment an employer is presented with this certificate from a medical practitioner that a particular employee is in a state of pregnancy, then that in itself is sufficient protection from that day forward. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has a right to reply.
4 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister must understand the legislation he is putting before parliament. The legislation he is putting before parliament gives us to understand that the certificate that the mother-to-be has to present to the employer relates to her obtaining six weeks before pregnancy and six weeks after. That is not what we are talking about. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair, but I am hearing other voices.

Mr. HINDS: It has been drawn to my attention that the mother to be must produce a certificate that sets out her date of confinement so that if she does not get a certificate that gives the date of her confinement but merely that she is pregnant, under this piece of legislation she has got no protection. What we want is that if an employee finds herself two months' pregnant or a week pregnant for that matter and she can obtain a doctor's certificate, she must present that to her employer and that will be sufficient protection for her throughout her period. (*Asides*) The Minister has the right of final reply. (*Asides*) Do not let us go into that area because it causes confusion. I have heard hon. members talking about the number of unwanted babies. I believe there are many women who are just following the type of teaching that is now being propagated here and there, but in truth and in fact the Barbadian woman who has a child really

loves the child and likes to accept her responsibility. There are only exceptional cases because of the various strata of society that exists where you find this person and the other person trying to duck away from one's responsibility and the like.

I am sure that the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill has enough before him which will encourage him to send the Bill to Select Committee and have everything ironed out there so that we can produce something more comprehensive to meet the requirements contained therein. I believe, Sir, that if this is done it would be done definitely to the interest of the women generally.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member for Christ Church West who was not in his seat as far as I can remember when I introduced this Bill and for the benefit of others, I stated at that time that this is a matter on which Government was working in 1962. This has nothing to do with 1975 legislation in England, and I stated at the beginning that the matter was not proceeded with at that time because we were working on national insurance legislation. I am sorry I have not got the file that I can show you the facts. Perhaps he was also not here when I said I did not have the file here but I can bring the file and you can see it. As a matter of fact, I go further. I think it was in 1974 that we began working on this Bill again and we circulated draft copies of the Bill to the respective Unions. We support I.L.O. Conventions in the sense of principles which indicate that matters of this kind should be sent to the respective Unions, and we sent a copy of this Bill to the Barbados Workers' Union and a copy to the Employers Confederation which is the employing body in this country. The first Bill contained a clause requiring the employers to pay the wages or salaries of the mother who had been granted maternity leave, and the Employers Confederation in their reply referred us to the I.L.O. Convention on this matter which at that time stated that no employer should be required to pay the Bill of his employees who are on maternity leave, and because of this and our support of the I.L.O. Convention we took it out. Because we have our National Insurance Laws and we know that the employee is entitled to maternity leave benefits which amount to somewhere in the vicinity of 60% of their average wages for a period of twelve weeks, we did not pursue it. We left it to the Barbados Workers' Union or whatever Trade Union might happen to be representative of the worker to negotiate globally for the additional benefit of the extra 40% or whatever else there may be, because even

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I drew your Honour's attention to the fact that what the hon. member is debating does not concern this Bill before the House today. I am not suggesting anything. I am suggesting that it would be dealt with under an appropriate Bill but not this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already drawn that to the hon. member's attention. We are dealing with a Bill to provide for the grant of maternity leave to female employees and for the protection of the employment of those employees during such leave. So I would like the hon. member for the City to debate that.

Miss MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am on a matter of comprehensive legislation for the protection of working women. I am making the point that this sort of piecemeal legislation is not good enough, and that this is no big thing which women in Barbados are going to hurrah about, because the Minister at this stage — I insist that a situation where a married woman is left pregnant, deserted by her husband — a working pregnant mother, those are the people I am discussing here. Every piece of legislation which is going to redound to the benefit of working pregnant mothers is relevant to this debate. I want to see the Act proclaimed and it can only be proclaimed by somebody on that side, and that is why you do not want it debated in here. Get up and do it.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, Sir. I think the hon. member should know this. Under Standing Order 28(2) — we have to draw the hon. member's attention to Standing Order 28(2). We are dealing with a specific matter before the House and it is a matter for Your Honour to determine if 28(2) applies to cock taxes or hen taxing. I prefer hen taxing.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order; a point of elucidation. Anyhow it seems as if the hon. member has completed her speech.

Miss MILLER: I definitely have no.

Mr. SPEAKER: Oh! I am sorry. I saw you take your seat.

Miss MILLER: It has come out, you see; that is the point. This is election year and that sort of thing is not popular with men who are going to be expected to vote for this Government. That is why the hon. members on that side do not want to hear it debated in here. They do not want the ball shoved into their

court again. They do not want to be reminded that this has been hanging for too long. If somebody on this side could have done it it would have been done. (*Aside*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, was I hearing that the Government intends passing legislation to put taxes on cocks. Is it game cocks or what sort of cocks?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not point of order.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order. It is game cocks.

Mr. SPEAKER: I said that it is no point of order; and I am sorry to see my Deputy jumping to his feet. When I am speaking, take your seat, or you cannot be my Deputy then.

I would like the hon. member to continue.

Miss MILLER: I am nearly finished. Sir, I just want to reiterate what I said before; that this piecemeal legislation is not good enough; It is not impressing anybody in here or any women outside of in here. This is another gimmick in the year of the gimmicks, to catch at the female votes. What we need is comprehensive legislation. 3.40 p.m.

There are too many areas in which working women need to be protected which have not even been contemplated, considered, thought of by this Government, and it is just not good enough. A little piece of legislation which is not, properly speaking, even ten pages long cannot look after the interests of the working woman in Barbados, and even if we are going to confine it to pregnant working women it is still insufficient and inefficient. I have spoken here today about married, working, deserted mothers. They are not looked after in this. There is something else on the Table in here which should all be incorporated in this, this is a little piece of thing to catch at working women; women on the ground outside know what this is all about, you are not impressing anybody with this, this is no big thing the Minister is doing for us.

I would like to add my contribution to what the hon. member for St. Philip North said about clause 8 of this Bill. I think it is grossly discriminatory for the Act to expressly exclude employees working at home for wages. There is a large number of women in Barbados working in all sorts of cottage industries at home and I do

not understand what the reasoning behind this clause can be. I do not think that the draftsman or the Minister or whoever can be so stupid as to be thinking for one moment that because an employee working at home is already home, that this should not apply to her. That is not the purport of the Act at all, the purport is that the pregnant mother should be remunerated during the 12 weeks either before or after her confinement, however she pleases to have it or however nature forces it upon her to have it, and I do not see that the mother working at home in whatever capacity, in whatever guise for whatever kind of employer is any different from the mother who has to come out and go to her trade or to her shop or a bank or wherever, and I really do not see why she is being discriminated against in this fashion. I would very much like to endorse the member for St. Philip North's remarks in that respect of that clause 8. It is a nasty stain on this little bit of legislation. It is bad enough, because it is so scanty, and that it should be discriminatory as well will only make bad worse. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, I am one of those hon. members who is satisfied that this piece of legislation falls far short of the requirement for the protection of women in employment generally. I believe that if the Hon. Minister who introduced this Bill would give some consideration to sending this Bill to a Select Committee, there you will find an opportunity would prevail where, let us say, in our sugar industry proper, just in the cane harvesting season, the crop season just ended, if he could carry out a survey to let us come to grips with reality, if he could carry out a survey to find out how many pregnant women had to be climbing ladders with canes on their heads — and when I say pregnant women I mean women in an advanced state of pregnancy — trying to eke out an existence.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, does not make ample provision for matters relating to the situation which I tried to bring to the attention of hon. members. There has been a case in my own constituency where during the crop season just ended a married woman whose task was the tying of canes conveyed to the Manager of the estate that her stage of pregnancy did not permit her to carry out the bending operation, it was too inconvenient for her to be continually bending, and asked that she be given something not so exacting. The Manager accommodated her for three days by giving her something lighter to do, but at the end of three days he said he was done with that, she would have to tie the canes

or go away. As you would understand, this married woman had to go her way because she could not continue tying the canes. What protection is there for this woman in legislation such as this? She was ready and willing to work, she was on the job, a married woman, but the bending operation was too much for her, she could not tie the canes, and if she couldn't tie she had to go. Is this in itself not something that behoves us to legislate comprehensively for the protection of these people?

Let us bring ourselves back to the point of some of us who say we want to take the women out of the field. Do not let us take them out of the field yet, let them remain until we can do better for them, but once they are there, for God's sake don't let us see women in an advanced stage of pregnancy having to climb ladders with the bundles of canes on their heads. If the women have to earn a living, if they have to work under such circumstances, we know their economic situation demands much, but we too must realise — and there are no two ways about it, a mother is a very special type of person — and as such we have to see that all we do, however we legislate that we legislate to accommodate mothers, and when it comes to the question of a working mother she needs extra accommodation.

This brings us to the point where we have to look at the overall aspect of their working conditions, their economic circumstances, and in truth and in fact try to relate thereto the responsibility that is thrust on a mother-to-be as in the case with these mothers in a state of pregnancy. But what is more — and the point I am going to make now I am surprised that some of those who are more familiar with the law didn't seek to make — at present a married woman who is not supported by her husband voluntarily if she is not able to pursue her cause in the High Court, all she can get in the lower court is \$10.00 per week from her husband. That is all she can get.

Mr. EDWARDS: I remember as Minister of Social Services increasing it to \$20.00.

Mr. SPEAKER: What was that? A point of elucidation, order or interruption?

Mr. EDWARDS: I wanted to draw it to the member's attention that it is \$20.00 and not \$10.00.
3.50 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, we like to go by the statute, or what is set out here before us. If the means of communicating what the hon. member for St. Andrew is now trying to bring before us has broken down; if the Attorney-General, or the proper authority, has not sought to convey it to the courts, I think I am right in saying that it still remains at \$10.00 and not \$20.00 as the hon. member is trying to tell us.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, in 1963 the Act was amended to make provision for \$20.00 as the maximum for married women. I did it myself.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act makes provision here for \$10.00. What I now gather is that a wife would have to make an application for the variation, but it is set down in the law that it is \$10.00. The practice is that the wife would, after getting \$10.00 from the Clerk of the Court, then make an application to get a variation thereto. (*Asides.*) We have to go by what is in the statute. In doing so, the hon. member for St. Andrew must remember that the wife, in making an application for a variation from \$10.00 to whatever it is, would have to satisfy the court that the employment condition of her husband has improved. She has to show that his earning ability has improved.

Mr. EDWARDS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think I can be so dumb. In 1963 I brought into this Chamber an amendment to the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act making it \$20.00 when we increased the children's from \$1.20 to \$5.00. I carried the married women's maximum to \$20.00, and I increased the age at which a child should be maintained from 12 years if it was illegitimate, and 14 if legitimate to both 16 years. All of this was in a comprehensive piece of legislation introduced in this Chamber by me in 1963. I did not print the laws, but I know it was passed in this Chamber at \$20.00. If there is a typographical error in the Act, then let us get our records straight. I know it was passed at \$20.00 in here.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say that you have broken the Rules by making a speech. It was not a point of order. You made a speech. I want to hear about the maternity leave. I do not want to hear about the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act. That can come another time. I see that all hon. members are debating that. Do

not let me have to warn hon. members who have not yet spoken about it. [*Several hon. members rose.*] When I am speaking, I want every hon. member to take his seat, or let me tell them that they can take the outside. These young members, who have just joined the House, must learn the Rules. I want to hear about the maternity leave and not the Married Women's Separation and Maintenance Act.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Your last remarks refer to me. You know that out of respect, I would get up as soon as you have finished speaking. I think you should give hon. members some latitude for the simple reason that the hon. member for St. Peter is trying to make a point on the state of the law as it now stands and relating it to the subject under debate. There is great confusion in the laws of Barbados as he has pointed out, and there is, indeed, a contradiction. If I may explain it very briefly so that we could get on with the debate, in relation to only if the married lady who had an order in 1963 came for a fresh order could she under Section 11 get \$20.00, but any person applying for the first time still gets the \$10.00 because of the manner in which the legislation is drafted. If the hon. member would look at Volume IV of the Laws of Barbados and read Sections 2, 5 and 11, he would see that that contention is correct.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now, the hon. member has given a full explanation. I thank him for doing so, but that is also a speech, having spoken already. We want to hear about maternity leave.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, what I have said and what other hon. members have said all relates to this question of maternity leave, because maternity leave as is contained and explained in this bit of legislation is applicable to women. When we discuss maternity leave, we are discussing women, whether married or single. The reference that has been made refers to conditions relating to women.

Now, Sir, you will understand that enough has been brought to Government's attention in this very short debate to let Government realise, as the hon. member for the City of Bridgetown has said, that this is really no big thing as such. We are just touching the border, the hem of the garment, in this case. We have to do much more to satisfy the issue, and the sooner the Government addresses its mind to this, the better it will be for all concerned.

There is, Mr. Speaker, a possibility that we must give consideration to the fact that there are many employers who, the moment they get the hint that there is a mother-to-be in their employment, will try to hasten to bring an end to such employment to protect themselves. We need, Mr. Speaker, more certification by a medical practitioner. To protect these same women, it ought to be stipulated that the moment they are certain of their pregnancy, a doctor's certificate ought to be presented to their employer and not leave it to the employer to gain information by the way, and take appropriate action.

My reason for saying so is that it brings us to realise that the moment an employer is presented with this certificate from a medical practitioner that a particular employee is in a state of pregnancy, then that in itself is sufficient protection from that day forward. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has a right to reply.
4 p.m.

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister must understand the legislation he is putting before parliament. The legislation he is putting before parliament gives us to understand that the certificate that the mother-to-be has to present to the employer relates to her obtaining six weeks before pregnancy and six weeks after. That is not what we are talking about. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member for St. Peter was addressing the Chair, but I am hearing other voices.

Mr. HINDS: It has been drawn to my attention that the mother to be must produce a certificate that sets out her date of confinement so that if she does not get a certificate that gives the date of her confinement but merely that she is pregnant, under this piece of legislation she has got no protection. What we want is that if an employee finds herself two months' pregnant or a week pregnant for that matter and she can obtain a doctor's certificate, she must present that to her employer and that will be sufficient protection for her throughout her period. (*Asides*) The Minister has the right of final reply. (*Asides*) Do not let us go into that area because it causes confusion. I have heard hon. members talking about the number of unwanted babies. I believe there are many women who are just following the type of teaching that is now being propagated here and there, but in truth and in fact the Barbadian woman who has a child really

loves the child and likes to accept her responsibility. There are only exceptional cases because of the various strata of society that exists where you find this person and the other person trying to duck away from one's responsibility and the like.

I am sure that the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill has enough before him which will encourage him to send the Bill to Select Committee and have everything ironed out there so that we can produce something more comprehensive to meet the requirements contained therein. I believe, Sir, that if this is done it would be done definitely to the interest of the women generally.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. member for Christ Church West who was not in his seat as far as I can remember when I introduced this Bill and for the benefit of others, I stated at that time that this is a matter on which Government was working in 1962. This has nothing to do with 1975 legislation in England, and I stated at the beginning that the matter was not proceeded with at that time because we were working on national insurance legislation. I am sorry I have not got the file that I can show you the facts. Perhaps he was also not here when I said I did not have the file here but I can bring the file and you can see it. As a matter of fact, I go further. I think it was in 1974 that we began working on this Bill again and we circulated draft copies of the Bill to the respective Unions. We support I.L.O. Conventions in the sense of principles which indicate that matters of this kind should be sent to the respective Unions, and we sent a copy of this Bill to the Barbados Workers' Union and a copy to the Employers Confederation which is the employing body in this country. The first Bill contained a clause requiring the employers to pay the wages or salaries of the mother who had been granted maternity leave, and the Employers Confederation in their reply referred us to the I.L.O. Convention on this matter which at that time stated that no employer should be required to pay the Bill of his employees who are on maternity leave, and because of this and our support of the I.L.O. Convention we took it out. Because we have our National Insurance Laws and we know that the employee is entitled to maternity leave benefits which amount to somewhere in the vicinity of 60% of their average wages for a period of twelve weeks, we did not pursue it. We left it to the Barbados Workers' Union or whatever Trade Union might happen to be representative of the worker to negotiate globally for the additional benefit of the extra 40% or whatever else there may be, because even

now as we have heard here this afternoon, the Barbados Workers' Union has been negotiating for full pay for persons who go on maternity leave. 4.10 p.m.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation. Would the Minister like to tell us about the large section of people who are not unionised, like domestics, and whether he would consider giving them that protection?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives them protection. I have a domestic. I do not call her a domestic. She is my maid. If she brings me a letter from a medical practitioner stating that she is pregnant and stating her date of confinement, I cannot dismiss her. She has protection under this Bill like any other worker.

Mr. FORDE: On a point of explanation.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of what explanation?

Mr. FORDE: I can deal with it when we go into committee.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Do it in committee. I never once got up when the hon. member was speaking. I might have tried to help him from my seat, but that is something else. Mr. Speaker, there has been one theme running through the Resolution at this time, and that is that it is intended to catch votes, that this is election year, and that members on the other side are saying that what we can do they can do better. In fact, the whole of their manifesto in 1971 was based on what you have done we could do better. We could do more and we could do better. All that they have done this afternoon is to repeat what they stated as their base in 1971 that they could do better than what we are doing. They are not saying that what we are doing is wrong, but that they could improve on what we are doing.

I make no bones about it. This is not intended to be any comprehensive legislation for women. As a **matter** of fact, this House has agreed to set **up** a commission on women's rights. We have been working actively on this since the early 1970s. This matter was referred to the Union in 1974. It is not intended to be and was never intended to be any consolidated piece of social legislation dealing with women. If it was, it would be for another Minister to introduce it and not me. Somebody else is in charge of that subject.

I am dealing with an aspect of work, and that is why I have brought this piece of

legislation here at this time. No matter how good the legislation that Government introduces, members on the other side will say perhaps that it is good, but that it does not go far enough. They will say that they will vote for it because it provides some sort of social benefits to a section of the people of Barbados, but that it has still not gone far enough. We are accustomed to this.

What I have discovered is that hon. members have not properly read the Bill. I believe that hon. members glanced through the Bill, but have not read it as thoroughly as they should have done; because this Resolution is a piece of socialist legislation. I would be the last person in the world to say that this could not be improved upon. I would be the last person in the world to say that any piece of legislation introduced anywhere could not be improved upon; but I am prepared to say that this is an important piece of social legislation protecting pregnant women in this country.

I want to make this clear, and I want to refute what the hon. member said earlier. So long as a woman discovers or believes that she is pregnant, and she goes to her doctor, and he confirms that she is pregnant and gives her a certificate to that effect, and he can estimate the time of her delivery — he is not God — so if he can estimate approximately when the baby is going to be born and gives her a certificate to that effect, from the time that the employee delivers that certificate to her employer the employer cannot by this law effectively serve on her a notice of dismissal, neither can he dismiss her without notice.

This Bill also grants additional leave when a person becomes ill after pregnancy, and in fact requires additional time to recuperate. It does not allow six months, but six weeks which can amount to 18 weeks of leave altogether. What is more, if the baby is born before the expected date, in other words, if the baby was scheduled to be born say on the 24th May, but was born three weeks before and the woman had gone off for three weeks before she thought that she had had six weeks before confinement, but in fact she only had three weeks, she is entitled to nine weeks after confinement — a total of 12 weeks — three before confinement and nine after; and in addition, if the mother suffers any illness arising out of confinement or after confinement, she is entitled to an additional six weeks.

I am positive that this Bill was read hurriedly by hon. members because they were concentrating so heavily on other items before

this House today, that sufficient attention has not been paid to the clauses of this Bill.

When I introduced this Bill I said that I had one or two amendments to make. That still remains the case. In committee I am going to move a couple of amendments. Quite honestly, I believe that I have replied to the points made. I have no intention of sending this Bill to a Select Committee. I think that it would be a waste of time. We know what happens to Bills which are sent to Select Committees. We had one which came out better, and that was the Succession Bill. It was dealt with promptly, but others have not been dealt with so promptly.

I think that this Bill as it stands is a good Bill for the protection of working mothers, and apart from a few amendments that I am going to propose I think that it is a reasonable Bill. If any hon. member has something to propose which is reasonable I am prepared to accept it.

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and agreed to.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move in Clause 2 that after the words "her confinement" the addition of the words "maternity leave". This is on Page 2 of the Bill. Immediately after "her confinement" delete the semicolon and add the words "and includes additional leave granted under Section 5".

I beg to move that this Clause as amended stand part.

Hon. A. MORRISON: I beg to second that.
4.20 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, before this is put to the vote, you will recall that during the

time we were here discussing this Bill in the House that I was making the point that the maternity leave legislation here does not make provision for payment to the mother who is going on maternity leave, and I was thinking that this is the section under which this could be raised again.

The point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is that I would hope that the Minister would recognize the fact that maternity is a period during which mothers need to have as much income as they possibly can, particularly income that they would be working for; and whereas I recognize the point that it might be difficult to include it in the section, the point I would like to make to the Hon. Minister — and I hope he would be able to pursue this under the National Insurance Legislation — that some provision should be made in the not too distant future for mothers who have to go on maternity leave to be paid their full wages or their full salary as the case may be, and from this area rather than the 60% which is at present paid, because I am of the firm view that some recognition should be given to this and I would take the point that it might be a bit clumsy to have it included here, but this does not mean that I am moving off from my position that if a working mother has to go on maternity leave that she should not be entitled, and indeed, that some recognition should be given to her so that she should be able to get her full wages or her full salary during whatever period of maternity leave is granted.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the hon. member for St. Philip North. I think in this matter there may be some of the people who support the Barbados Labour Party, those are the ones who object to employers paying. The position is — and the hon. member for Christ Church West represents these people — the big employers in Barbados

Mr. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I would explain. I have represented the Barbados Workers Union before, I **will** represent it again, and the hon. member should **really** not make that sort of remark. I have represented the hon. member before and if he is in trouble I will represent him again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And as far as the Chair is concerned, that is absolutely no point of order.

Mr. WALCOTT: Why I can say so. He represented me and as he knows, when it came to

the eleventh hour he was like Peter — anyhow he gave a reason.

I am saying that the employers here, they react very stupidly when it comes to a question of maternity leave. Under National Insurance people get 60%; you can make it 100% but you see National Insurance is only token. Nobody pays national insurance on their proper salary. If you paid on your proper salary you would get more money but it is a token payment that you make, up to the maximum amount that everybody pays. Well, the amount that is going to come out of that is going to be conditioned by the amount of money that goes into it, and I sit on national insurance, and I have to be very frank about it. There is sickness, and maternity and industrial injuries — the load is spread; we consider what individual employers will be paying and the load will be spread over the individual employers.

In our own organization we pay as a condition of employment. All the women who work at the Barbados Workers Union are entitled to maternity leave — not any three babies or four babies, but for the very reason — people have said in the past that this thing will encourage people to have more children, but it is a fallacy. We pay full wages to all of our staff, sickness or otherwise, and the incidence of illness is for practical purposes, zero, because they know they do not have to sneak out in order to get — the hon. member said it does not matter — I have members on the staff, I have to see them on the profile to realize what is happening because they do not come to me with any medical certificate. I do not need any medical certificate. They can go home for any period, though we have a period of three months purely as a matter of having some sort of regulation, but it is accepted and the union pays them full wages; at any rate, it does not matter how much they work for, because we consider that it is an obligation; but employers in Barbados would not agree to it. They say they paid it into the Fund already and why should they pay twice. That is their attitude; that they are paying it into national insurance and that they are not going to pay it into national insurance and then pay them also.

So I feel that this is the sort of thing that we will have to do by Committee really. We have to set up a Committee to make a study as to what way we can extend maternity benefits to the community in a general way. The hon. member for the City of Bridgetown and the hon. member for St. Philip North said it was discriminatory. It is not. They have to bear in mind that you are

talking about maternity and you are talking about employment. A person who is working at home is not working at home for any single employer. A person who is working at home can be working for fifty employers; which employer are you going to make responsible for the maternity benefit? These people are self-employed people; so it is going to be difficult. Working for wages at home cannot be easily assessed because you have people at home who do not work for any single employer. They may be carrying some things at the Park; they may be carrying things on which they have worked, to various places.

The hon. member for St. Philip North said he would like to see a contract of employment here, but even if you have a contract of employment — and in England they have a contract of employment but there is still a lot of court cases, and they have to determine when it is a contract of employment because some of them do not always consider that all of the contracts into which you enter — you may get a contract working with a man coming and picking you up every morning and taking you to work. There are cases like that — if it is a contract of employment or a contract for employment because you do it every day; you do it 364 days. It is a question of getting the lawyers to know that this is the besetting situation. Even in the English courts for the last hundred of years have had border line cases, each court sometimes coming up with a decision, not too deep, just on the border line.

4.30 p.m.

We had one here some years ago where a man was putting some stuff in a building and the employer said he had given out a contract. We held different views and therefore we went to the Board and we said we felt it was a contract of employment and not a contract for services, because he did not want to pay severance pay. I did not say that the hon. member for Christ Church West at that time didn't advise him, on the otherside they had wrong advice, but we didn't even seek too serious advice because it looked to us so patent we wouldn't even worry to waste money on advice, we fought against that advice and won. Again, I do not think it is discriminatory but it is going to be a very difficult one. If a woman is at home doing smocking and she is going to send it down to the IDC it is going to be difficult to determine. When she gets pregnant at home who is going to make the contribution for her? You have a provision already for self-employed people, so she would have to make up her mind. A shopkeeper would

be in the same position, it is only a question of the level of what you earn, so you have to have the dividing line at some point and I don't think it is discriminatory, but you cannot include everybody.

I feel that if we can get the Minister to agree that at some time we will get a committee to investigate the widening of the area for maternity benefits, then we will be able to spread the coverage, because it is a fact that the women who really need it are the ones who are worse off. Unfortunately, I would like to say to the hon. members on the other side that there will be a lot of women who are not working, because if they are not working they cannot get maternity leave, but the problem you are going to get is the number of working women. The hon. member spoke about the married women who the husbands leave, but there are the ones that are not married too. There is no problem with any husbands leaving them, because you then have to identify the husband and wait until the baby is born to see who it looks like, and those are the unfortunate ones we have to deal with, because sometimes they are so confused they cannot always spot the right father. Sometimes they have more than one visitor coming to the home, and this can be a bit of a problem and a little confusing, but again it depends on how attractive the person is, not like when the hon. member for the City asked what you can do. These are people who can do, and therefore they are doing and as a result of doing they pay the price. You can't have it both ways, the price you pay for being young is that you are foolish sometimes. George Bernard Shaw said that sometimes youth is wasted on young people, and therefore you can't help this, but these are the problems we have to live with.

I think if we give a committee in the future some scope for looking at maternity leave, a committee to look at the social problems as they relate to this, they may find something additional we can do to lighten the burden in some of these areas where you find poor people having children without any kind of assistance, and too many of them have to rely on public assistance because they cannot identify the fathers at all.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one or two points in answer to the member for St. Michael West. I think he misunderstood me when I asked for a Contract of Employment Act similar to that which obtains in England and has been there since 1966. I know the problems he has been trying to identify which always upset lawyers, the problem of a contract of service and

a contract for services. He knows that it was Lord Denning who tried to rationalise the whole position subsequent to 1949 in the series of hospital cases. What I was trying to say in the substantive debate was that we should require employers to exhibit in their work places certain basic information for the benefit of the employees. For example, in England the Act applies to all employees except close relatives of the employer, civil servants, registered dock workers, people who are employed under a contract of less than 21 hours a week, and so on, and what the employer has to do in circumstances outside this category of person is, for example, he has to give in writing notice of the date of commencement of employment. He has to give the rate of pay for the job, he has to give the hours of work and any terms and conditions relating to the hours of work, he has to give in writing your entitlement to holiday, sick leave, holidays with pay, he has to provide in writing as to incapacity to work due to injury; if there is a pension scheme or other pension rights in operation he has to give you something in writing about this. That is all I am saying, that we should come towards that position now in Barbados to help safeguard the rights of the employees further than just what we have in operation now, a loose form of arrangement between employer and employee.

The question that the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question was put and resolved in the negative without division.

The question that those words be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 3 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: I wonder whether the Minister would consider certain amendments to clause 3. One is that I would like to suggest that he considers an amendment that the certificate from the doctor need not set forth the expected or the actual date of confinement, but merely set forth the fact that she is pregnant in his opinion in those circumstances.

Secondly, under clause 3(3) (a) she must work for not less than 12 months for this employer. Why this should be so I do not know, if an employer takes on a lady who is obviously pregnant, let us say that she is at the time six or seven months pregnant, and he takes her into his employment, he should be as much obligated to give her her entitlement to confinement as anybody else. Indeed she may have to go out to work because of the fact that she is one of the deserted pregnant women of whom the hon. member for the City spoke, and it seems to me that to put a limitation of this 12 month period is unsatisfactory. This can only be for the benefit of the employers, it is not the sort of provision that is there for the benefit of the employees.

The other point is that an employee is not entitled to maternity leave by the same employer on more than three occasions. That can hardly be fair. Let us assume that the woman does have maternity leave on one occasion and that she starts to take her maternity leave, and during her period of six weeks confinement prior to pregnancy she loses the child, and that she is one of these people who find it difficult to hold children and she may very well lose the child in those circumstances, and that she finds that she has more children afterwards. Do you mean that she would have given faithful service to this employer from the time she was a girl of 18 and she has had unfortunately more than three pregnancies and she cannot get any more maternity leave?

4.40 p.m.

Now, it is an undoubted fact that the older a woman becomes and the more often she is pregnant, the more susceptible she is to illness and, indeed, the more susceptible she is to bring forth a child that is either physically or mentally retarded. This is the medical fact about women, and this is the sort of information which I wanted a National Commission to investigate, so that we would see the rationale for proper legislation. It seems to me a bit of a pity that, at this stage, we are missing wonderful opportunities for really updating the legislation in a proper way.

When I suggested that we send this to a Select Committee, Sir, it was not to kill Bills in Select Committee. I am at present suffering from having some of my Bills before Select Committees, and they do not seem to be able to come out of Select Committees. It was because this type of legislation should be a once-for-all legislation that it is really an ideal for as much as we can see and comprehend at

the moment. What I do not like about provision such as Section 3, Sir, is that we can see needs; we know that they are staring us in our face; we are the law makers, and we have it in our power by a short adjournment, or suspension of this particular sitting, to ask the Legal Draftsmen in the Government Service to bring down the amendment, once Government considers that the points we are making are valid, and yet we are going to push the legislation through at this stage on this particular day. This is the point I am trying to make, and likewise under this Section there should be, as the hon. member for St. Lucy has said, protection given for the woman to be entitled to her pay.

Now, I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael West on this point about not looking for just the amount of entitlement under the National Insurance Act. I believe that a person who goes home because of illness, or maternity leave, should be as much entitled to the full amount of her wages because it is through no fault of hers. It is an act of God, if we put it that way in many instances, that she is so unfortunate as to be ill, or to be confined, although there may be some human intervention in the case of pregnancy in this instance. I do not think we will see any more of the Immaculate Conceptions in our lifetime. That was a once-for-all act, Sir.

I am very serious about this. Too many people in Barbados, and too many employers still, if I may put it that way, feel that when a person goes home that all she should get is two-thirds of the amount that she is entitled to under the National Insurance Act. Indeed, it is in times of illness and confinement that people depend more on their full pay to see them through, because they are having the extra expense of illness, or confinement, in those circumstances. (*Asides.*)

We have social consciences. I have not said, in attacking or criticising the Government constructively, let me put it this way, that the Government has not got a social conscience, too. I have never said that. They have a big one. What I want the Government to know is that we have as big if not a bigger social conscience than they have on instances such as this nature. The hon. member for St. Michael West will know that although I have learnt a lot from him in my past and close association with him, I believe I have taught him a little, too, on matters of this nature. I know he teases me about the service which I may have rendered,

but if political division of political labels had not divided us, the two of us by now would be running the country a long time ago. He knows that, too. I am not making any bones about that, Sir.

When it comes to matters of this nature, I will say this for the hon. member although I have criticised him in public, and he has done the same to me, that when it comes to matters of this nature there can be no division in our attitude about the necessity for people, particularly the poorer section of this community, to get absolute protection. If we have to legislate for it, legislate we will even though it may annoy some of my relatives, some of my friends and some of my clients. There are many clients that we advise quite frequently that their conduct may not be correct morally, but that is the law. We have to advise them that that is the law, but we do not necessarily agree with their actions. I want to make the position perfectly clear on this matter. No matter how many clients I advise and say, "Well the law gives you an out here," it is not necessarily my opinion in this House, or out of this House, when I am not bound by professional secrecy and I am thinking of these matters as a person, and as a person in Parliament, I have always reserved my right to disagree with my clients on my views. I do not mind whether they vote for me or employ me. When it comes to a matter of this nature, I have no axe to grind. I would never have put in these limitations in the Act at all, and I would have brought them down a provision that there should be a deduction, a weekly payment into a fund in order to make up the difference in the National Insurance contribution so that the person gets her full wages during confinement, and the employer gets it as a tax deduction. I do not want to hear any squealing from employers on this matter. I am an employer, too. In my small way I am an employer, but I think it is the right thing to do in the society, and particularly for those people who are less well off. When they are women, as in this instance, you will know how sentimental I am about that. When they are women, they must be right. It is not too late for the Minister to do something about this matter. We must be sitting next Tuesday, Sir. What about getting his Legal Draftsmen here? That is why we should have Parliamentary Counsel attached as Parliamentary Counsel to the House, because if the Government realises the cogency of the arguments as put up by the hon. members for St. Lucy, St. Michael West, St. Philip North, St. Peter, St. Michael North East, and the City, and to mention myself

with no overweening pride, or boasting, I think they ought to accept them. We should never go down as legislators saying that we know that this is right, but let us go ahead with it, unless there was a State of Emergency for this particular legislation, or something of the sort. That is why I am suggesting the amendment to Section 3.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member said that we agree on matters of a social nature. You cannot deal with these matters emotionally, and you have to give thought to them. Now, Section 3 deals with the point he would like taken now, but this is a section that deals with the whole international arrangement. You are talking about confinement and maternity. If you delete confinement, you are no longer talking about the same thing. You must have confinement in. You cannot have a maternity clause where you delete confinement, because you will get a lot of problems arising from it. If you delete it from the Section, you will have nothing left. You do not know what you are talking about now. A woman can tell you, "Every morning I get up I was vomiting." You cannot have this sort of business. Too many men have been trapped on the basis that a baby was on the way, and the baby has not come yet. We do not want to trap any woman. You must understand that this woman is expecting a baby, and when she gets the baby and goes home you cannot dismiss her during the time she is away from work. Do not let us bring in other extraneous parts. This is not something dealing with the whole social gimmick. This is something to do with these vicious employers. You have a lot of them in Swan Street and other places. You have to deal with things as there are now, and the part dealing with the money will come later. We are talking about people not getting back their jobs because they had a baby. This is a fact of life. If she can prove that she had a child you cannot dismiss her. She must prove that she was expecting a baby, and not hope to be, or she felt so, or she was trying some of **these** old fancy tricks. You must understand what is behind the Bill, but I am not taking up the position of the Minister. I am not going into the employers' court, because you know what those fellows will tell you.

4.50 p.m.

For a girl to come in and tell you that she is expecting, then you may have five within the year because you have no limitation. You have to

be careful because you are not dealing with the same person. There is nothing in the Act to tell a girl or a woman how long she must be with you; so let us be quite clear on this. It is confinement you are talking about as it relates to a person whom you cannot dismiss. Let us be quite frank. It would be difficult to ask a man to employ a woman whom he knows is expecting a baby and within a short period is going to leave. Don't let us be moonshines. Do not let us fool ourselves that the State is going to employ such a woman. You have two people applying for a job; one is eight months in pregnancy and the other is flat. You cannot employ the one who is eight months pregnant; so what do you want to prove? That you are another Christ? I am not going to pretend. You have to enact legislation that is going to meet the reasonings of the people you have to live with. It would be different if you had a comprehensive plan covering all aspects of social security for which this would be an aspect, but this has to deal with one of those problems we have in Barbados where, as I have heard some hon. members say, some employers get rid of women.

The hon. member for the City talked about high density areas, but it is high density employment she must talk about because you can live in a high density area and not be working, so the problem does not arise. It is in the hotels and the industrial factories where you have the problem, and where I want to tell you, if you do not know, that there are women 16, 17 and 18 years old with two and three children, and each time they have a child they go home and are not sure they have a job and have to start from scratch at another place. Some of them have to start from scratch every time they have a child, because if they are 17, 18 and 19 and have one child, they know what it is like already because they know the way of the world. It is one thing not to have done, but once you have done it is difficult to ask people not to do again. I visited a house not long ago in which there were about seven children and nobody in the house was 25 years yet and neither one of them was working. This is one of the problems we have. It is in the factories at the Deep Water Harbour, at Newton and these places where you have these problems, and there is no point in saying that this Bill is to protect those girls who are working in these places. These employers have women who go home and if they take them back they have to start fresh. There is no security, and it is this you are protecting; so let us get on with protecting these women, and if we have something else to do it can be done at another time, but we must give these people the protection they need because

we have these rapacious employers in Barbados. If they do not know how to treat people like human beings, then we have to pass legislation for all these small business men who are very rapacious. So let us pass this and get on with it. Let us close this dragnet early.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would consider an amendment to section 3 subsection (3) (a) which says: "An employee must, in order to qualify for a grant of maternity leave, be employed for at least 12 months by the employer from whom she requests such leave;"

This is another area of discrimination, and if we are taking seriously what the hon. member for St. Michael West is saying, the first thing we must do is face the fact that the community in which we live is not one where marriage is the norm, and where pregnancies in women between the ages of 15 and 25 are highest. If we face these facts and are legislating for conditions in our community as they are, I do not think it can be fair as subsection (3) (a) states, that in order to qualify for this grant you must be employed for at least 12 months. I would like to see a situation where there is no time limit put on it.

I am a firm believer in family planning and birth control and would like to encourage a situation where all women would stand to benefit under the Act: so do not get over there and giggle and laugh about it. What I am saying is that if you go into employment and you become pregnant whether it is a month, two months or three months or whatever, you should be entitled under the Act to the relief. How is it that you are discriminating in this way? We are facing the facts and we are taking what the hon. member for St. Michael West said to its natural conclusion. I am not suggesting that we encourage women to get pregnant in order to benefit under this Act, but it is hard enough to get employment as it is protection or no protection. There are women who have been trying to become pregnant for years and have not achieve it, and there are those who try to prevent it and it occurs, and it is not fair in these circumstances that two women would go into employment and one becomes pregnant after six or eight months and does not qualify, whereas the other by the grace of God becomes pregnant after 12 months and qualifies under the Act.

That is a serious defect in this piece of legislation and I would very much hope that the Minister will consider an amendment to delete at least 12 months. I do not suggest that a

woman who goes pregnant to an employer should benefit because this would encourage a situation where women will deliberately try to get pregnant to benefit, but what difference is there between two women under the same employer, one becoming pregnant after ten months of employment and the other becoming pregnant after 13 months? How do you justify that situation? What is the rationale behind the 12 months? You are trying to alleviate a certain area of social distress, but at the same time.....

Mr. WALCOTT: On a point of order, the rationale would have to be that she now has to qualify under national insurance, otherwise you will have confusion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Has the hon. member for the City completed?

Miss MILLER: I am grateful to the Chairman. I sit down in my place and know my place until you give me directions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will continue.

Miss MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I hope the Minister will seriously consider this amendment to section 3 subsection (3) (a).
5.00 p.m.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was saying that I hope that the Minister would seriously consider this amendment to sub-section 3(a). Dealing with sub-section 3(b), this provides that an employee is not entitled to maternity leave by the same employer on more than 3 occasions. The hon. member for St. Michael North East suggested that two occasions might be more appropriate. I am not so sure that I do not agree with the hon. member.

We have a situation of unemployment here, Mr. Chairman, and we have to face that situation. We have a Family Planning Association fighting against desperate odds. The Act sets out that confinement means labour resulting in the birth of a child after seven months of pregnancy. Miscarriages happen more often in our society than people realise; but the period for miscarriage is, roughly speaking, well before this time. It is very rare where a mother will miscarry between eight and nine months. I would like the Minister to further consider an amendment under Clause 3(3)(b).

Mr. HINDS: Mr. Chairman, Clause 3(3)(b) would give one to believe that we are of the opinion that some women become pregnant in order to gain maternity leave. I do not think that

in our society we find such a situation occurring at all. I believe that we have to give some consideration to this aspect of the Bill because it is definitely against our women in this particular.

Mr. Chairman, we also find in Clause 3(1)(a) that the employee has got to produce a certificate issued by a medical practitioner. As I have said earlier, I am one who supports the production of a certificate as soon as it is known that the employee is pregnant, and the earlier, the better; but at the same time we have got to give more consideration to the rights of employers. The employer too needs certain protection under this Bill because, Mr. Chairman, you must know for yourself that there are what you may call behaviour patterns of pregnant women.

As soon as a woman become pregnant, her behaviour is something that has to be tolerated. She has got to be accommodated, and some accommodation must also be given to the employer because mothers to be, because of the fact that they know that having presented this certificate they cannot be dismissed, there are some who would stretch things a bit too far. They would even try to turn up for work late. They may stay home from Monday to Thursday.

Mr. Chairman, I am a small businessman. I am still trying to scratch a little rice here and there. We all want to see things made as easy as possible for employees, and I want to see that we give the fullest protection possible to pregnant women; but at the same time as long as they have to be employed, do not take all the rights and give them to women as such. There must be still something to keep the employer in his employing position. We do not want in the circumstances to see advantage taken of the situation one way or the other. So, we would like the Minister to consider this section of the Bill in its broadest sense.

I do not support this idea of maternity leave to the same employer on not more than three occasions from the same employer, and for many reasons. I am praying even now that the Hon. Minister would decide to postpone this section of the Bill and let us come up with something better. As the hon. member for Christ Church West has suggested, it would be good if we could pass it feeling within our hearts that we have done justice to employee and employer alike. I do not feel that we are asking too much of the Minister in these circumstances.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting situation. The hon. member suggested that we should defer further consideration of this Clause until we come back next week; but he does not set out any proposals that we could consider in the interim between now and Tuesday. (Mr. HINDS: A provision which provides protection for the employer). The qualifying period is protection for the employer. We cannot conceive of people asking for jobs now and then walking off their jobs in the next two months. There is protection for the employer under the qualifying period. I agree that the employer is deserving of some period of service. After all to qualify for severance pay you have to give two years employment. There must be a qualifying period. This is an important thing to consider.

5.10 p.m.

Similarly here, Mr. Chairman, to qualify for this there must be a qualifying period. You cannot just delete the period and then say you are doing justice to everybody because in fact we are not doing justice. It would not be equity; it certainly would not be. It would be chaos.

As regards the matter of a medical certificate, we are not asking for a certificate from a doctor or from a quack. We are asking that the employee submit a medical certificate but I would presume that if a medical certificate is going to be supplied, that person would have to be examined by a doctor, and if that person is examined by a doctor and found to be pregnant the doctor if he is worth his salt — and I believe any qualified man would be able to do this — could give an expected time; not necessarily a precise time — could give an expected time of the delivery of the baby; an expected time. (ASIDE) Somebody said they could do this. It would be unreasonable to expect the employer not to know when he will have to make some kind of other arrangements because that pregnant woman has been carrying out such a responsibility — he has a period of time to make other arrangements for somebody else to carry them out.

I have considered very seriously all that has been said. A lot of it — I do not want to say this but — a lot of it appears to me to be fraught with emotionalism. Let us act as responsible people. This is a responsible Act with which we are dealing. Do not let us, because it is election year, act in an unthinking way. Let us be reasonable.

Mrs. EASTMOND: Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that a woman can become pregnant six weeks

after she has had her first child — six to eight weeks after — and if this happens on three occasions, how much time then is she spending in work and what is left for the employer. We have to be rational and look at these things from both angles. What about the person who is doing her job? We have unemployment, we have family planning people who are working to control the population. Just look at these things.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: That can happen, but we legislate for the norm. We do not legislate necessarily for what always can happen and what cannot happen. We legislate for normal circumstances, and it happens; it may happen a number of times but that cannot be considered the norm.

So again, do not let us be too emotional about this matter. If that person gets pregnant, well then she would have expended all her leave, probably in two years with three babies.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 4 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the drafters of this Bill have informed me that the words at the beginning of Clause 4(1) "Except where an employee otherwise desires," those words are unnecessary. I move that they be deleted and that Clause 4(1) as then amended — those words "Except where an employee otherwise desires" stand part. The legal draftsmen see no good reason to have them in. They do not think that they do anything for the Clause at all.

It will then begin "maternity leave shall be". So I am proposing that the words "Except where an employee otherwise desires" be deleted, and that Clause 4 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has given us the assurance that it means, in such instances with the deletion, that she cannot opt to take three weeks before and nine weeks afterwards?

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, if it is necessary then it does no harm as it is. For that reason I am no longer pursuing the amendment and I am seeking Mr. Chairman, to withdraw the amendment.

Leave was granted.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

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

Clause 5 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: With reference to Clause 5, Mr. Chairman, I am moving that the words "under section 4" be inserted after the words "which she is entitled" in line 4 of that Clause. It would then read "an employee who after confinement, suffers any illness arising out of such a confinement shall be granted, in addition to the maternity leave to which she is entitled under section 4, such additional leave."

I move that the Clause as amended stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, again I am really going to urge the Minister — I do not think he is accepting any amendment at this stage — but I really want to make the case strong. Part of my amendment was accepted; but the limitation on the six weeks period is the one that really bothers me. I am really concerned about women who, because of the effect of childbirth on them are medically in a position that they have to have longer periods. Some women in fact even in childbirth, because of the effects of this on them, find themselves committing infanticide. Pregnancy is a serious thing; bringing a new human being into the world can have traumatic effects on health and constitution of the female, and it seems to me that we could have yet given enough protection to an employer in this section by saying that she is entitled to such additional leave as a medical practitioner recommends, but giving a right or an entitlement to the employer if he disagrees with the recommendation, to have her go before a panel set up by the Minister.

This at least would mean that no medical practitioner would recommend an additional period, let us say, of three months lightly because he would be liable to have his recommendation refused by at least an independent tribunal which is responsible neither to himself or to the employer; but it seems to me that we are, by this section, by using the limitation of the further six

weeks period, not covering those genuine cases that would occur where some women should be entitled to a longer period because of the effect on them of the child-bearing itself, and those are the cases that I am fighting for under this section.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the ladies on this. There are ladies in here and I have not heard the ladies on this. I feel the ladies have a voice and an equal voice with the hon. member in here. It is they who suffer these problems. I presume that the hon. member does not suffer these problems. If there are any suggestions by the ladies I would like to entertain them.

5.20 p.m.

Mr. WALCOTT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to agree with some of the things the hon. member said, but I believe the Government is bringing this down because of the kind of employers we have in Barbados. If we have humane employers so far as I am concerned I would take it out, the six weeks, because I have said already that we have repacious employers, but I don't have to work with them the same way the hon. member has to work with them. I am dealing now with an employer where a woman was sick and they had to send to Trinidad to get from their head office the solution to the problem.

I heard the hon. member speak about these women who have these kids in that form, but I would say that is a good instance for the withholding of some cents if they come up at that speed. I take good advice on that, because it would be too frequent, but there can be these problems. The hon. member is worried, and I think the hon. member is a father, but you don't need a doctor to tell you if your wife is expecting what would be the expected date, you are not dealing with a camel or an elephant, therefore you would know from this full moon how you would come down, November, early part, first week, second week, you can't be all that wrong if you know what you have or have not done, so you can't be that far out. But on the point of people coming back after the period is out we know this can be exploited, but in legislation like this if you don't put this in, if there is no limitation, you are in for trouble. Somebody would say that there is no limitation therefore the sky is the limit. I wouldn't press the Minister with this period not exceeding 12 weeks after the confinement now, some women have post confinement problems that are more serious than pre-confinement problems because

this is where the problem arises both ways, both with the baby and with the mother, and this is why some mothers don't like to leave their babies too early.

I agree with the hon. member for the City, it is always a problem of getting women away from their first child especially, and there is a problem leaving a young child with people of whom you are not sure. They are soft and you have to leave them with people to whom they do not belong and it is a little hard to part with something you were holding for nine months. It is a very difficult decision a mother has to make; we realise that, but here it is, we are now dealing with something in the mother's and the family's interest. It is a case sometimes where the mother has to go back out to work on a family basis to make two ends meet. Sometimes it is a question of reality, and therefore we have to live with these things and I do not think that there is any doubt in my mind that this clause is a reasonable one, but I know the Minister is going to have a problem. Are you going to make it 12 weeks? Are you going to make it 18 weeks? My idea is that this is the kind of legislation, now that we are passing it against the background of helping people so that they do not lose their jobs, I would say let us accept this and be prepared to work on anything that would be better for the future, but let us get something on the Statute Book.

The Question that those words be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

Clause 6 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: In clause 6 subsection (2) (b) on page 6 of the Bill, line 2, insert immediately after the words "contract of service" the words "for a fixed term." In other words, we are dealing with fixed term contracts which expire by fluctuation of time, and if that contract happens to expire at the time when the employee becomes pregnant, or coincides with the time when the employee becomes pregnant, then because of the expiration of that contract that person is not entitled to the maternity leave provided for under the Bill. The subsection would then read:

"(b) there has been an expressed contract of service for a fixed term between an

employer and an employee which has expired;"

I beg to move that clause 6 as amended stand part.

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

The Question that those words be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

The Question that clause 6 as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 7 was called and it stood part.

Clause 8 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 8 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: I would like to make an amendment, Sir, to delete all the words "This Act does not apply to employees working at home for wages." In other words, to delete the whole of clause 8.

Miss MILLER: I beg to second that.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: We are really not being realistic. I think we are not looking at what really obtains, the situation as it exists. Quite frankly we are not doing this. The people working at home are really not employees.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion before the Committee.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I am speaking on the motion, Sir. As a matter of fact, there are two motions before the Committee and I don't see how you can have two motions, because one is not really an amendment of mine. It is not possible to have two motions before the Committee at the same time. However, Sir, except my motion was amended, what the hon. member should have done was to move his motion before I put mine but that was not done. I am not going to raise that because I am not going to accept that as it is.

Mr. FORDE: If the hon. member would give way, should my motion not have been put, Sir? I was suggesting the motion and reserving the right to speak, I don't know what he wants.

Hon. P.M. GREAVES: We have two motions now, which is confusion, but I am not pressing that point, I just mentioned it by the way after you spoke to me, but I am not pressing it. What I am saying, Sir, is that we are not really looking at these people who work at home realistically. We are not taking a realistic view of what really is happening. Who is the employee who works at home? You are a self-employed person, an employer, you can work as you want to work.
5.30 p.m.

You are your own contractor. We are not being realistic.

Mrs. G. L. EASTMOND: Is the hon. member for Christ Church West thinking that these persons will be self-employed persons, and, therefore, they would have to be covered by National Insurance?

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member really does not appreciate the point that I am making here. An employee is a person who works under a contract of service, but not a contract for services, and, therefore, if I am employed by you to perform a task for you where you can tell me how and when and what to do, then I am an employee. Where, on the other hand, you have contracted out for my services and I have the time and the manner of working within my own sphere; you cannot tell me how or what to do or when to do it. I am under a contract for services. Those self-employed persons, or people who provide just labour for people, or something of the sort.

Now, there are some employers who...

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Can the hon. member help us by giving examples of a former case? It would be very helpful to us.

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, let me then give the hon. member an example then, if he wants, of a contract of service. A contract of service, for instance, where people in curio shops, or indeed even in the Government Departments ask people to work for them doing smocking, controls how they work, and deals with their wages, but instead of the people coming to a workplace they are allowed to do the work at home. In my view those persons are under contracts of service and not contracts for services, but because they are carrying out their employment not at the employer's place of business but at home in those circumstances, they will not have the benefit of this Act. By using the word "employee" here

rather than "does not apply to a person under a contract for services", we have really achieved that result. If the Minister wants to be clear and to keep out the so-called self-employed persons, or persons who are under contract for services, in my view they should be in the definition section a definition which makes this clear by saying, "This Act does not apply to persons working under contract for services." I know the law on this is pretty difficult, but it has recently been rationalised in the National Insurance Act. As a matter of fact, we are getting a lot of trouble in other spheres, as the hon. member for St. Michael West knows, from those employers who believe that they are getting out of these Acts by saying, "You are not under a contract of service, and you are under a contract for services." This is going to compound it. We have some of these cases in the court, where some of them want straightening out very seriously. I really would not like to be arguing this Act again, Sir, and that is why I am asking the Minister to say, "Shall not apply to persons working under contract for services," so that the position will be clear.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: I think we are losing sight of something here. With reference to people doing smocking, these people are paid for piece work. I cannot think of any other category. People doing needlework are under contract for services. They work for a lot of people and so on. I am thinking that you are an independent or private contractor like the wife of the Leader of the House. That is contract for services. The person who is doing smocking is working on a piece rate. If she does not produce anything, she does not get paid; she does not get sick leave; she does not get vacation leave; she does not get a lunch hour. She is privately employed.

Mr. FORDE: I would really like the Minister to take the opinion on this matter of the Legal Draftsman because, in my view, there are too many people who are flouting the National Insurance Act. Those persons who are working for these overseas firms and doing the beautiful work of smocking should have the protection of the National Insurance Act and the Severance Act. I have always contended that that is a wrong interpretation of the Act, and people are flouting the legislation. If the Minister is not careful, this will encourage them to do so.

Mr. WALCOTT: The hon. member must understand that the Severance Payment Act is a little different from what this is purporting to be, because the National Insurance determines what you work for in any given period. It determines

if I am going to deduct money for you, and if I am going to pay you. I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West in this as long as your definition is amended. What I was worried

it here in this Section is that, unless you read Interpretation Act, there is no definition Clause for "employee". It is not defined in the Act what an employee here means. It applies to employees working at home. What does this mean? Will it be working at home for wages? They want to exclude people who are self-employed, because they have no employer to go to.

As I have said earlier, I think it will be difficult for even those people who do smocking to be able to say who is the employer, if it can be proved that they are working for other people and doing other things at home. Will somebody say, "I am devoting two hours to smocking; four hours to something else; I do some shirts for the hon. member for St. Michael, and the hon. member for Christ Church West to wear to court and so on." These are the things they can do, therefore, it becomes a very difficult matter to determine their employer. These are the areas where we will get trouble.

It seems as if they want to encourage a sort of Japanese industry where you have a lot of factories at home. I believe that is one of the reasons why the Japanese can export their goods because the factories are being run by the people themselves. I agree with the hon. member for Christ Church West that this a matter on which we would not like to have very much litigation over. The only people to benefit would be his colleagues and himself in the courts. The people would not get much out of it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants to hear whether we will look at this, of course, we will look at it. We have to look at the matter in a fundamental way, and not only as it relates to your point.

Mr. FORDE: In that case, I will seek leave to withdraw my motion and await proper legal consideration of it.

Leave was granted.

The question that Clause 8 stand part of the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
5.40 p.m.

Clauses 9 and 10 were called and they stood part.

Clause 11 was called.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Christ Church West to Clause 11, It is an example of what I said, that the Act was not read properly, because the Act specifically states that this Act binds the Crown.

I beg to move that Clause 11 stand part.

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

Mr. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am thankful to the hon. member for saying he is drawing my attention to this. He will recall that in my speech when he reads the debates I later said that the point I was making was not that it was not binding the Crown, but the position on unfair dismissal. I am glad he raised this point because it gives me an opportunity to comment on his statement that the Crown, meaning the Government, was considering this piece of legislation since 1962. All I want to say is that it must show there is no coordination between the Ministries because if the Government had this legislation being considered since 1962 in the first place, why it should take fourteen years to bring forth this Bill I do not know. That is fourteen years to produce this small Bill and bring it to the House. It shows the dilatoriness with which the Government has considered this matter and that the Crown could find no urgency in bringing this legislation before the House. I will tell you why I say so because I really want to speak on it.

Just before the St. Philip by-election the Crown, acting through the Ministry of Education purported to terminate the appointment of a female teacher and after the implication of their action was drawn to them, the Crown then had to renege. If the Minister of Education, I am sorry he is not here, who has recently said that he has assumed the portfolio for women's rights was aware that this type of legislation had been considered by the Government since 1962, he should never have made the sort of statements we heard being made or see the type of action that was being taken at the time, and that therefore on this he should have resigned, because it would have been contrary to what has been recognised Government policy since 1962. I am glad to see that this is now binding the Crown. In fact, there is a lot more legislation for the protection of the subject and of individuals that should bind the Crown, particularly now where the principle of collective bargaining by the Crown is in serious doubt, and I would join with the hon. member for St. Michael West on this, that despite the

general terms of the legislation in our Constitution, the Crown should be strong enough to come in here and bring special legislation for collective bargaining and make it binding on the Crown itself. I want to make that point very strongly regardless of who would be the Government of the future, regardless of whether I form the Government or not or am a member of the Government in the future, I feel that in instances like this where we are dealing with the rights of people particularly collective bargaining rights, the Crown itself must be bound by that type of provision. It cannot opt out of it.

Hon. P. M. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I have to reply to what the hon. member said about the fourteen years gestation, because we are talking about maternity and so on. I would like to explain to the hon. member, but I do not think he wants to hear. I want to explain that this matter was first raised in 1962 and Government first started working on protection for mothers in 1962 before the work was begun on the National Insurance Bill, and that included provision at the time for compensation and so on. When the work began on the National Insurance Bill, this matter was not proceeded with. About three years ago I went back to the Cabinet with fresh instructions asking Cabinet to agree on certain action to be taken along lines which this Bill should be providing. This Bill was then drafted and sent to the respective Unions and it did not get back to the Cabinet again until about three months ago after the deed had been done, but it was not the Minister who dismissed the worker. As a matter of fact, the Minister did not even know that the worker's services were

terminated until after they had been terminated and this is normally the case.

The question that Clause 11 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. P. M. GREAVES seconded by His Honour A. DaC. EDWARDS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of the Bill with amendments in Committee. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. P. M. GREAVES each seconded by Hon. C. E. TALMA, the Bill was read a third time, passed, and cited as The Employment of Women (Maternity Leave) Act, 1976.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. C. E. TALMA: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this concludes Government's Business for today's Sitting.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, the 29th June, 1976 at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The Question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
5.50 p.m.