

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12th October, 1976

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 12.15 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour, Welfare, Youth Affairs and Sport); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.(Econ.); Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.(Lond.); Hon. B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism and Leader of the House); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, B.A., M.A.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Community Development); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc.(Econ.); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY HIS HONOUR THE SPEAKER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the months of April, May, and June, 1976, as prepared by the Accountant General.

I have also received two copies of the Auditor General's Report on the result of the examination of the accounts of the Island for the year ended 31st March, 1973, together with two sets of relevant Statements and Accounts.

I have also to announce that I have received copies of two Election Petitions in respect of the constituencies of St. Philip North and Christ Church East.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting held at the Public Buildings on Wednesday, 6th October, 1976, have been circulated. Are there any comments from any hon. member on the Minutes?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Minutes be confirmed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

PAPERS PRESENTED

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following documents on behalf of the Prime Minister:

The Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1976.

The Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1976.

Hon. B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer for the Year 1975.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions on behalf of the Prime Minister:

- (1) The Resolution to approve the Leave Passages (Amendment) Order, 1976.

- (2) The Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1976.
- (3) The Resolution to amend Resolution No. 48/1976 relating to the emoluments of teachers in Secondary Schools.
- (4) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$9,978 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 12, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolution:

The Resolution to grant the sum of \$276,541 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 14, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Resolutions:

- (1) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$165,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 16, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.
- (2) The Resolution to grant the sum of \$258,717 out of the Consolidated Fund and place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1976-77, Part I - Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1976-77, No. 17, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

12.25 p.m.

STATEMENT RE AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT OFF THE COAST OF BARBADOS ON 6TH OCTOBER, 1976

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I have to report to the House that on Wednesday, 6th October, 1976, a DC-8 civil aircraft, registration No. CUT-1201, which was operated by Cubana Airlines, crashed

into the sea off the western coast of Barbados at approximately 1.28 p.m. There were 73 persons on board the aircraft; fifty-seven (57) were Cubans, eleven (11) were Guyanese and five (5) were Koreans. No one appears to have survived the crash. To date 15 badly mutilated bodies have been recovered.

The aircraft which was on a normal commercial scheduled service, departed from Seawell International Airport at 1.15 p.m. on that day, en route to Kingston, Jamaica. It had earlier arrived from Piarco Airport, Trinidad, and was on the ground at Seawell for approximately forty-five minutes.

Nine minutes after take-off the crew of the Aircraft reported to the Terminal Radar Control Unit at Seawell that there was an explosion as well as a fire on board the aircraft. Soon thereafter the aircraft crew requested immediately permission to land at Seawell Airport, and Seawell Air Traffic Control cleared the aircraft for landing.

While attempting to return to the Airport the aircraft crashed in relatively calm water northwest of the Bridgetown Harbour. The Coast Guard and all other Search and Rescue Services were notified.

In accordance with usual practice a preliminary Departmental Investigation was immediately instituted by the Civil Aviation Division. Officials of the Governments of Cuba, Canada and Guyana as well as a specialist aircraft accident investigator from the United Kingdom and Air Canada personnel are assisting the Barbadian Aviation authorities in their investigation. Assistance is also being provided by the Coast Guard and the Police.

A Trinidad and Tobago Coast Guard vessel as well as local private craft have also rendered valuable service in the search for bodies and wreckage from the aircraft.

Without prejudice to the abovementioned preliminary investigation, the Cabinet, at its meeting on the 7th October, 1976, decided that there will be a Public Enquiry into the causes of, and circumstances surrounding the accident. The Enquiry will be carried out by a Judge of the High Court of Barbados and two other persons possessing practical experience in the investigation of aircraft accidents. It is hoped to announce further details of the Enquiry shortly.

The Police are also conducting investigations in connection with this accident, and are in close

touch with the security and criminal investigation agencies of Trinidad and Tobago and Guyana.

Security at the Airport has been tightened and a complete review of existing security arrangements will be undertaken as a matter of urgency, with a view to improving further these arrangements.

The condolences and regrets of the Government and people of Barbados have already been conveyed by the Prime Minister to the three Governments of the States whose nationals perished as a result of the accident.

I now wish, on behalf of the Government and of this House to extend deepest sympathies to the sorrowing relatives and friends of all those persons who lost their lives in this tragic accident.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I should certainly like, as Leader of the Opposition, to join with the Deputy Prime Minister, the hon. member for Christ Church South Central in expressing our regrets at this unfortunate incident in which so many innocent people lost their lives.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second that.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

BILL TO AMEND CERTAIN ENACTMENTS RELATING TO STATUTORY BOARDS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 stands in the name of the Honourable Prime Minister and it is to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend certain enactments relating to Statutory Boards.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to deal with this in the absence of the Honourable Prime Minister who is out of the island.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection leave is granted.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the enactments set out in the

Schedule, and the Object of the amendment is to permit the Cabinet and Ministers power to appoint members of this Honourable Chamber as members of the Statutory Corporations set out in the Schedule. They are, the Barbados National Stadium Corporation, the Barbados Agricultural Development Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the Natural Gas Corporation and the National Housing Corporation.

Unlike the other branch of Parliament, members in this Chamber suffer a disability in not being able to make their contributions to these bodies. It is no secret, Sir, that this political party for a long period of time has publicly expressed disapproval and disgust indeed, with the manner in which these corporations functioned under the previous administration. It was its policy and expressed in the Manifesto of this party that in the event of its being elected, that it would seek to associate members of this Chamber with the management of these bodies. In so doing it is our belief that the mere fact that members of the House of Assembly who are part and parcel of the body which is responsible for the public purse at present on these bodies — it is our belief that this will go a long way towards improving the standards of accountability and administration in these bodies.

This matter was not hidden from the public of Barbados in any manner. At the very first meeting of this political party in Carlisle Square, the views of the party upon this matter were set out to the public, and I myself well remember in great detail setting out this to be the policy of the Barbados Labour Party.

12.35 p.m.

We went further and we put it in black and white in our manifesto. It is our contention, therefore, that this is a matter which has been publicly ventilated, and we have reason to believe by reason of the endorsement that we received from the public of Barbados as a whole that the public of Barbados are in favour of our contentions in this respect.

Many arguments have been raised, and no doubt will be raised; but we will deal with them as they are raised in this Chamber. I believe that already one of my colleagues has successfully demolished the mouthings and writings of an erstwhile member of this Chamber in another medium.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition cannot support this Bill. I will give my reasons for this. In the view of the Opposition this is an attempt by the Government to institute by legislation political patronage and favouritism. It is as simple as that. I will give in due course concrete examples as to how this method as suggested by the Government can create in Barbados a group of mendicants and "yard-fowlism."

When I first heard of this, I was amazed to see that the Government had been thinking of ways and means already in 1976 of perpetuating themselves in power by preparing to give to those who would become chairmen of boards an opportunity to dispense favours and political patronage.

I will give you examples of how it will work. I do not want to quarrel with a Government attempting to perpetuate itself in power. That is part of the game; but already in this House Ministers of Government are accountable to this House for the operation of boards. Under the last administration nothing stopped the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Communications and Works from attacking the ADC or the Transport Board as the case might be. There was no board or organisation that was not subject to scrutiny.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. The hon. member must lay the case as it is.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please state your point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member is misleading the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Under most of the statutes that we are amending today the Minister gives policy directions to the board and he is answerable to Parliament, not for the day to day administration, but for the breakdown of the whole system. If you talk about the last elections you will find that the Government itself had a full page advertisement pointing out that there was \$150,000 missing from the National Housing Corporation and so much from the Barbados Marketing Corporation and that therefore Government should be blaming Ministers who were policy directors for defalcations and other things that happened. Therefore, even when

appointing members of Parliament as Chairmen of boards, the Government is responsible already through the Ministers for the actions of these boards.

The Deputy Prime Minister is responsible for the IDC. He has to answer in here for the IDC. So to say that there is no Parliamentary control, and that you must have a second or third tier of parliamentarians in order to bring it within Parliamentary accountability is nonsense; and I can find no Commonwealth precedent for a member in Parliament being Chairman of a Statutory Board.

Let us go on. The argument that I initially started is quite clear. I will give you an example. Take the Chairman of the Housing Authority. Whenever he is appointed and whoever he is, he will have an opportunity to dispense patronage in this country — to every person who gets a loan and to every old lady who gets her house repaired; and I believe that he will also be able to sign cheques, which Ministers cannot do. As Chairman of a Board he will have the right to dispense public funds which is more than the Minister himself has the right to do.

Every person who gets a loan from the Housing Authority will become a yard fowl. Everybody who gets a job with the Parks and Beaches Commission will become yard fowls, cap in hand, thank you Mr. Chairman. Anyone who gets a job with the Caves Authority, it will be thank you Senator Field. Everybody who gets one with the Tourist Board will be thanking the member for Christ Church South Central and the member for IDC, if he puts up industrial estates, everybody will be going to him saying thank you Mr. So and So. Let us deal with the situation. There are people in this country who believe and are firmly convinced that members of Parliament can get them jobs and that Ministers can give them jobs. I am sure that the Minister of Education probably has his office full of people coming for School Meals jobs. The Minister of Health will have people coming for jobs at baths and other places. As for Housing, I have already heard that they are telling them to come back Friday.

They are only creating a group of mendicants in this country. If we are going seriously to upgrade the standards of thinking of our people, we cannot sit here and allow parliamentarians who are subjected to political pressures from their own constituents and from party members throughout the island to be able to go to a chairman for a house or to the Parks and Beaches Commission for jobs or the Caves

Authority. You will find that the Caves Authority, whoever is the Chairman, will have all the people from the Bay Land. The industrial estates will be filled with people from Silver Sands and the weak points of the member for Christ Church East.

12.45 p.m.

Ministers and members are subject to common political pressures and if a person goes from a constituency to the Chairman who is a representative of the people and says he wants a job and that he is a voter, I cannot see on that side or on any side that the member or the Chairman can deliberately tell him that he does not deserve a house, he does not deserve a job, he does not believe he deserves these political favours. If the people want it that way and you say they voted for you so that you can victimise some and help some, that is their business; they would have got the type of Government they deserve. If you are saying that you mentioned this to the people and they voted for you because you are going to put your backbenchers on Statutory Boards to dispense favours to political and party hats and the people want that, then they must pay for it. This is what they are going to pay for because I cannot see how anybody in Christ Church East could vote for the hon. member for Christ Church East to get a job on the industrial estate as Chairman of the Board and he is going to chase them away, unless he is not running again.

When I hear about this new breed of integrity you are bringing into this country, I would support this if the Government had an undertaking from the backbenchers that they were not running again. That is the only way I would support it because then there would be no danger of their giving out favours to political and party hats as would happen, because in a small community like Barbados every single one of us is constantly under pressure to do favours for people, some of whom did not vote for it, but when you get in they all say they are voting for you; so you see what you are up against. We are only trying to save the Government from themselves. This is what is going to happen and this is political realism. Let them hear that you are Chairman of the Housing Authority and they want a house, you dare not tell them "no" which means you will discriminate against applicants from other constituencies and applicants from the Opposition constituencies in favour of applicants from your own constituencies as a first priority and then the constituents of your fellow parliamentarians. That is what it is going to be, and if the people cannot see it is going to be a subtle form of corruption, political patronage and

political yard fowlism, they do not understand what is going on in this country. Everybody can come cap in hand and say "thank you master for the house, thank you for the loan, thank you for the job", because the Chairman is a powerful man.

The Chairman of a Board is a man who can dispense favours, so do not come here and pretend that the Chairman is one of a group. He is a man who has power, and if you want power, this is an example of naked power. If you want to perpetuate power, say so, but do not pretend that this is a method you are adopting for more efficiency, accountability and more responsibility. That is arrant nonsense. It is purely an attempt by the Government Party to perpetuate themselves in power by giving to individual backbenchers the right to employ and dispense favours.

Secondly, how do you really expect the backbenchers as chairmen for management to function? As an example, imagine somebody goes to the Chairman of the Housing Authority for a house or for a loan, he is a voter in the Chairman's constituency, and the Chairman says to the manager "give Mr. John Brown a house". The manager does not feel that Mr. John Brown is entitled to a house because of a late application or some other reason. What happens with the manager's job? Would he have to go like the manager of C.B.C.? He has no security, so he is working in fear. I would like to hear the Church talk about fear. This is driving fear in the hearts of management, because there is no manager unless he has a background who can function with a parliamentarian as his political boss, who can get the Government and the Prime Minister to fire him. There is no manager who can stand up to a Chairman who is part and parcel of the Government in power. I would like to see that happen. If you send a message to him telling him to employ Mr. So and So who is a constituent of his and he says "no" too often, I would like to see what would happen to him. This is not a criticism of the character and integrity of the Chairman. I am talking about the political realities of Barbados where you and I are subject to day to day pressures from our constituents to do favours for them, even unreasonable favours, and this is what I am trying to protect you from. I am not saying that you are going to do it, but this is Barbados, 166 square miles where everybody knows everybody else, you are their representative, they say they voted for you, and you are in a position to grant a favour or deny them that favour if you are not running again. It is as simple as that. That is why the method is even worse. At one time you

talked about the abolition of Local Government and said that when you got into power you would re-establish Local Government, but instead of involving more people in public administration, you are taking parliamentarians who have enough to do and making them Chairmen of Boards, thereby robbing people of the right to play a part in the affairs of the country. Are you so sure of persons committed to your cause that you cannot find in your Party besides yourself people with ability and integrity to be Chairmen of Boards? With 52% of the electorate and all the middle class and white people voting for you, do you mean that you cannot find four, five or six with integrity, ability and administrative know-how to be chairmen of your boards? Do you have to pick up neophytes and put them on Boards? This is what you are doing and you are the ones who were shouting aloud and saying that this wicked Government abolished Local Government and did not involve the people, and you said you would re-establish it when you got back into power. The manifesto did not come up with that because I think you realised that would be a waste of time; but can't you find six or eight people committed to your philosophy, people in this community who can be chairmen, to work under the direction of the Minister with the Minister having parliamentary accountability? Is there such a dearth of talent in your Government that you are going to pick up the same people in this House who are drawing a salary to give them additional increments?

That brings us to the third point. This whole question about Parliamentary Secretaries is simply hypocrisy. Here you are supplementing the incomes of backbenchers by making them chairmen. Are they doing it free? When you look at the salaries now of the Chairmen you are indirectly raising the salaries of backbenchers and giving them additional increments which are barely short of Parliamentary Secretaries. It is just like the Prime Minister saying that he is not living in Culloden Farm when by not living in it he will be able to pay his mortgage. He should tell the people the truth. It is not that it is this broken down place, but he is drawing the money by law to which he is entitled. I am not quarrelling with it, but I am saying that he is pretending to the people that Culloden Farm is broken down when for his own financial and economic success it is easier to live out of Culloden Farm than in. It is more beneficial for him economically. Let him tell the people that. *(Asides)* Do not mind you passed the law, but you get this big picture in the Advocate pretending that Culloden Farm is not good enough when it suits him to live and pay the mortgage on the new house he built. All this hypocrisy you get in here.

The law, 1973 — 12 Section 2(1) gives him the right; so let us get these facts fairly straight.

Mr. Speaker, this idea of picking up backbenchers and increasing their salaries just short of Parliamentary Secretaries and pretending to the public that you are cutting down on Parliamentary Secretaries is hypocrisy. You cut down on the number of people in Parliament drawing salaries while in effect you are giving almost the same as Parliamentary Secretaries. All this is hypocrisy. This is not fair to the public of Barbados. They will regret it, and they have started already. What I am asking you to do is to look around in your Party for people outside who supported you and take some and put on the Boards as Chairmen, and what would happen is that the Minister who was the policy maker would come here and be responsible as he has always been in Parliament.

12.55 p.m.

What do you want now? You want the Minister to be responsible and the Chairman in here to be responsible. Are you selling something? Do you want a two-tier, three-tier, middle man something? You have the Minister at the top, you want now the Chairman a member of Parliament. Are you running a shop that you want a three-tier system of selling? The Minister is responsible to Parliament and he is in a position to answer to Parliament, you do not have to pick up a man of ability to put him there. Do you mean that members of your Party are so void of brains and of ability that you can't find somebody to be Chairman of a Board other than parliamentarians?

Then look at the whole hypocrisy of it. Sunday morning the Prime Minister rang me to ask me to name members to Boards; he probably thinks I am a village idiot. He asked me about my parliamentarians or people who had lost their seats. When I read their Manifesto — and I see it has gone up to a dollar now, it was fifty cents during the election campaign, but like most commodities it has gone up — but be that as it may, my Party can afford the dollar. Let me read what you said about Statutory Boards, and what the Deputy Prime Minister said in his speech which alone betrays him. Let me read this briefly. I am dealing with this in connection with his ringing me to name members to Boards.

"Statutory Boards

By a recent count the number of Statutory corporations, commissions, boards, and other institutions is now more than 50. They operate outside the strict control of

procedures and expenditures laid down for the civil service. They are directed by persons appointed by D.L.P. Ministers....."

the very Ministers he wants me to name on Boards, ".... and who overwhelmingly display their political interests in every aspect of the Boards' activities."

So he is ringing me as if I am a lamb to the slaughter, that I, the Leader of the Opposition, must name or recommend one man to a Board among seven BLP members to be outvoted at every meeting, and when the Board falls down and I come into Parliament you will hear from the Government that the member for St. Michael South is on the Board, or the member for St. Lucy is on the Board. I would be abdicating my responsibility as Leader of the Opposition if I ever fell for that, and then the Advocate tells you it is a magnanimous gesture, magnanimous to whom? To lead me up the garden path, slaughter me, and then the Advocate calls it magnanimity. What sort of idiots are there in this country? It was a magnanimous gesture from the Prime Minister to the Leader of the Opposition to name one man on a seven men Board to be outvoted, to be slaughtered, and then when you come into Parliament to be told that your Party man is on the Board and therefore I cannot criticise it. If I had accepted, that would be magnanimous and stupid too.

I am only trying to save you from yourself, and I want you to understand I am not criticising the ability of the proposed member of the IDC, Tourism, or else, I am saying that this new twist to political patronage and favouritism is going to create in Barbadians a begging spirit which up to now you do not find. They will have to know that they cannot go the Chairmen. All the Boards under our Government were run by Chairmen appointed by us, and some of the members over there know that they got favours done. I would hesitate to go and ask the IDC or Housing for a favour. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. (*Asides*). I am not asking for any house for anybody, you should be coming in here asking for a house like me, you should not be in a position to dish out houses, that is what I am saying, you should not be in a position to dish out jobs at IDC or the Tourist Board, the Caves or Parks and Beaches, you should never be in that position, because you are all practising politicians, you are all young men who are going to run again, and let me tell you this. If you do not do favours for your people with the intention of running again you will be the biggest idiots in Christendom. That is what I am saying to you. (*Asides*). I am an old man.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition please address his remarks to the Chair?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am sorry, Sir. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, that if these young fellows have any desire to continue in politics this is what we will get in this.

As I say, I would support this if you would sign an irrevocable undertaking to the Integrity Commission which we will get years from now — I see the Prime Minister alone knows what you have or do not have — but what I am saying is that I would put to the Boards, because I know you would not be in a position or be forced because of political pressures in a small community to dispense favours.

I shall not be very long on this, except to say that during the election campaign, and again dealing with the question of the Leader of the Opposition and nominating members, their Manifesto included the question of Boards. They said they will concertina Boards and blend them or mesh them or whatever they are going to do, so I appoint or recommend a member, he is put on for two weeks, when the Government feels that they are going to mesh two Boards, out goes him. That is another danger. How can I recommend when I do not know? Should I expose my Party colleagues to humiliation and snobbing, for somebody to laugh and say 'Oh, they kicked him off the Board,' as they are doing now? Would I expose any of my Party members to humiliation from that side?

Then we go on. I, as Leader of the Opposition, had I fallen for that — and let me say here that the Prime Minister has one of the best brains that I know of, and I have told him already that he should leave it to Science, because I know nobody else thinks like him. This is his idea, this is too big for those other members. This was one of the big ideas of the Prime Minister when he rang me. What I am saying is, how could I discharge my parliamentary function with my colleagues on Boards, and yet I am told it is magnanimous? I think it is a political attempt to embarrass me.

I do not think there is very much more to say, except that I see His Honour the Deputy Speaker in his usual self-constituted authority as a constitutional lawyer. Because he gets a column to himself he is an authority, but that is no magic once you understand it and interpret it,

the Constitution is a simple document, but every Friday or Saturday I read these effusions about how a Speaker must behave and how a Leader of the Opposition must behave. He comes out with a very — I wouldn't say, learned, I think he knows better than that — explaining Senators and parliamentarians. (*Asides*). All right, the Senate and the House together form Parliament. The Senate is a differently constituted body, however. When I was in the Senate I had a private telephone, but when I got elected I had to run and change it fast. I was nominated to the Senate, nobody voted for me, so there was nobody to call me, but if I am elected by people I have to be at their beck and call. The Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition can revoke the appointments of their Senators overnight, so they are not on all fours.

People voted for you, people are expecting favours from you, people are coming to see you daily and people are asking you for jobs. Who will have to ask a Senator for a job except a Senator who is running again and the Senator is going to give jobs to strengthen his areas for the next election? The Senator who ran for St. Michael South is in a position by this Government as a parliamentarian to use the taxpayers' money and to use his position as a Chairman to strengthen the weak areas where he got beaten last time to prepare for 1981. (Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Carmichael did it and he still did not win). Now you see, two wrongs do not make a right. This is what I am getting away from, that the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister is telling me that Carmichael did it and didn't win, so do you condone doing it then and winning? I am talking about integrity, your Government is one that is talking about integrity in public life and you are admitting to me on the floor of this House in an *Aside* which I heard that it was done by a member of my Party and therefore it justifies you to perpetuate it. All right, if that is how you feel, and a Party that goes to the country on integrity and yet you are condoning this, you are permitting this, do you think that is right for the people of this country you are supposed to represent?

1.05 p.m.

That is what I am getting away from. Whether it is the House or the Senate, it is not right that you should use your political position on a Board using taxpayers money to consolidate your political future. This is what I am saying. I am nothing to do with who has done it. I am saying that it is wrong politically. I am talking about integrity, which is not something that I do something wrong and, therefore, it is right. Integrity is not something that I do, or you do and, therefore, it becomes right. Let us start getting facts straight.

I am saying, Mr. Speaker, finally that the Opposition will not support this measure. I conceive it to be, from the moment I heard of it and I read their Manifesto, part of the power game to perpetuate themselves in power at the expense of the masses. What did strike me as even worst is that by this very method they were creating Barbadians who hitherto had a high respect for independence and had a high respect for being their own people. The respect they are creating in them is a knowledge, and a certain knowledge, that if they are to get any of the things which they are entitled to as loyal citizens of this country, they will have to go cap in hand to a politician and beg him to give them a house, or a job, and so on. I could never support this if it is the last thing I do, because it is a wicked system. You should find outside people; let the Minister give directions as a policy-maker, and then let those people do the work. Do not tell me that there is such a dearth. You have people outside who can do the job. You have found them for the Development Bank, and you have found them for Boards. You have people outside who are capable of being independent Chairmen and, therefore, you should give it at least the aura of being respectable and fair.

If the people of Barbados want this type of thing. (*Asides*) We got 48% of the votes, too. I can see the Democratic Labour Party by this action of the Government Party being victimised, and this is what hurts me. If the member for Christ Church East knows that someone who canvassed for Mr. A., his opponent, has come to him for a job at IDC, I would put my head on a block that he would not give him a job. Similarly, with the member for housing. If a member knows that a man was loud-mouthed in the election for another opponent, then he would not get a house. This can go on *ad nauseam*. This is another vital aspect. The Democratic Labour Party will be constantly victimised by the Barbados Labour Party Chairmen of the Statutory Boards of this country. I am against victimisation in any form. I am against racial discrimination in any form, and this is what I am warning this country about. I am warning not only our 48%, but all fair-minded people on the Barbados Labour Party's side that this piece of legislation can so easily lead to political victimisation that it can give to this country a very bad name in the long run.

If we are concerned about the good name of Barbados, this is a piece of legislation we should scrap and continue with the old method whereby the Minister appoints a Board and an outside person as a Chairman and let things work that way. If the Minister can exercise influence on the

Chairman that is his business, but let us at least give it an aura, or a halo, of being fair and not of discriminating against your opponents. This, as I say, is the evil part of this Bill: institutionalising finally by legislation to give it respectability, political patronage, political favouritism, and political yardfowlism.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that my first speech in this Honourable Chamber would have had to deal with a matter on which, at least, the Opposition would have made a creditable speech. Perhaps, one can sum up what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has said by reference to two of the passages in his long-winded speech. He said at one stage that it was wrong to use one's political office to feather one's position politically, and he also said that if one did not use one's position as Chairman of a Statutory Board for one's political benefit, then one was an idiot. That, to my mind, sums up the totality of his speech: totally lacking in any logic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not finished, because when one examines carefully what the hon. member was saying, one comes to the conclusion that either he did not know what he was speaking about, or that he has made a thoroughly bad analysis of the situation. There is no fundamental distinction between a Senator and a member of this Honourable Chamber when one is looking at the position of Chairmen of Statutory Boards. Both persons are Parliamentarians, and the point which I am making is that the system of appointing Parliamentarians to chair Statutory Boards has been in existence by the other side for some time. All that we are doing is making absolutely sure that people who are efficient and who have demonstrated a certain intelligence will now become Chairmen of those Boards so that it will bring greater efficiency in the operations of the Boards. Any point which the other side is making about Ministers managing Boards during the last administration and Chairmen looking after the Boards independently is a lot of nonsense.

The hon. member is obviously speaking from experience when he talks about the potential political interference by Chairmen in the proposed system with the management of the Board. It is my experience, and I am sure it is the experience of other hon. members, that there has been in the past interference of an unwarranted kind by Ministers in the ordinary operation of the Boards. I can give certain examples, but, perhaps, one of my hon. Colleagues may deal with some specific examples later on. But there has been that kind of interference in the past. What this new system

will do is to ensure that we have efficient people running the Boards as Chairmen and looking after the day-to-day management of the Boards, and it will also ensure a greater control over what happens in these various organisations. There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have witnessed some of the most lamentable waste of public funds in some of these institutions. If hon. members of this Chamber are to become associated with the Boards as Chairmen, then those persons have a double responsibility. They always have to remember that they are members of this Chamber. They may be times when they will have to make explanations here on which their very credibility and integrity may stand. They will also remember that they are also representing a Party which has a certain responsibility to the electorate.

In the old system, some of the Chairmen were loosely connected with particular Parties and, therefore, had no cognizance of the public spirit and the public interest. What we are attempting to do under this new system is to be absolutely sure that Parliamentarians are now so closely concerned with the operation of these Boards that they keep their feet on the ground as it were. They are attuned to the political needs of the people and, therefore, that sense of what is going on at the ground level to bear when they make decisions.

I want to deal with the point which was raised by the hon. member in relation to question of handing out jobs because of a person's political leanings and so on. That is a point, Mr. Speaker, which is consistent with past experience. One had a situation in the past where it would appear in order to receive what is one's just right, a house, or a job, and so on, one had to demonstrate a particular political allegiance. (*Asides.*) I am reminded by one of my colleagues that one had to demonstrate a passport, but the point is that if that point is made now it is based on past experience about which we know. There is no indication that it will happen in the future. 1.15 p.m.

In fact the very fact that members of this Honourable Chamber who by their very nature are men of integrity — and this is why we call them honourable — the very fact that they are now to be Chairmen of these Statutory Boards is a strong suggestion that this sort of political patronage will no longer take place; and I for one, if I were the Chairman of a Statutory Board, would make absolutely sure that one dispensed such patronage as one had to dispense, irrespective of political leanings, because a number of the problems which we have in this society at

the moment have been engendered by that kind of partisan behaviour by some of the members of the last administration. I have been a victim of it in my own constituency, and there are physical examples of the manoeuvring and manipulation by the other side during the last five years; but the point is this. This new system is a system designed to ensure that the brains which we exhibited to the public during the last campaign will now be used to ensure efficiency in some of the operations and to make absolutely sure that the public funds dispensed in large measure by some of these Statutory Corporations are under the control of persons who are members of this Honourable Chamber and who can be dealt with if something goes wrong.

That to my mind, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps the most important point; but I just want to say one thing which I believe was said in this Honourable Chamber years ago, and that is, that one of the most important passages in a speech which has come to be known as the speech on the Bushe Experiment was a passage which was said throughout the history of British Parliamentary institutions — and obviously we must now take it to mean Barbados' Parliamentary Institution — it has been realized that the great evil which must be avoided is power without responsibility. That was the system which operated under the old dispensation. Mr. Speaker, these provisions are designed to ensure that power is placed in the hands of those who are responsible to the electorate at large, and on that principle alone I am going to support this measure and I am sure that all hon. members on this side and those on that side who are thinking properly will also support the measure.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before this Chamber, as I understand it, is an attempt to clear the way for the launching of a very interesting and important experiment in the administration of Government in this country. As I understand it, Sir, it is an attempt to make sure that the legal obstacles are removed

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it the member for Christ Church East has a peculiar interest in this Bill. He is supposed to be Chairman of the IDC. He has a practical interest in this Bill.

Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the Bill does not affect me. The IDC is not involved in the Bill at all. I am not surprised that the Leader of the Opposition is not aware of that, because thus far he has demonstrated that he is aware of very little.

The Bill is an attempt to remove the obstacles in relation to the National Housing Corporation, the Barbados Marketing Corporation, the National Stadium Corporation and the Agricultural Development Corporation. It has nothing whatsoever to do with IDC, and that is the reason why I have been functioning since about six weeks ago. The Bill has nothing to do with me.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned about the debate at the level of whether it concerns me or not. I think that I can view the matter before the House with sufficient objectivity, and what I want to do in my short contribution is really to lay bare before Parliament the considerations of high principle which formed the decision of the Barbados Labour Party in Opposition to bring about this change, and the real reasons why we now in Government seek to affect this change.

The first point which needs to be made relates to the principle of accountability. It has already briefly been touched upon by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister but I think that it is so significant that it deserves to be elaborated upon.

Now when the Democratic Labour Party dismantled the system of Local Government in Barbados around 1969, what in truth and in fact they did was to remove the contact which the elected members of the Council had with the people, and over the years in this country there has grown up a gap between administration and the people, and this Bill before the House is an attempt to bridge that gap to make sure that the administration is in contact with the people, and in appointing members of parliament as Chairmen of these Boards, all that we are trying to do is to bring the administration closer in contact with the electorate.

I want to contend further, Mr. Speaker, that since the Local Government system has been dismantled there has grown up a large number of Statutory Corporations. There has been a growth in the machinery of Government, and in many of these Statutory Corporations there has been obvious examples and very clear evidence of maladministration, and one of the reasons why we believe this has happened is because the supervisory role of the Ministry has been too extended, and Ministers have not been able to deal effectively with the supervisory role which they have as far as their far-flung departments are concerned; and all that we are trying here to do is to ensure that the supervisory role which the

politicians play is made more effective and that members of the House who are serving on these Boards have a more effective role to play as far as supervision is concerned.

One of the other considerations which are important, Mr. Speaker, has got to do with experience. We see this as a training ground too for some of our parliamentarians. There is no reason why Parliamentarians cannot by serving as Chairmen of these Boards get a greater insight into what is happening in a certain area of public administration to the point where they may improve the efficiency of the administration of these Boards, and more, if and when they are called upon to serve at a higher level they will already start off with having had some experience and some insight into the administration of Government at a certain level.

Now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that in his researches he could find no precedent for what we are attempting to do here. He said that in his researches he could find no precedent for that. Again that does not surprise this side because he has never been too well known for doing thorough research; but, Mr. Speaker, I would just like the point to be made that what we are doing here today is a variant of what was done in Ceylon many years ago before the Ceylonese had their independence. They had a Committee system of Government whereby politicians were Chairmen of the Board dealing with Education, the Board dealing with transportation, the Board dealing with Waterworks, and so on; and all that we are trying to do here is to introduce a system which could be regarded as a variant of the Ceylonese model. So it is thoroughly wrong and thoroughly misleading to say that there is no precedent for attempting to do what has never been done. He has been suggesting that this is something novel, that it has never been done, and that we are doing something which has never been done before.

Now I quite agree with the hon. member for St. Michael North West when he makes the point that it is not fair to judge us in this experiment against the standards that they have used in the past. I think that if there is one lesson learnt from the last five years in particular, it is that because you have a particular view of people which says that they have got to be treated with favours and made to beg for what are their just rights, that they will vote for you.

1.25 p.m.

Indeed, if that was so, I could not have been in this Hon. Chamber today. Mr. Carmichael would have been the member.

Indeed, if that was so, Mr. Philip Greaves would never have lost his seat; but the evidence is clear. The day after Mr. Carmichael lost in the by-election Parks and Beaches Commission workers danced. The very ones that had to beg him for a job, and in the end got the job, danced and rejoiced that he was defeated. That is because people do not expect to be treated like that; and I hope that the members of this side who are serving as chairmen of the statutory boards will at least take the point that when people have got to beg for what they are entitled to they do not respect the person who gives them. If you think that by using your power to dish out jobs and dish out houses it will make you popular with the people, it may do so for a little while; but those who are denied their position in the queue simply because they do not identify themselves with the party, in the end their viewpoint will prevail and you will fall, as indeed our friends on the other side fell not too long ago.

The point that I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this experiment is well conceived. It has been brought here for the right reasons. This is an attempt to bring public opinion into closer contact with the administration. It is an attempt to make sure that the supervisory role of the politician is more effective; and I would hope that those criticisms cannot be made in another three or five years after we have had the experience and looking back on the experiment. I would hope that members on all sides will give it their blessing as an attempt to improve the public administration of this country. I believe that when we look back we will be able to say that it was a wise experiment and was well justified. There is an English poet, Mr. Speaker, who says: "The forms of Government let fools contend. What'er is best administered is best." I have no doubt that when we look back at this experiment after three or five years and evaluate it, we will unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that it is a wise experiment and that it has resulted in the country being better administered. (*Cheers*)

Mr. E. E. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my disapproval of this measure which is before this Hon. Chamber. In doing so, I will as the basis of my argument — because it would seem as if the members of the Government are accessible to some kind of logic, and I am glad of that. I will therefore use as the basis for my argument the statement of the Deputy Prime Minister when this Bill was introduced, or at least a statement made by the member for St.

Michael North West and an extract from the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party; because when you examine these three statements, Mr. Speaker, you will see where there is no logic and where there is no consistency in the position sought to be established here today.

Let me refer to the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister when he introduced this amendment. He stated that in the past "members of this Chamber suffered a disability in not being able to make a contribution towards these bodies." That is the statutory corporations for which presumably we are seeking to make these amendments.

Now, when you examine that, and examine the statement which is contained in the manifesto and further examine what the Government is trying to do here – to clear the way for members of Parliament to become chairmen of certain statutory corporations – you will see the point that I am making; because the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, the document which presumably is guiding this amendment, makes absolutely no mention of making members chairmen of statutory corporations. The manifesto states that wherever possible you should associate members of Parliament of all political parties with the operation of boards.

I am submitting to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very clear indication that associating members of Parliament with statutory boards is not a departure from what was going on before; but what we are seeing here today is something more vital, something more fundamental than associating members of Parliament with the operations of the corporation; because we are seeing a situation where the Government is trying to establish backbenchers as chairmen of certain statutory corporations as indeed they have done in some instances already.

You, Mr. Speaker, would recall that during the days of the Democratic Labour Party members of Parliament were associated with the functions and administration of the operations of statutory corporations. I cannot recall whether or not you yourself were given the honour and privilege of being associated with any of the corporations, but I well recall that the hon. member for St. James was at one time or another associated with the Sanitation and Cemeteries Board. So that when this new system is being presented – because I see a distinction between associating members of Parliament as members of Boards and making a

member of Parliament Chairman of a Board; because a Chairman has a lot of power and is in control of the situation.

That is what we are objecting to on this side. We do not consider that it is right for a backbencher to become chairman of any of the statutory corporations of Government. The member for Christ Church East when he spoke made mention of the fact that this was a move on the part of the Government to establish the principle of accountability. In doing so he said that this would tend to bridge the gap or narrow the gap between the administration and the people; but he went on to say that in doing so, or at least the way in which this would be done would be putting elected members of the House of Assembly on statutory boards.

I want to say Mr. Speaker, that like the Leader of the Opposition who spoke first on our side, we regard this kind of measure on the part of the Government as an attempt (1) to satisfy certain pressures which were obviously coming from within their own ranks, as you will very well know, Mr. Speaker.

1.35 p.m.

What this does is to give some members of Parliament the opportunity to earn an income which is almost equivalent of a Parliamentary Secretary so that when one talks in terms of the Barbados Labour Party reducing the number of Parliamentary Secretaries in Government, one would see very clearly that this move on the part of the Government is a very open attempt to get around this idea of reducing Parliamentary Secretaries; so that this is a backhand way of re-introducing something which they claim they went to the public on. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that it was stated very clearly by the Deputy Prime Minister and the other members who spoke on the other side that nowhere in the manifesto and at no time during the campaign of the Barbados Labour Party in the last General Elections was it mentioned that they would have the audacity to make backbenchers Chairmen of Statutory Corporations. If this were done, as indeed we will see in the not too distant future, there would be no doubt about the outcome, because the people would have recognised the dangers that would be involved in this kind of situation. What we are going to witness in this country is a situation where some members of Parliament will be occupying key positions and will be able to dispense favours in a way they think best. It is fairly obvious the way in which these favours will be dispensed. When I heard the hon. member for St. Philip North in an aside indicating that nobody need bother to come to him, I do not believe he meant that.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, is the hon. member referring to an aside and misleading this House about what I may have said to my friends over here? I never made any such statement over here, but I have the right to speak later on.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say to all hon. members who are addressing the Chair that I want them to desist from inviting cross talk during debates in this House. This Chair will not tolerate it.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recognise that we are all capable of making statements which will invite cross talk.

The hon. member for Christ Church East talked about the principle of accountability, and I want to go back to that for just a short while because as he was speaking I was turning over in my mind where under the Rules of this House a backbencher who is a member of a Statutory Corporation would become accountable to Parliament for any of the actions or policies of that Corporation. As I understand it, the Minister will, generally speaking, give guidelines, and would under the Constitution and the Rules have responsibility and be accountable to Parliament for anything which goes wrong or for any particular matter having to do with any of the Statutory Corporations. Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that if I want to come in here and raise a question about the National Housing Corporation, the Industrial Development Corporation, the Tourist Board or any of the Corporations of which backbenchers are Chairman that I can address my question to the Chairman concerned or to that particular member? As you very well know, this is not possible because the Minister has the responsibility.

When one talks in terms of accountability, one will see very clearly that this rests under the law and under the Rules purely in the hands of the Minister, so let us not fool ourselves. No backbencher, no Chairman who is sitting over there is accountable to Parliament for anything which goes on within the Corporation. It is the Minister who has that responsibility and who is accountable. I do not know therefore what accountability or responsibility our members are talking about. I would say therefore that when one is looking at this, one must take into consideration a number of factors. I said earlier on that if one were to listen to the introduction which was made by the Deputy Prime Minister, one would recall that he said that in the past members of this Chamber suffered from a

disability. I am further saying that when you compare some of these statements made by the hon. member for St. Michael North West and the hon. member for Christ Church East, you will see very clearly that they do not tally. There is no logic in the situation because they seem to be speaking from more than one position. It would seem as if howsoever the ball is playing, they want to be in a position to bat, whether one is spinning or bowling fast, so they are attempting to cover a particular situation which cannot be justified. To say that a matter like this was publicly ventilated, to say that you went in public and told them that you would be appointing backbenchers, if you capture the Government, as Chairman of Statutory Corporations thereby enabling them to enhance their emoluments — and I am not against people getting handsome emoluments, but it is the way it is done that I would be against — is one of the tricks which we were told should not exist, and we are going to expose those tricks as we go along. There were to be no tricks in 1976, but this is the first trick, Mr. Speaker, that we are witnessing, the legalising of a trick which was played on the electorate of this country. That is what we are witnessing here today, and we cannot in all honesty and sincerity support this kind of open trickery.

1.45 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Government's amendment. I would have thought when I came here that I would be listening to members from the Opposition making out a case against the Government's amendment, but so feeble have the hon. members from that side made their case that it is not really difficult for me to make a case in favour of the amendment before this House.

In the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party — and I must quote the Manifesto — because we set out in this document to state that ordinary members of Parliament would be associated with the machinery of Government, but we went further and in dealing with Statutory Boards we said that wherever possible we would associate members of Parliament of all political parties with the operation of Boards.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that members of the Opposition do not understand at this moment that we have made provisions for all political parties, and they are setting out to mislead the Hon. House that we on this side are seeking to plant on these Boards members from our side or from our Party. What the Leader of the Opposition has made known to this House is that the Hon. Prime Minister invited him to

nominate members to these Boards, and he stated categorically that he had or has no intention to nominate members from his side. So you see, Mr. Speaker, that they are refusing to represent the people who supported them on September 2. When we were in Opposition, when we were asked to sit in on Boards we did so and we made our contribution, but I hope that history will record that the members of the Opposition on this day have indicated their lack of intention to represent the views of the people who supported them.

In 1974 when the amendments to the Constitution were brought before this House it was pointed out that some 300 people had supported what was known as the amendments. We on this side would like the hon. members from that side to understand that on September 2 the electorate of Barbados gave us an overwhelming majority because they believed in what we put forward in our Manifesto, and what we seek to do today is to legalise or to bring before this Chamber what we advocated in our Manifesto. I can go on and on speaking in favour of this Bill but what baffles me most is to hear members getting up quoting and misquoting and misleading the electorate of this country time and time again. We know that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose, but in opposing they must ensure that what they are opposing is based on fact and of some substance.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, there is not very much which hon. members from this side have to say other than to make it abundantly clear that we have put to the electorate of this country our policies in the Manifesto, they have endorsed them and we today are seeking the approval from this sacred Chamber.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I can well imagine the arguments that would have been advanced and the reasons which would have been thundered from the Opposition benches before September 2 were such a proposal put before this Hon. Chamber. Let me say this too, never have I seen you so subdued, because I am certain that in a sense you must be ruining the fact that you have to sit and as a duty listen where you yourself cannot participate actually and contribute by your speeches on such a matter. I am certain that you would be one of the leading opponents to castigate the Democratic Labour Party Government of the day for bringing such a proposal before this Chamber.

I would like to look at this matter in its true perspective. I think we should forget

emotion and look at the particular proposal before us for making certain amendments to the legislation relating to Statutory Boards in order to remove the disqualification of members of Parliament to serve as members of such Boards. The Statutory Boards affected are set out in the Schedule.

One of my disappointments in this particular debate — I do not mind what has come from the back benches — but my one regret is that in introducing this particular Bill the Deputy Prime Minister and member for Christ Church South Central advanced the argument — and I listened very carefully — that it was necessary to bring this particular measure into this Chamber, and what we heard was that it was some proposal that was included in the Manifesto and that the people had given a majority to the Government and that therefore the measure should be advanced, and that therefore it is now before this Hon. Chamber. Then there was a passing reference to accountability.

I want to look at the main reasons why Statutory Boards were established and try to find out what in fact constitute the essence, the important factors relating to Statutory Boards. This is very important because this particular measure that is before us, short though the Bill may be, is a very fundamental one because it affects the way public administration of Statutory Boards and Corporations are administered in this country, the relationship of Parliament to those Statutory Boards, the relationship between members and Ministers and such matters. All of this is very fundamental to this debate and that is why I regret that from the front benches these matters have so far not been referred to.

Now let us take the question of the essence of the Statutory Corporation. As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Statutory Corporations have been established in order to regulate or operate or own as far as the public is concerned certain businesses, industries or certain services in the public interest.

1.55 p.m.

That is why Statutory Corporations are set up. Now, there are ways and means of doing this. The traditional way in the Public Services of the countries of this world has been by means of the Government Department, which means that a Minister is directly responsible for a particular Department of Government, or a Department of State, with a number of officers under him and an administration to carry out his policies through a Government Department. We have

instances of that in this country. Whether it may be the Ministry of Communications and Works — I am not certain if that is still the name for it. We have some new-fangled name for it, and I am not certain what it is called. We have the Ministry of Labour, and those constitute Government Departments under which there is a Minister who, through his Parliamentary Secretary, his Permanent Secretary, and other public officers, directly administer the affairs of a Department.

But there are other areas of Government, other areas of activity in industry, in businesses, or in certain services like the Natural Gas Corporation. Certain utilities like the IDC where it was felt that the best administration for those services, or those industries, or businesses, would be to remove them from the direct control of a Department in terms of control and personnel management and, indeed, the general day-to-day management of those particular industries, or services, and to put these at one removed both from the Ministry and the Department as well as from scrutiny as far as the day-to-day management, albeit not of policy, but of the day-to-day management of these Corporations concerned.

That is why we have had Statutory Boards arising in this country and in other countries to get the best of both worlds. It was an attempt in the history of public administration to get services, or businesses, administered in a manner that was akin to the private sector, bringing about whatever are supposed to be the virtues of private enterprise together with what accountability might be necessary as far as the particular interest is concerned. That was the classic case for the introduction and development of the Statutory Corporation in countries of this world.

Indeed, the development has marked one of the main distinctions between Communist States and those States which are known as Democracies. (*Asides.*) That has been one of the main characteristics because the whole idea of looking after the public interest through the establishment of Statutory Bodies to run those interests, whether it was a business or a service, this has represented one of the main developments in history.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: It now being 2 p.m., this Sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now question time. There being no Questions, we will move into Private Members' Business.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, there is only one item under the heading of Private Members' Business, and I move that it be now taken as the instant Order of the Day.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION RE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last we had the Opening of Parliament, and in traditional fashion the Acting Governor-General to joint Houses of Parliament and to the public generally the Government's intention for the First Session of Parliament. It is the Opposition's view that, as early as possible after this speech, the Opposition should debate and indicate to the public of Barbados what their views are on this particular speech. Consequently, as you will know, Sir, it is traditional for the Opposition if it agrees with the speech to say so, and if it disagrees with the speech to Table a Motion critical of it, and so I move in this Honourable Chamber a Resolution that the House takes note of the Speech from the Throne while regretting the absence of measures to provide for services adumbrated in Government's policy or to create an immediate impact on the employment situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if one reads the Government's intentions as I have done there are quite a few things that strikes one about it after a thorough persual. The first thing is the vagueness of it. I can appreciate a Government being in power after a month not being in a position to come up with concrete proposals in certain areas. One can also imagine, as the Prime Minister said at the United Nation where he praised himself and said that the Government being in opposition for 15 years had plenty of opportunity — at least in the last Session when they claimed that the Democratic Labour Party did nothing — to at least, plan and have a fair idea of what their plan should be for this country.

If you read the Speech you will find phrases — Mr. Speaker, let me say that. I regret the absence of the Prime Minister today moreso in

his capacity as the Minister of Finance. All of his Speech, as I realise, if you look at my complete Motion – I must say the Order Paper version of it is a truncated version of my approach, because in my original Motion that, in the absence of taxation, he had mentioned several projects without saying how he is going to finance them, but I will accept the truncated version on the Order Paper. I regret his absence particularly as Minister of Finance.

Now, if you read the Speech from the Throne, you will see His Excellency saying, from time to time, words such as "Provision will be made..." "A review will be made....." "My Government will strive..." "Full support will be given....." And then you will get a few phrases. "Active consideration will be given to the provision...", and you get phrases, from time to time. "My Government is unswervingly committed to the principle..." "We will pursue systematically..." "We will study this..." "My Government proposes, after consultation..." "It is also proposed to..." "My Government believes...", "Early attention will be given..." "Believing that this..." "My Government considers.....", "My Government considers..." "Great emphasis will be placed...".

2.50 p.m.

The Government in its early stages made allowances for the Ministers to read the files to understand and to appreciate and to plan and to reshape. This Government is in a very fortunate position in that they have inherited from the Democratic Labour Party so many projects and so many schemes which were on the verge of being successful or being commenced.

I am thrilled – Ministers have been on tours and said 'I am impressed.' The Minister of Education is impressed with the School Meals Scheme; he will open Ellerslie, and even the Nation will tell you of places which have the name Frederick Smith on them, and even although his name cannot be put up at least he will try to remove them. I am not quarrelling with him. He will visit the School Meals Scheme at Lancaster, he will visit the Community College, he is reviewing the Polytechnic; he has seen countless schemes which we started during our term of office which it will be his honour and pleasure to open in due course. He should soon have an opportunity to open the addition at Queens College, which as you pass by River Road, should soon be ready. I am not quarrelling with that. Governments come and Governments go. I have opened some schemes that my colleague, the member for St. Michael South started. But what does impress the public is, that

the Ministers on their tours are so impressed with what the Democratic Labour Party has been doing.

The Minister of Health is impressed with the Clinic she sees at St. Michael District Hospital. She is impressed with what she sees. The Deputy Prime Minister thinks that a lot of planning and a lot of hard work has gone into the Airport. I am grateful for that. The Minister of Communications and Works is pleased with what he has seen at the Deep Water Harbour; he says the extension is necessary and it will pay dividends and it is a worthwhile extension.

You know, when you really consider after reading day in and day out the tours by the Ministers of this Government, one must feel heartened to think that after our time of office in this country, they can go around visiting as a must, to familiarize themselves with what has gone on. They are so impressed with this and that and the other, that the public are watching them, because when you tell the public we did nothing and still are being impressed with what we did, it must begin to make people think.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, you will appreciate that every Government that comes in starts witch hunting. You will get the occasion of the North Point witch hunting, you get the occasion of the Housing Authority wanting a commission; you will get a commission of the Parks and Beaches – although I think the Minister of Finance is drawing back on that; you are going to get some lashes in here on that when the time comes. Be that as it may, I am prepared to give you a period of witch hunting. I am prepared to say – well, the Minister of Labour has not got much to witch hunt about because they truncated his Ministry. They did not give him Housing, or he would be also witch hunting this too; but be that as it may, we are allowing you a period of witch hunting; we are allowing you a period to tell the public for one reason or another that you have gone into a Ministry, you have perused the files – and I would like you to read some of my Minutes on those files. I think you will realize that they were always on the side of the working class man. Be that as it may, I am giving you a period when you can carry on witch hunting.

This is natural; after fifteen years of Opposition you are entitled to expose or pretend to the public – and I want you to lock up who you can lock up; who you can lock up, lock up, and who you cannot lock up do not lock up. I am willing to go to jail. I am willing. If you can charge me I am willing to go to jail. If you can find something against me that I did, if I carried

away public funds, if I did anything, lock me, the member for St. Michael South Central, up. I am willing. If you find anything in my Ministry witch hunting, expose it. This is fair enough; but I think you must reach a point when the people are going to expect you to honour the promises in your manifesto; and even although the initial honeymoon in not over — I do not know how long is a political honeymoon. I do not even know how much is a normal honeymoon. It can vary. I do not want to say what Confucius said. Confucius said that a honeymoon cannot last longer than a week, that seven days make a whole week; but be that as it may, I am not going in for how long a political honeymoon can last, but all I am telling the Ministers and the members of the Government is that the people are expecting them to honour their promises.

The Opposition is not so unconscionable as not to give you a period within which to familiarize yourselves with what has gone on, to review, to discover, and in order to readjust your policy. Let us get that straight. I would not be, as Leader of the Opposition, unreasonable enough not to give you an opportunity to look through the files, to reconsider schemes, whether it is Wotton, or wherever it is, to look at the educational policy, the labour policy, the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of Agriculture, — the Opposition is prepared to give the Government time. We do not want to obstruct you in achieving what the people have put you here for. We are going to scrutinize it and we are going to oppose. What we are going to do is, give you an opportunity. The new Minister of Health is the first lady to be a Minister of Health, and I as Leader of the Opposition would like to congratulate her on that achievement — but I would like to give you an opportunity to go through the files and to see; and I am saying for the Democratic Labour Party who has lost, it is extremely heartening to find that the Ministers themselves in their visits to departments are in many ways saying that hard work, planning and good work has gone in to some of the schemes which they have seen. When you couple that with the witch hunting which you are permitted to do, then of course we will get the whole gamut and a whole view of what the Democratic Labour Party has done.

Now as I said before, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the speech it is a speech typical in a way — unless a new Government is entitled to make a speech like this, that is, we will consider, we will review, we will set up Committees, we will do this and we will do that, or we will consider these things. Now what does worry me about the whole question — and I am sorry that the

Minister of Finance is not here because a Throne Speech starts out with the financial implications; it is not a budget, but you are going to set out in your Throne Speech that you intend to do things for the people of this country based obviously on your Manifesto, and your Manifesto contains money, and therefore it would have been good if the Minister of Finance had been here, and I hope he will do it at the earliest possible opportunity — to give to the country some idea of how he is going to raise the money and how he is going to finance the schemes which he has set up.

I notice that on page 1 — I shall not deal with the financial aspect of it in detail, but he says in a blanket phrase “my Government is deeply concerned at the state of the Barbados economy.” Now I think the public of Barbados would like to know why is Government deeply concerned at this state. The country deserves it, and what does worry me in this Barbados is, that I can read in the centre column of the Advocate-News that the Barbados Government was not in a position to pay salaries and that the Minister of Finance had to take certain financial initiatives in order to meet this need. I am not saying it is not true, but the country does not know; Glyne Murray could know it.
3 p.m.

This is something which is not secret. Do not misunderstand me. I am a citizen of Barbados and Leader of the Opposition and I can read in the Sunday newspaper that the Government has run out. (*Asides*). I can read in the Sunday newspaper that the Minister of Finance had to take certain initiatives to meet payments. It is not good enough that I as a citizen, a parliamentarian and Leader of the Opposition can see a columnist come out with information that I do not know about. He can come out and say that on good authority and from reliable sources the Minister took certain initiatives.

This is a Government that talks about open Government. After all, I am accustomed to hearing about the “Treasury drain” and that there is no money; but we can read from Glyne Murray in the centre page of the Advocate-News that the Minister of Finance had to take certain initiatives. (*ASIDE: You know how it was done before.*) You tell us how it was done. Do not confuse the issues.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if a Civil Servant has presented his cheque for his pay and he does not get it when he goes to the bank, any columnist who has initiative can find out.

Mr. SPEAKER: That was not a point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That may well have happened. I do not say that the Government does not have to take financial initiatives; but do not let me, as Leader of the Opposition, have to read that from a columnist who has no connection with Parliament. I heard about borrowing money from the National Insurance. I expect the Minister of Finance when he needs money to take the proper steps to raise the money; but I have got to read it from Glyne Murray. I want to know who could tell Glyne Murray that when members of Parliament did not know it up to that time.

I hope that the Minister of Finance at the earliest possible time will let the public know what he has found out and what measures he has had to take to meet the financial obligations of this country. Let the public know what is the position. Let us have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me God.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Is the member telling the House that we must bring sufficient evidence to kill Mr. Barrow or.....

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: All that I am saying is that I am asking the Government to be frank with the public of Barbados and do not hide anything. You said in your Throne Speech that the Government is deeply concerned with the state of the Barbados economy. I am not interested in personalities. You have to raise funds. If you have to lock us up early and send us to jail for misappropriation of funds, that is your duty after you have done your accounting and you come to the conclusion that we have misappropriated public funds. That is your duty to the majority who gave you 17 seats to 7. Prosecute us, lock us up and do whatever the Laws of this country demand. One thing I believe in in this country is equality before the law whether you are high or low. (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You want Barrow locked up. That is your ambition in life.) If you can lock him up, lock him up.

Sir, all I am saying is that what I am asking the Government to do is that the Deputy Prime Minister should convey to the Prime Minister that it is better to let Parliament know the financial position other than a columnist in the Advocate. Is that not the respect to us due from a Government which has just taken office? From a Government to which the Opposition has given

an opportunity to read the files and study the various portfolios before the Government initiated its programme?

I am glad to see on Page 1 of the Acting Governor General's Speech that the Government has honoured its promise about the Retail Sales Tax. I was glad to see that at the first meeting of the House they honoured it. Do not let the taxpayers feel that it is coming off one way and not going on the next. If you remove sales tax, income tax, trade tax or whatever, you have our whole hearted support if you can carry out your programme without burdening the people of this country. You are pushing an open door.

Let me give you a warning. Every measure that brings in a penny more, the Opposition will be watching it like hawks and so will we be when you lose this amount of money with which you expect to carry out your development projects.
3.10 p.m.

When you promised the people all these goodies, sweeties and lollipops, when you take off this tax, I want to know how you will meet the cost of these lollipops. I am in no hurry because the Opposition will speak for a long time, because talking is my line.

I want you to understand, Mr. Speaker, that we support the removal of the sales tax, because the Opposition is agreeable to any relief to the taxpayers of this country in any form whatsoever, and if the Government in promising so many things can do them, then it has our support. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the speech itself is vague in so many ways. I have conceded it has got to be vague because all of you are Ministers for the first time. (A VOICE: Like you were.) I had ten years in this thing. (Asides) Don't mind my pension; I will deal with that later. In the same way, you are a little older, Mr. Speaker, than me; so don't let them tamper with this pension thing. Some of them are only thirty-two or thirty-four and can talk that way, but they have a long lot of years in here. Anyhow let us move on. (Asides.)

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James will have an opportunity to make his contribution.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, let me say just finally on the general opening that I am prepared to concede that your speech has necessarily got to be vague, but I am telling you that the people of this country are not going to stand for these vague promises. What I like about the people of Barbados now is that they will not

keep a Government in power for any long time. They will look at the promises and look at the performance, and I am telling you that if you think by using the amendment to the Statutory Board Act it is going to keep you in power, you will be making a mistake. As I said earlier today, they will be looking at this book which cost 50 cents during the election, was brought down to 25 cents and now has gone to \$1.00 and judge you by your performance. I know you will come up with a lot of anancy stories. When you cannot get through with your National Health Scheme, you will tell the people that the middle class doctors are not supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, let us look now at the Government that introduced this Throne Speech and ask if it is seriously concerned with the working class people and with relieving the burden which they said the Democratic Labour Party placed on the shoulders of the people of this country. I have always represented the working classes and I would not be in here except for the vote of the people in Halls Road, Delamere Land and Carrington Village because I did not get any votes in Belleville and these middle class areas; so I must be representing the working classes that I am in here. I did not get any of the votes in Belleville, George Street or Pine Gardens; I got votes from the working class people and I would like to pay a tribute on the floor of the House to the working classes in Delamere Land, Halls Road and Brittons Hill and such areas. I will talk about such people because I represent them and they are the ones who enabled me to be back here as I told the Minister of Labour. (*Asides*) One vote was enough. I did not have a narrow margin like seven; it was a good twenty.

Mr. Speaker, I will use their own manifesto to deal with issues, and I am going to point out in the course of my discussions that the Government has studiously avoided dealing with certain aspects of this particular programme, because in my view this manifesto of theirs gives priority in areas which they have omitted to mention. We have a large school population where thousands of school children wear uniform. When children were sent home from the Garrison School for not wearing the right shoes, I as Minister said they should be sent back to school, and I make no apologies for that, but what have they promised the people of this country? The provision of free uniform for school children. Now the poor and the rich, all classes of people buy uniforms, but there is no mention in the Throne Speech of free uniforms for all school children. (A VOICE: It is coming next year.) It should be in the Throne Speech for this Session.

When I deal with omissions one after the other, you will hear that they are coming. This is an important enough bit to deal with this Session. They should be getting it from January. I read the speech of the Acting Governor-General, on education, and nowhere can I find any mention by the Acting Governor-General that the Barbados Labour Party now the Government, will provide free uniforms for school children. Are you going to wait until 1981 to sweeten them?

I would have assumed, Mr. Speaker, that with the mothers in Bridgetown, the same mothers that the Barbados Labour Party have turned off at the Parks and Beaches who have children going to school and who have got to find uniforms, that one of the first things they would do if possible from January would be to provide free uniforms, and that they would have included it in their Throne Speech for this Session, but I assume, perhaps wrongly that the things not mentioned in this Throne Speech are not being done in the first session. I cannot control how the Government is going to divide their session, but I am assuming that if this is priority No. 1 that they are prepared to give this to the people in the first session which would last two years, three years or six months, I do not know.

I want to deal with the black heavy type you have in your manifesto, because the rest is in small ordinary print, but when it comes to the provision of free uniforms for school children, the mere fact that you had it in heavy black print would suggest that the Government would consider this to be priority No. 1, but nowhere in the Throne Speech is there any indication that you are prepared in the first session of Parliament to honour this promise to the people of this country. Now in the first one where people are needing uniforms, where the people that you say that we oppressed and downtrod are needing these benefits, you have not included this in the Throne Speech. Is it deliberate? Or are there tricks in 1976? You have it in black print and I am dealing with all black print. Do you think this is the only one you have in?

3.20 p.m.

I want to deal with this, because if you are interested in working class people then the provision of free uniforms should be priority number one, so that in January coming, or I will even give you till April or till September, 1977 — the new academic year — you will be able to honour that promise, because if you do not honour it and do not have a time limit you can easily say it was not in the Throne Speech of His

Excellency the Acting Governor-General, because there was no mention of it, and it is important enough and emphasised enough in your Manifesto to justify inclusion in the Throne Speech of the Acting Governor-General. That is one serious omission.

Then you lay off 258 people, some with ten and twelve children, who have to get uniforms to send their children to school, and you have not even included it in your Throne Speech. I am going to deal with this. If you can find free uniforms in your Throne Speech, then you show it to me and I would assume, since I represent working class people, that you should stick to those promises which would bring alleviation, financial and otherwise, to the lower sections of the people who go to primary school and otherwise in providing free uniforms for them. You are not interested in them, you put that in in order to put money in the merchants' pockets with the uniforms, so the merchants can wait for a little while, but the people who will have to buy them in the meantime you are not interested in them, so who do you think will make money out of that? Even if the merchants make money, if you had introduced it in your Throne Speech as a priority, then at least we could say, just as you honoured the retail sales tax, you are at least honouring something to the benefit of the working classes, so that in January little Miss Mary with eight children at primary school, some at Queen's College, Harrison College, has to go and buy so many yards of uniform material, because you have not included it as a priority in your first Session of Parliament.

You have not done it, but we abolished school fees when we got in in 1961. You promised free school uniforms and you have not honoured it yet. That is one omission, Mr. Speaker, one serious omission. I would assume that one dealing with old people would also put them as a high priority. Sometimes I say that people get the Government they deserve, and I feel that just as you must pass through heat to know cold, good to know bad, night to know day and appreciate day, the people of this country have to pass through you all, otherwise they wouldn't appreciate what we did. It is as simple as that. Life is a question of contrasts.

Another aspect you have put in to get more votes that you have not included in your Throne Speech is this. To me it is so ridiculous that it is not even funny. I will read it because this makes interesting reading. I do not think the public read this, except for the goodies. I will turn now to pensions of old retired civil servants where this

Government has promised civil servants — listen to this, these are civil servants who retired years ago, some have one foot in the grave, some are active, but one would expect that a socialist Government that got in on promises would try to honour those promises that would benefit people who have one foot in the grave and who are getting older and older for three score years and ten. No mention of this. On page 12, Mr. Speaker, Old Age Pensioners. I am waiting to hear when the Minister of Labour and Welfare who used to talk about \$25, and I see the Manifesto says \$20, so I am waiting for the \$20 to come early, because these people are dying day by day. If you listen to Rediffusion every day you will hear one Miss Jane of Hawkers Land died, so I hope he is not coming with that late in the Session, because this is priority, and I hear them every morning on the obituaries, friend of so-and-so. If you are going to honour these things honour them early, the people are dying.

I am going to move on now to the civil servants, not to the old age pensioners, to the people that they say they want votes from and who probably voted for them on these promises, but these promises are not included in their Throne Speech. This is what the Manifesto says:—

“Adjust the pensions of retired public officers to take account of the salary being currently and from time to time paid to the relevant office holder rather than pegging the pension to the salary paid to an officer at the date of his retirement.”

As I understand it, do you know what that means? I understand this to mean that if a man retired as Commissioner of Police fifteen years ago and is getting a pension based on the salary he got at the time, that this Government is going to look at the office holder today, if he was getting \$600 then, the office holder gets \$2,000, that they will adjust his pension to bear some relationship to that \$2,000 which the present office holder is getting. Where is that in the Throne Speech?

I am a retired pensioner and you promise me this I am voting for you lock, stock and barrel, but you are going to adjust the pensions of retired public officers to take account of the salary being currently and from time to time paid to the relevant office holder. This is the man on the spot, but no mention of this, so when is he going to get it when all of them are dying out? I thought this should be priority number one, because you have retired pensioners 80, 75 and 60 years old who write letters to the Advocate saying it is difficult to make a living, it is difficult

to eke out a living, it is difficult to exist, you have this sort of thing and yet you will get a Throne Speech and the Government — where the people are dying, you only have to listen to the obituaries every morning — the Government pensioners are dying and the Government does not include this in the Throne Speech. Do you mean you are going to let them go to the grave without honouring this promise that you made in your Manifesto? So that in their old age, before they meet their maker and creator, at least they can say the Barbados Labour Party, the new Government did me a justice by adjusting my pension to the pension which is paid to the relevant office holder at the time? Do you mean you are going to let them go to the grave on a promise, a lick and a spittle?

You have done nothing in your Throne Speech to indicate to the old age pensioner who may have voted for you that in the first Session of this Parliament you are going to honour that promise. The poor fellow is going to his creator with a promise on paper but in practical terms not cent one. If Peter asks him "how stood you before you came to me?" He cannot answer "I was promised by the Barbados Labour Party, Oh Peter, but I didn't get through." Are you not really ashamed of that? That you got votes on these promises and in your Throne Speech you did not try to say when you are going to honour them? You did not say you are going to honour them in your first Session. You will honour them in 1981, but a lot of them will be six feet down by then. As the member for Christ Church East said, this might not help you because by then things will be different. A lot of water is flowing under the bridge between now and then, and we will keep the pressure on you; you had better believe it.

I am waiting to hear the Minister of Welfare on the third priority. I have the debate waiting for him, because he used to ask for \$25, the Manifesto promised \$20. Do you want time till the Budget Speech? If you want time till the Budget Speech I will give you till March or April or when you are coming, but if you don't come good, through the eddoes you will go, because I have a lot of things here waiting for you. I will be fair to you, I do not want the Prime Minister to introduce a temporary thing, I will give you till then, but come good, do you hear? Let me tell you this.

As to the Minister of Education, another witch hunter, he has gone into the Ministry and playing he is going to rise Peter, kill and eat. He is finding everything now, not even gracious

enough when he opens a building to pay tribute to the man who built the building. (*Asides*). Traffic Wardens didn't start with him, Ellerslie didn't start with him.

3.30 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend should realise that Traffic Wardens came about as a result of a question I raised in here!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Regardless of whether it came about as a result of a question asked by you or not, it came about in our time. Furthermore, whenever he goes into the Ministry he is building a bath and removing a toilet. I do not blame him. Spend the money, wild, boy. They put you in power and you must use it up. The Minister of Education is putting in a bath in the Ministry of Education and removing a toilet which the Parliamentary Secretary used to use. Let us get our facts straight now. All of this hypocrisy in this country has to stop. Speaking about the shower, I wonder if it is warm and cold water, too. I have not heard about that part yet, but the shower is coming up.

Now he has introduced in this Manifesto, and there is no mention of it in the Throne Speech — in here is going to be rough. (*Asides*.) I have 60 months, and I am going to take my 60 months. If you say that I have 60 months, then I am going to enjoy my 60 months. Look at the promises the Minister of Education made to the people. (*Asides*.) The Party and not him. What hurts me, Mr. Speaker, more is that, during the election campaign, the Minister of the Government Party got little children 9 and 10 in a paid advertisement to write: "I like the Barbados Labour Party because they are going to stop the 11 plus, and I do not like taking the 11 plus. I will get free uniforms." Yet, neither the abolition of the 11 plus examination nor free uniforms is mentioned in the Throne Speech. They paid the *Advocate* for an advertisement with two little children writing in a scrawl: "I like the Barbados Labour Party because they are going to stop the 11 plus examination."

Now, read the Throne Speech on Education. I am talking about omissions, Mr. Speaker. The 11 plus is coming up in May. The Labour Party says on this, and it is important: "Immediate abolition of the 11 plus examination." This is in heavy black print. When you are heavy and black you are heavy. You cannot miss it. It states: "A programme for making the entire educational system

co-educational. The abolition of the Common Entrance Examination (the 11 plus)." Now, children are preparing for this examination in May. (*Asides.*) Where is your pronouncement that it would not be taken next year in May? It is not in here now. Are you going to introduce it administratively? I am waiting for it, because I want to know what you are going to do about it. You are making all of these glib attempts to represent that the Minister is a McGuffie on education. (*Asides.*) Where is it in the Throne Speech that in May next in the First Session you are going to abolish the 11 plus? I will bet you that this Session will end and you will not abolish the 11 plus, but, be that as it may, good luck to you.

One would expect, since you have put it in heavy print, that just as you have mentioned about technical training, reviewing the Polytechnic and so on that one would have heard something about the 11 plus being abolished before May when the children now are worried. You have published an advertisement saying: "I like the B.L.P. because they are abolishing the 11 plus." I would have assumed that if you can use children to that extent, and use it as an advertisement in the newspaper, that you had clear ideas that those children would not take it at all. That is what you have used young children for. That was one of the worst things I came across in the last election. Children were used to write — (*Asides.*) I do not know who wrote it. I am not a handwriting expert, but I would really like to send it to an expert to see which member of the Party wrote it. I know who wrote it. But to see that this Government can use 9 and 10 year old children in a promise, and yet in their Throne Speech do not say in the First Session that it will be abolished by May, 1977. (*Asides.*) Well, 1980 might come, but when they can use that as an election gimmick — assuming that children wrote it — that is not fair.

Mr. Speaker, I am drawing attention to these omissions not because they may not honour them in 1981 just before election, but I am doing it because I am satisfied that these things rate priority. Mr. Speaker, when I was the Minister of Education I had the honour and pleasure of your shadowing me. Mr. Speaker, I know that, if you had had the honour of sitting in the chair next to the charming member for the City, you might have had a better chance of implementing the 11 plus than the member for St. George South.

Mr. SPEAKER: But as I understand the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, he is still awaiting his opportunity to sit the 11 plus.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I beg your pardon. I really did not hear the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is what you said.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Now, Mr. Speaker, with a remark like that you have just forced me to blow my own trumpet, and I do not want to do so. I do not think anybody could take that remark seriously. It is good to relieve the tension by such remarks. Let us go on to the omissions. The remarks about the 11 plus are in big black writing. Let us go on. Abolition of the 11 plus. Now, let us look at the Minister of Welfare. We were working actively during the Government's time trying to relieve old age pensioners of their commitment to pay water and light bills. Where can I find any mention under Welfare of the intention of the Minister of Labour to pursue this matter? It is promised, Mr. Speaker, and I can read it to you. It is promised here again. This is in small type this time. "Ensure full implementation of the proposals to pay the water rates and electricity bills for old age pensioners." But nowhere in the Throne Speech is any mention made of this commitment to be honoured in the First Session.

What is worst, as I say in dealing with old people, they are dying day by day. It is not a question of they not dying. They are dying. (*Asides.*) I killed them, but you must relieve them early. That is why I am appealing to you to relieve them early. If you say that we were killing them, then you have a wonderful opportunity now to relieve them early by giving them the \$20.00 you have promised them, by paying their water rates, by paying their bills, by giving them Old People's Homes, and all of the facilities. One belly full does not fatten a barrow you know. When I see them giving the old people a meal one day it is a good thing, but that is not all the old people want. I want you to know that one belly full does not fatten a barrow. A little outing, or any little thing.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, which barrow is the Leader of the House referring to? Will he identify it?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is a Barbadian expression, Mr. Speaker. When I see in the newspaper that people are being feted for one day, you must remember that they have to eat for 364 other days. Since this Government and the Minister of Labour and Welfare are the champions of people and old people, I want to see early in this Session, and they did mention this, apart from spending an hour with them, or

a half-hour a week, or a month, not only the pension increased to the \$20.00 which is mentioned in your Manifesto, not only the rate and the age lowered, but I would like to see you mentioning, "To ensure full implementation of the proposals to pay the water rates and the electricity bills for old age pensioners."

3.40 p.m.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an urgent priority and I with respect suggest that it must be honoured by this Government; by the Government that pretended to be able to honour it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Now let us come to another election lollipop. Now listen to them under Housing. No mention of this is made in the Throne Speech and I really should not mention this now. I should wait until the arrears in the Housing Authority get to about \$10 million — and I believe that is only to satisfy the Parliamentary Secretary who is sitting behind the Minister of Labour. Let me read this one now. The Corporation — this is on Housing, you know, Mr. Speaker. That a responsible Government — it is not mentioned here. I should wait until about 1979 when the people, on this promise, do not pay a cent and the arrears of the housing estates get to more millions. Let me read it to you. The Corporation to be directed to write off arrears of rent in the housing estate for persons who are genuinely unable to pay in order to give them a fresh start.

Now when are they going to make the fresh start? I really should have kept quiet on this and let you all go on merrily so that when it gets to about \$10 million and you have to honour this promise — but this is purely to satisfy the member for St. Michael South East who represents a big constituency and housing area where the residents are mostly delinquents. I believe this was your plug — the member for St. Michael South East probably had this plug in. The member for North East will reach it in another year or two, so I do not know if I should raise it or let the member for North East get his moratorium like the member for St. Michael North West.

How can a responsible Government make a promise to people that people living in Government houses and who are getting the benefit of Government houses, who have cars, television, radio and everything — they are going to write off these arrears. You have to honour it, you know. I am not telling them not to pay rent. In 1971 when the hon. member for St. Thomas, Neville Boxille lost, I went to the Ministry of

Labour for a month and I had an order drawn up to get rid of all the people who did not pay rent, and then I was transferred to the Ministry of Communications and Works. So I do not believe in people using facilities, who are in a position to pay. Now how are you going to tell who is able to pay or not?

What I wanted to see in your Throne Speech is some indication that you are going to write off the rent from a certain date. So are you going to let the rents accumulate, accumulate, or are you going to let the session pass? This is another important financial measure and that is why when I tie it in with the whole question of lollipops, goodies, and sweeties and toffees that the people are promised — how can they seriously honour what they have told the people in this manifesto?

Look at the total speech. If the people read this, that you are going to write off their arrears, you can understand they are going to back-back; so you had better introduce and write off early and start early, or do not build many houses this time. So I am warning you.

If you put that in, naturally the members in the housing estates start at an advantage. Any member who represented a housing area where people are told if you are in arrears we are going to write it off, those people should vote for you. This is commonsense. They should vote for you, and this is probably what they did. As I say, we should watch that with the greatest interest.

Now Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of hearing the Prime Minister address the United Nations yesterday. I do not listen to him much but I heard now he has been in power since the 3rd September, and if you had listened to his speech, his speech is a tribute to the good Government of the Democratic Labour Party. It was a tribute to us that nothing he could say about the foreign policy of this country, about Barbadians, about their love of democracy, about this, that and the other — he could not create. It was the former Government that created the foreign policy; and if you had listened to him you will have found that in no way has he departed from the Democratic Labour Party's foreign policy in this country. In no way. He does not say he has one either. We may not have had one but his speech to the United Nations did not create one and he certainly did not give any indication that he was deviating from the policy which we over the years, since Independence, have created for this country.

Read that speech. He wants Angola in. We agree with Angola. He wants Korea in. He did

not say which but he used Korea blankly. He wanted Vietnam in. He did not say which. Well, there is one now they are united. Korea is not united but he did not say if South or North. So we are not going to let him get away with that. Korea is two Koreas. (*Aside*) Is Korea united? Do not talk foolishness. Haven't they just shot an American in the Demilitarized Zone for cutting down a cherry tree? Do you all not read? Is there one Korea? (*ASIDES*) Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; but when I.....

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. It was not a cherry tree. It was a popular tree.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am glad to hear the maiden speech of the hon. member for St. Michael West. It was a very nice maiden speech. Mr. Speaker, be that as it may, I hope the member for St. Michael West would understand that in Parliament we do have the asides. I am glad to hear his voice. I would not characterize it as your maiden speech because I know I will have the pleasure of hearing so many speeches from you having had the pleasure of meeting your charming mother. So forget my reference. I think you know me well enough. Apology to your mother; but let us go on.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us get on with the Throne Speech.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, when you seriously read this speech — and I will get back. There are two Koreas, there is one Vietnam now. (*ASIDES*) The Prime Minister did not mention if he was breaking off diplomatic relations with Taiwan and forming diplomatic relations with the Communist Chinese — the People's Republic — this is what we are waiting to see; but what I am saying is, he did not say it at the United Nations where he had an opportunity to indicate to the world what his foreign policy was. I had the pleasure of listening to his statement, and he praised the Caribbean, he praised Barbados, which he has a right to do; but in no single instance did he deviate from the policy which the Democratic Labour Party had pursued during its term of office after independence. You read it and you will see.

When I was listening I thought I was going to hear some new initiatives, some new startling foreign policy decisions. What I am looking for and what I would like to hear from him — the Budget Speech for the expenditure is coming up — I want to know from him — and this is going to be interesting — that he has promised the people in this country so many things; he is going

to cut down the expenditure. We were tired hearing of this when we were in Government, how he is going to cut out this, cut out that, cut out the next, make people sleep under London Bridge, and he is going to make them do this and that, and I am waiting to see whether he is going to close down or sell the houses that cost all of this money, when he is going to cut down on staff, close the Embassy in Venezuela, the one in London, the one in New York — I want to see what he is going to do, and when he is going to cut down salaries in order to bring, within what they in the Government consider reasonable limits, the foreign policy of this country.
3.50 p.m.

Now you will find this. When you were in the Opposition you acted as if you did not understand what independence meant. Now you are the Government. We are watching to see whether you are going to close down the Embassies, because the impression was always given to the public of this country that the Democratic Labour Party had over rated the embassies, that they drank champagne and did all sorts of things that were wrong. Come budget time next year and expenditure time the Opposition is expecting a significant cut in expenditure for External Affairs. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance is not here. He has got a lot to answer for because they have been fooling the people of this country, not appreciating what independence meant. They have not been telling the people the truth. They made it appear that you could run an independent country, an independent country which you inherited, on a truncated foreign affairs and overseas representation. (*Aside*) That is no big thing. That is no secret salary. It was in the budget. How much do you think he used to get? \$3,000? But with the cost of living going up in London, watch and see.

Anyhow, I will be watching it like a hawk. If the Government cannot significantly cut down on the overseas cost of the Foreign Affairs Department of their Government then we will have seriously to question whether they were not fooling the people all the time that the last Government was extravagant in their presentations.

Let us look at some of the goodies in the Throne Speech. I was very relieved today to hear the Deputy Prime Minister mention the Coast Guard, because the Coast Guard went out to help rescue 73 people who lives were unfortunately lost. If there is one department which came in for criticism when we were in power, it was the Coast Guard. We heard how it went fishing in the

Grenadines, that it was a waste of time and a waste of money. Well, I have the privilege and the pleasure of hearing the Deputy Prime Minister today talk twice about the valuable services rendered by the Coast Guard in an attempt to rescue or salvage, or what have you, people from the aircraft which was unfortunately lost. One would have got the impression during the last session that as soon as they got into power we would have had an auction sale of the four boats and the Coast Guard would have been finished with.

If you read their manifesto, it makes very interesting reading. It says: "Defence and Security — Barbados should have no territorial ambitions" — well Pelican has gone and we are getting some dredges. The manifesto goes on: "Whilst recognising the Crucial geographical significance of the North American and Latin American continents, there is no reason why Barbados should attract foreign invasion or intervention. The party will not commit our country to any foreign defence pact. Internally, the Defence Forces will be limited to such as are adequate to maintain law and order. There will be no need to maintain any standing army or other defence forces. Externally, the party will work towards the elimination of all armaments of war and the achievement of total world peace."

What is the Government doing? Are you keeping the Coast Guard, or are you scrapping it? I ask that because if you go through the debates of this Chamber, year after year, every time you come for a penny for the Coast Guard you would hear criticisms that would curl your hair. Now you are in charge of the Coast Guard, and you are going to praise it today as a vital link in the rescue operations after the unfortunate incident. What is the Government's policy as regards the Coast Guard? Are you keeping it or are you not? One would expect to hear something because when you were in Opposition, every Tuesday, every time we came for one cent, every budget time you were attacking it. (*Aside*) You are keeping it? All right, keep it. You know that politics is a strange game. You in, you out, you out, you in. You shout with one side of your mouth today and tomorrow you talk with the other side. It is a good game for lawyers. It is the best game for them because we are accustomed to talking on both sides of a story. You are for the defendant today and you can be for the plaintiff tomorrow. We are for the accused today and for the prosecution tomorrow. It is not fair to the people whom you have led to believe that the Coast Guard was a colossal waste of money, that it was a play thing of the Minister of Finance. Now, not one word on it.

You indicated in your manifesto that you were not happy with Barbados' membership of the Organisation of American States. This is interesting. I hope that you do not spend one cent of the millions that the democratic Labour Party Government got from the Inter-American Development Bank. That is what you are saying in your manifesto. On Page 22 it says: "The party is not yet convinced that continued association with the OAS is bringing any tangible benefits." They are not satisfied that they are getting any tangible benefits from being a member of the OAS of which the Inter-American Development Bank is an arm; but you still got money for the Community College which the Minister of Education has praised. You got a loan whether you use it or not for the sewage scheme. You got a loan approved for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. You have been getting technical aid to set up a language laboratory at the Community College.

I am going to watch you. It may not appeal to the man in the Street because he may feel that OAS means something else; but I would like the knowledgeable people of Barbados to listen to your manifesto on the OAS. Ask some people in the street what OAS means and they may not even know.

The manifesto goes on: "The party is however, interested in promoting a wider Latin and Caribbean group. We will critically and thoroughly examine Barbados' relationship with the OAS in an effort to determine our future association with that body." There is no provision for this in the Throne Speech. I want the Government early to tell the public if they are breaking off relationship or pulling out of the OAS. As a matter of fact what is even more vicious and ridiculous is that that wicked Government over there, Mr. Speaker, terminated the appointment of the Ambassador to the OAS with six hours notice when he was acting as Chairman on the Permanent Council of the OAS.

The Foreign Minister sent a letter to him on the 15th September telling him that the Acting Governor General had terminated his appointment forthwith after leading him to believe — (*Asides*) it is inhuman. You are not dealing with dogs. You are dealing with a fellow Barbadian. You wrote him on the 3rd September. You get into power on the 2nd September. On the 3rd September you sent a telegram to the Permanent Representative. You could not even wait. You sent him a telegram telling him that the Prime Minister is expecting him to resign. He is a Barbadian. If you are going to get rid of him

you do not have to be so inhuman. As a matter of fact, the other ambassadors in America wanted to know if there was a military coup in Barbados. One Latin American said Barbados has a reputation for being sane and reasonable. It was a shock to our Caribbean Colleagues who were members of the OAS. As a matter of fact when he got the letter from the Foreign Ministry he was still Chairman on the Council.
4.00 p.m.

He was to receive the Latin American Ambassador which fell to be his job as Chairman of the Permanent Council. He was to attend certain functions as Barbados' Representative and as Chairman of the Permanent Council. He may be of a different political persuasion, but you do not have to treat him as a dog. This will go down in political history and anybody sent up to represent Barbados on the Organisation of American States will have a hard time, because you have created the impression that you are an inhuman bunch of people, that you can look at a Barbadian who is a responsible person, and, after you wrote to him and told him you wanted his resignation and he wrote back and told you "yes", send him a letter six hours before closing time saying that the Governor-General has terminated his appointment on the very day, and then you send to him on the very day when your conscience starts to prick you and say that he can remain on post for ten days to say good bye. You do not tell him he will get a cent. (*Asides*) And you want the right to appoint backbenchers on this side to Statutory Boards when you can show your inhuman nature by treating a fellow Barbadian that way. You would not even treat a Trinidadian that way. (Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: You chased away Ramsey on Christmas day.) But he stayed in the house. (*Asides*) Let me say this; anybody you send to the OAS will run into the disgraceful way you have treated this Barbadian.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I wonder if the hon. member would tell this House how many times the OAS communicated with Barbados in English. They send documents to me written in Spanish. What OAS are you talking about? Ask Dr. Caddle what are his views on the OAS.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I expect a pronouncement from Government within the shortest possible time that it is pulling out of OAS. That is what you must do. If you say it is nothing, you are Minister of Agriculture and you have collective responsibility. The Deputy Prime Minister says it is not anything, so the public of Barbados expects a pronouncement from the

Barbados Labour Party Government in a short time that they will be pulling out of OAS and sending back the money they got from the IADB. The morality of the Government is seriously in doubt. You would invite a person to your home put some drinks on the table and when you get the money, say "friend, go through the door". (*Asides.*) I have not reached part 2 of my speech yet. What I am saying is that it will go down in history that the Barbados Labour Party as one of its first acts of Government, treated another Barbadian inhumanly. He had written a letter to the Prime Minister which he copied to the Leader of the Opposition. I did not expect it to come up in this debate, otherwise I would have brought it and made it a document of the House, because it shows clearly that this Government.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the fact that you have served on the other side for a very long time and it has always been a policy of yours to ask handicapped children to come out of the sun. Do not let the hon. member catch a cold, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James will take his seat.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: How did you get so high up in that Party?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am pleading with the Leader of the Opposition not to encourage cross talk in this Honourable House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: When he gets up and makes a foolish point like that, what do you expect? As I was saying, a Government changes which is part of the democratic process, but how can you be so inhuman to your own fellow Barbadian. It is not like Gairy who has a Columbian as his representative at the U.N. Anybody knows that with a change of Government you have to tender your resignation, but he was Chairman of the Permanent Council. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: I will invite the hon. member not to listen to asides but to continue to address the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that at the moment when elections took place he was Chairman of the Permanent Council and one of his functions was to receive Ambassadors. It was only for a month and life is so short that he did not have to treat a Barbadian that inhumanly that you terminated his appointment from the day he received the telex, and then you wrote back and said he could stay on the post for ten

days without telling him whether he would get any money. I am going to read the letter in the debate to let the public get an idea of how Barbadians can treat a Barbadian when they get a little power.

Mr. Speaker, I am expecting to hear from the Government in power that within a short time they will come to Parliament with a recessment of Barbados' membership of the O.A.S., and judging from the comments of the Government.....

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is very sad to hear the Leader of the Opposition try to accuse us on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please state your point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I would like him to compare Morgan's treatment of Tom Clarke and what he is talking about and about the last Speaker, Mr. Hoppin.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Even being a Minister does not increase intelligence. If you want to talk about Morgan and Clarke, you can do that, but I am doing my own thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to the Leader of the Opposition to ignore the asides and continue his speech.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the first part of my reply to the Throne Speech deals with the serious omissions of the Government as compared to what they had promised the people in the manifesto. The public must begin to wonder when, oh when will they come to fulfil those glorious promises which they have made.

Now Mr. Speaker, the second aspect of my Resolution deals with the serious question of the employment situation in Barbados, and if you read the Throne Speech from beginning to end you will realise quite seriously that the Barbados Labour Party, apart from carrying on the projects which the Democratic Labour Party left them, have not made one serious projection or even mentioned one serious project to relieve the unemployment in this country which the Prime Minister said in his Budget Speech was 28%. At least when we got into power in 1961 we had a crash programme, and one would have expected that when they got into power they would have

done something, if not spectacular something meaningful.

4.10 p.m.

What have you done? You are carrying out (Asides)

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to draw the Speaker's attention to Standing Order No. 33 on the behaviour of members not speaking. I think that they are provoking the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thank the hon. member very much, but I would wish to tell him that his attempt to do so is a reflection on the Chair.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, they are not provoking me, they are just interrupting me. This second ground of my argument here. If you read the entire Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, you will find that all they have mentioned so far is that they are carrying on the projects which they found when the Democratic Labour Party went out of power. They are carrying on the Deep Water Harbour, they are carrying on the airport, they are lucky to have the Community College, they are reviewing the Polytechnic, but in the immediate future, with Christmas around the corner, when they say that the unemployment rate of this country is at least as high as 28%, I can find no project mentioned here to relieve that massive unemployment on which they took the Government to task. This is important. This is important because this is very vital, because, Mr. Speaker, after all they are saying, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in his reply to the budget speech indicated that the unemployment percentage was 28% at least, yet nowhere can I find in the Throne Speech by the Government any project for the immediate future to bring some relief to these masses whom they say are unemployed. Further from that, what do we hear? People being laid off at the Transport Board, people being laid off — 258 of them, and they are laying off some more today — at the Parks and Beaches Commission, women with six, seven and eight children, and what is important, Mr. Speaker, is that I was present at the opening of the Assizes and the Acting Chief Justice said that the crime rate between January and August 1976 had dropped by 25% from the crime rate between January and August 1975, because we were employing people. A man who has an honest day's work and bread going home does not have to look for it in any dishonest manner, and that is what the Acting Chief Justice said, that the Commissioner of Police had clearly indicated to him, whether they were working at

Parks and Beaches or the Transport Board, that the crime rate in Barbados had dropped 25% in 1976, and I attribute that, whether it is a political gimmick, no matter what it is, it is a Barbadian desire to earn an honest dollar. When he goes home and the children are bawling and crying and he can bring home \$40 or \$50 it is all right, but if he does not have it he has to come to me, to you, to the merchants, to somebody to know where he is going to get it from. This is what is important.

You should be in a position to find alternative employment. Assuming you had to lay off somebody from Parks and Beaches, some from the Transport Board, if this Government is seriously concerned with the employment and the working class situation in this country, is it beyond you to devise some scheme whereby you can give gainful employment on a crash temporary system to the workers of this country? We did it in 1961, and you owe it to the people of this country, with Christmas coming up just two months away — you will soon hear carols, Good Christian Men Rejoice — but they are putting more money into the pockets of back benchers of this House and the people out there are starving. This week people do not know where their children will get a bread from. At least 1,000 to 1,400 people are going without bread, thanks to that Government that just got into power that is interested in employment. They castigated the Democratic Labour Party because we had employed people in order to enable them to earn an honest living, but the day of retribution is coming, the day when we are going to eat the bread the Devil kneads. If you think you are spiting the Democratic Labour Party by laying off 258 people — you got the seat, Carmichael lost — but if you think you are spiting Dr. Caddle by laying off people at the Transport Board, you have another thought coming, because you are not spiting me or Carmichael or Dr. Caddle, you are spiting the poor working class man who is prepared if he is given work to do — do not blame him if he is not given work, there is a lot of work in Barbados to be done — but you are spiting this poor, working class man who is prepared to work. It is a question of supervision of the work, it is a question of seeing that he does it, but what is important, Mr. Speaker, is that the working class man, the poor man, the man at the bottom has an opportunity to maintain his self-respect by earning an honest living. However small that pittance he takes home on a Friday or a Thursday, his children can have the respect for him, because Daddy is a working man and Daddy is bringing home the bread and the bacon, and this is important.

They say the Democratic Labour Party took them on on a six months' basis, but that is not true. I am instructed — do you hear the legal phrase, Mr. Minister of Labour? — I am instructed.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am appealing to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. Do you see the type of cross talk you are again inviting? You are obstructing the business of this House in so doing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I appreciate that. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I am instructed that at no time were these workers told they were being employed to the 30th September, and if the Government was really interested they had between the formation of the Government, instead of witch hunting to have a big Maguffy enquiry at the Housing — and the same Parks and Beaches falls under Senator Mapp — what they should do then is to look around the country through which they have campaigned over the last month, since 11th August, and find areas in which they could employ people to let them earn their daily bread and maintain their self-respect. Far from that, last week-end, this week-end, Christmas around the corner, carols soon to be heard, what have the masses to look for now? When the Leader of the Opposition of the last Parliament said in this House that the unemployment rate was 28% the members over there gave resounding cheers thumping the desks of this Chamber. No wonder now, since you applauded the fact that in Barbados there was 28% to 30% unemployment, that you are faced with the challenge of meeting the needs of these people you do not know what to do. This very table at which I stand was beaten to a pulp with your applause when the Leader of the Opposition said that the unemployment was 28% to 30%, and now what are you doing? Laying off people.

I am saying that you must find alternative work. Is it beyond you, with all those brains over there, according to the member for St. Michael North West, do you mean you have not got the experience to find alternative employment, temporary till all the glorious plans in your Manifesto can come to fruition? But you are going to send people on the dump heap of unemployment. This is what you have done, but you got 52% of the votes, you have 17 seats, you have the numbers, we have the few, but the day of reckoning is going to come. If you think that the people are going to forgive you for the callous way in which you have terminated their employment and have made no serious attempt to help them, you have another thought coming.

Now, roads. Tenantry roads, subsidiary roads, a lot of areas are there. Do you mean you cannot shift them? They are labourers, they are not skilled people. Your constituency is asking for things, the Minister of Communications and Works' constituency needs most things, do you mean you cannot adjust and shift? There are dams to be built, so many other promises to be fulfilled, are you going to let Christmas come and find these people unemployed?

4.20 p.m.

Are you going to let Christmas come and leave these people not being able to say, "Peace on earth and goodwill towards men over a bottle of rum?" Are you going to do that? (*Asides.*) Now, I did not provoke him, Mr. Speaker. I am really worried. The question of a supplementary vote is no big thing. Every year, since I have been in Parliament supplementary votes were obtained; votes were busted by August; votes were busted by July, and I do not see all of this big thing about supplementary votes. We spent half of our time in Parliament, Mr. Speaker, dealing with supplementary votes. Votes have been expended earlier than that in this Chamber. Votes have been expended soon after the Financial Year, but it is a big thing now. Money granted for the whole year is spent.

Do not let us go in for this political witch-hunting or victimisation. A lot of people do not understand that hearing this cross-talk between the Minister of Labour and myself does not mean that we are enemies. What I am saying is that in all of this fighting between politicians, it is the man in the street who suffers. The sooner he gets that in his head the better it will be for him. All of your attempts to prove that we were the villains of the peace, all of your attempts to prove that we were a wicked bunch of people and that you are the angels with wings sprouting from your backs, the man in the street is the one who is going to feel the pinch and he is the one who is going to suffer.

Therefore, I appeal to the Government to review the whole question of the Parks and Beaches. If you cannot employ them there, then you must look at other areas. Barbados at this time needs a mass programme of employment, temporarily at least, for Christmas time. I will support any scheme, or any financial requirement, that you may need to bring cheer and happiness to the masses that you say we made unemployed. The 28% that the Prime Minister, as Leader of the Opposition, said that we had created. I can find nowhere in your Speech any indication of anything which will

create in the immediate future some impact, temporarily even, on the employment situation in Barbados. Let me tell you that a hungry man is an angry man, and you by your goodies and lollipops have raised the hopes of the masses and especially the young people in this country. They are not going to stand it for too long, and you have done nothing in your Throne Speech to justify those hopes.

If you read the Throne Speech you will find that you have promised old age people increases; you have promised other people things, but what have you promised the unemployed masses of Barbados in this Speech? You have promised the women all sorts of legislation; you have promised the National Arts Council something; you have promised the children citizenship, but where is the employment you have promised the masses? I refer to the masses that you have wooed when you wanted their votes. I have read this Speech from cover to cover; I have looked for hope; I have looked for something in it that can make me feel that the man in the street, with the removal of the sales tax, can at least buy a bread. You have removed the sales tax, but you have done nothing to give him purchasing power, even to buy something out of the sales tax that has been removed. When is the Government coming forth with ideas to relieve the masses? I know that you cannot relieve all of them, but when you were in the Opposition you gave people the impression that you were going to solve the whole unemployment problem. We have always had unemployment, but where are the opportunities? I cannot find it in this. I do not know if it is in your head or your foot, or somewhere else, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if it is in the Government's head, foot, or somewhere else.

I am debating the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I can only look to the Throne Speech as an indication of the Government's intention for the next Session. That is the whole purpose of the Throne Speech, and I wish that I could take my seat in the knowledge that somewhere in this 12-page document there was some little scintilla of hope for the unemployed masses of this country. When I consider that in a very short time the Christmas Season will be upon us, I am looking forward now and between the House rising for December to hear something which will, at least, benefit the people.

Now, I want to deal with one final matter, Mr. Speaker, and it deals with this question of civil servants and teachers. The Prime Minister has very cleverly wooed to his side one Senator

Trotman who is the General Secretary to the National Union of Public Workers. When you read the debates of the Prime Minister and this falls under the Throne Speech on page 7, where "My Government is unswervingly committed to the principle of collective bargaining and will not countenance nor be a party to any measure or act which tends to undermine this process." Now I want to know from the Government, now that they have wheedled the General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers to be a Parliamentary Secretary in the Prime Minister's office, whether they are going to reopen negotiations with the teachers and with the civil servants to see that the collective bargaining process obtains. I would like to read from the debates in this House given by the Prime Minister, who is not here. Throughout the entire speech we heard from the Prime Minister that the salaries were not enough; that collective bargaining was the wrong process and so on. We have heard so many things, but now he is in power, if he is going to be honourable and honest, he owes it to the civil servants, he owes it to the teachers, to continue the bargaining process. He has clearly said that the 35% given by the Democratic Labour Party was wrong, and it was not enough. That we were calling on the civil servants to bear a sacrifice which the bus workers and other people in private enterprise did not bear. Is he going to honour his promises when he was in the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker, the very Parliamentary Secretary that he now has, who was the General Secretary to the Union of Public Workers and who had put up for eighty-something percent, and who kept on saying when the settlement was made — he criticised it, but everything explains itself now. This is a part of the tricks in '76, that the gentleman whom I can read as the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister was a member of the Barbados Labour Party since 1960.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making disparaging remarks about a person who is a member of the Other Place. He is not allowed to do that. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister is a member of the Other Place. It is a matter of public knowledge that he was sworn in as a member of the Other Place. He is alleging that, while he held another post, he dishonestly adopted a position by virtue of the fact of his membership of the Barbados Labour Party. He is not entitled, cowardly, to attack another person who is not in a position to defend himself upon the floor of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will desist from so doing.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am giving the facts. I read in the newspaper that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister was since 1960 a member of the Barbados Labour Party. I read in the newspaper and I know for a fact that a General Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers had asked for 88% for the workers. I also know as a fact that when the settlement was made he was a great critic of the Democratic Labour Party Government. I know as a fact that some how or other he finds himself as Parliamentary Secretary in the Barbados Labour Party Government. Is that disparaging? I do not have to draw any conclusions. The conclusions are obvious. A man who can negotiate for workers against us, and give the Government a negotiating team, and at every point criticised the settlement, suddenly finds himself called to higher office in the Opposition Government now that it is in power. Barbadians are not fools. You do not have to defend him. I am stating facts. Conclusions will be drawn both by the National Union of Public Workers and by the public. Now that he is in there, and since he said all the time that the settlement was unreasonable and unfair, I would expect him to advise the Prime Minister that he must start negotiations afresh with the very workers whom he said did not get a good deal under the Democratic Labour Party. That is only fair.

4.30 p.m.

The Prime Minister himself — if you will read what he said you will constantly find that he condemned; that is why I believe he put it in the Throne Speech, that they believe in collective bargaining, when he is in a situation now where as Minister responsible for Establishment and Personnel he is satisfied beyond a shadow of a doubt that the settlement for the civil servants arrived at in July was not arrived at after a proper collective bargaining process. The Government must tell the public whether they are prepared, — since the Deputy Prime Minister agrees, whether they are going to reopen negotiation with the Union of Public Workers and the other Union, and the teachers, to arrive at a proper financial conclusion for what they say we did wrong. That is what they have got to do, otherwise all the hot air they talked during the debate in increasing the salaries means nothing.

They are now in power and therefore one would expect them — these promises and these criticisms are going to come home to roost — and one will expect them, Mr. Speaker, to at

least attempt or go through the motions in order to honour and to pay, not lip service, but to pay true service to what they intend to do.

If you will read the debates of the House of Assembly on the 25th June, the Prime Minister's speech, as Leader of the Opposition, was replete with promises and criticisms that that Government, the Democratic Labour Party, had ridden rough on over the processes of collective bargaining, and that the settlement arrived at was calling on civil servants and teachers to make an unusual sacrifice which in view of the high cost of living, was unreasonable.

I want the Government to tell me now or at any time they care to — and it will be raised on the Establishment Order again, and if it is raised on the Establishment Order I will be reading the speeches then; I am not going to bore you with them now. I have the speeches that he made and when we are dealing with the Teachers Order laid today and when we are dealing with the Civil Establishment Order I am going to read what he said and what the Opposition said, to indicate that they were not satisfied with the progress nor with the result of the settlement for the teachers. *(Aside)* I will read the Leader's and you can read the other. All right, I will read the speech of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, this is vital, and I want to say that I will be expecting the Government in a very short time to give forthwith an explanation or a promise that 'we will be re-opening negotiations with the civil servants.' The civil servants might very well be so happy now with a change of Government that they might not want any coppers. You never know human nature, you know, Mr. Speaker. They might be so happy now that they have new Ministers in office to tell them what to do that they might find the power of guiding is more important than the coppers of shopping. You get this mentality. They might feel that with a new bunch of Ministers they are so much happier with them guiding them and telling them what to do, that they will forget the salary increase which they say we did not give them when we should have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so much there is that I can say. As I said, and I will go back to my original premise; Government will be given by the Opposition a reasonable time to come with specific pieces of legislation to implement the vague promises made in the Throne Speech. I shall not say anything on the re-naming of the Grantley Adams Airport at all. I shall not quarrel with things like that. That is just part of the speech with which I do not think we have too

much quarrel. What I am saying finally is, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular speech the matters to which I have adverted my mind and the matters that I have mentioned have left me with a certain degree of misgiving and I can only come to the conclusion that the Government concentrated more or less on the plans which they have inherited from the Democratic Labour Party without coming up with any new ideas of their own either for immediate employment purposes or otherwise; and I need not, Mr. Speaker, point out finally that in this particular budget speech — I wonder when you look at the promises made and the Government's projection — either they are going to get manner from Heaven or they are going to find oil or uranium, Mafia or some other source has got to produce the money for them to meet these. Some organization somewhere. When you look at this coast road that they are building, Mr. Speaker — it will be a nice road on which to drive from Belleplaine right through. When you consider the necessary examination which will be given — a new coastal road in the parishes of St. Joseph, St. John and in northern St. Philip to link up with the East Coast Road and Bathsheba and the St. Philip road at Blades Hill in order to develop the coast road, now, from where are you going to get the money to do this when people need tenantry roads, widening of corners; do you know how much that is going to cost? Anyhow as I said, it falls under.....

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has mentioned the question of tenantry roads. I draw his attention to the same Throne Speech at page 6 where it says 'the improvement of subsidiary roads and private tenantry roads will be accelerated.'

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Point taken. What I am saying is, if you are going to accelerate tenantry roads, subsidiary roads, road improvement, and you are going to build this colossal road with gullies and need for bridges, where are you going to get the coppers from? That is all I am saying; so we are not at cross purposes. You are going to accelerate tenantry roads, subsidiary roads and other roads; you are going to build a colossal road from Bathsheba right up to Blades Hill. I appreciate that the member for St. Philip North wants a little piece of the action because Blades Hill belongs to him. So he wants a little piece of road by the coast. That is reasonable; but what I am saying is that my Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is dealing with the fact that nowhere in all of these promises can we find one penny, and if the pattern of the Government in removing trade tax — and that is something that will be dealt with

later on; and if you will notice again the same phrase 'my Government will provide relief from trade tax for many small traders on whom that is now a burden.' Do you see the vagueness of who is small and who is big? I am going to watch you all like a hawk because when that legislation comes down we have to know who is big and who is small.

4.40 p.m.

When you look at the Legal Aid Scheme, the works programme, the cost against roads, community centres, day care centres — money like peas — and yet they are going to remove the burden of taxation from the masses of this country. Yet, the Acting Governor-General has presented a programme which in the absence of taxation is replete with promises which I can only describe as lollipops.

I notice that they have not mentioned an increase in bus fares. I know that the Minister of Communications and Works has said that he was reviewing it. It does not seem that the review will take place in this session.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Leader of the Opposition please take his seat. The time being 4.45 p.m., Private Members Business has come to an end.

RESUMPTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: When the suspension was taken the hon. member for St. Michael South was addressing the Chair. He has a further 20 minutes.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I do not really intend to delay the Chamber on this particular measure. I just have a few points to make on it. As this particular measure has been characterised, it is in the nature of an experiment. That is the terminology I heard used by the member for Christ Church East, and any new Government, I suppose, is entitled to carry out some experiments; but in carrying out this experiment I would like to issue a warning. This particular measure appears innocent on the face of it. What it is really doing, as the Leader of the House stated when he introduced the measure, is to remove certain disabilities which hon. members suffered in serving on some of the Statutory Boards at the present time; and this amending Bill is to remove the disabilities which relate to the Statutory Boards listed in the Schedule to the Bill to permit members of this House to serve on these Boards; and then we have the additional proposition that members may also become chairmen of these boards.

I think that it is that particular aspect of the measure which gives concern to those on this side of the House. As I was indicating, there are certain essential characteristics which most of us who have studied Statutory Boards and corporations have come to expect in such bodies, and I believe that five such characteristics have been identified. One of the main purposes as indicated when I started to speak was that a statutory body should have relative freedom in terms of day to day management and that therefore there should be specific means of carrying out investigations and for discussing matters relating to statutory boards. They should have a certain freedom from parliamentary inquiry, and therefore there should be specific means whereby such inquiries could be undertaken; and that to me constitutes one of the essential characteristics of the classic statutory corporation.

The second characteristic will be that the personnel has freedom in terms of appointment and in terms of conditions of service from a Government Department; that they are able to renovate these matters of personnel and day to day management within the framework of the corporation itself and not within the framework of any Government Department.

Thirdly, one of the essential characteristics would be that in terms of financing, the corporation should be self contained so that it meets the needs for its particular operation, and that has to come either from its own sources of revenue or those which are provided as a sum to the corporation for carrying out its particular functions.

I will say that lastly — and this is a very essential point — if we look at the establishment of statutory corporations and their functioning in other countries, one expert in this area has indicated that the members of these corporations, the chairmen and members, are appointed for fixed terms that they are normally allowed to serve.

That, in terms of the research I have been able to carry out, represent the essential characteristics of the statutory boards and corporations. I am saying that while I recognise that it is the right and the duty of the new Government to carry out these experiments and introduce into this Chamber measures which it believes will lead to an improvement in the management of these services, while they are free so to do, I would issue a warning that this may well put an end to the statutory boards or corporations as they are known; because when

you have members of Parliament not only as members of these boards but as chairmen, I think that that in itself derogates from the principle that the statutory board should be as free as possible from ministerial or political considerations in terms of the extrusion of its day to day operation and management.

According to this measure we will not have such a removal from political control or from party control in this House of Assembly; and that in itself derogates from the principle that the statutory corporation, as far as its accountability to Parliament is concerned, should be as free as possible from such control.

One of the arguments I have heard advanced — I do not remember if it was by the hon. member for St. Michael North West or the hon. member for Christ Church East — one of the arguments I heard advanced was that this amendment to make members of Parliament chairmen of statutory boards will lead to an increase in the efficiency of the administration of these statutory boards.

4.50 p.m.

I do not believe any such thing because, examined logically, by itself the appointment of a member of this Chamber as Chairman of a Statutory Board will not necessarily mean that the Board will be better managed, because that certainly would depend on the qualities and characteristics of the particular person who is Chairman of the Board. The simple fact that a member of this Chamber is endowed as Chairman of a Board will not necessarily and by itself mean that there will be efficiency in the management of this Statutory Board no more than making a particular member Speaker of this Honourable Chamber mean that that person would be a good Speaker. Now I am not referring to you, Mr. Speaker, because so far you have been very exemplary in your control of this Chamber and I am particularly pleased to note your rulings in respect of the hon. member for St. Joseph who has so far on five occasions.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I try to put God first.

Mr. SANDIFORD: We all put God first and that is why we stand for prayers in this Chamber. But he has made five fraudulent points of order and all five have been ruled out of order by you, Mr. Speaker. So we have no fears on those grounds. I wish to make the point that the Government is free if they want to experiment to come and experiment, but in this particular measure I think they owe a duty to this Chamber

to state that the classic Statutory Corporation as we know it will no longer exist as a result of this particular amendment, because we have a new dimension being introduced into the management of this Chamber, and the whole process of accountability will not necessarily be improved, because as has been stated, it is the Minister who is responsible to this Chamber, and you did not need to bring in another level of administration as far as the members of this Chamber are concerned in order to bring about that particular accountability. What I would ask those persons who make the appointments to these particular positions as Chairman of Statutory Boards is to avoid in the exercise of their responsibilities the possibilities of introducing a spoil system, because this is one of the dangers. I will put it no stronger than that. It is a very real danger to which this amending Bill can lay open these Statutory Corporations. This is something which I feel very strongly about. I do not wish to put it any stronger than that, but we will be watching from this side of the House to see how these responsibilities are exercised.

In respect, Mr. Speaker, of the argument that this may be the training ground for higher office — this is what the hon. member for Christ Church East indicated — I believe that there may be a lot of ambition on the backbenches over there, but it only came through very thinly. There may be ambitions, certainly not in the Chair. I am certain there are no ambitions for ministerial office as far as the Chair is concerned, but if this is to be considered as a training ground for higher office, there seems to be a lot of ambition on the back benches over there, and this has come through quite clearly. But I would say that the traditional means in the parliamentary system for training is the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries, but you have reduced the number of Parliamentary Secretaries and by this other device now of appointing members as Chairmen of Statutory Boards, giving a more or less concealed increase as members and Chairmen in emoluments or income to the members. You have got around that particular problem, giving the impression that you are cutting down Parliamentary Secretaries, but in effect you are using another device to have the person drawing emoluments not very dissimilar from them and trying to achieve the same purpose.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact it is a question of utilising the abilities of members of this Chamber in order to give them insights and training and scope as far as the business of public affairs in this country is concerned, I

learn where all of these things are later on. I have no instrument in my hand from any Minister, so that I am not in a position in respect of any of these Boards we are speaking of today. I am concerned at the concern shown by the members on the other side in relation to the activity at the National Housing Corporation. I am not saying any more on that because, as we know, Sir, the Minister has said that certain procedures are in train. But they show a lot of concern.

It was sought to attack the members on this side and say that we referred in our Manifesto to integrity. I only want to say this to the Leader of the Opposition, Sir. Integrity is a quality that can be judged historically and in terms of one's futuristic behaviour. They have the chance now to see how we will perform when we are on these Boards in the future, and whether our integrity stands the light of day. Historically, no one in this country can challenge the integrity of each and every one of us on this side. You have the example of how we behaved in the past as a guide to how we shall behave in the future.

Their fears, let me allay them now, about victimisation and about partisan behaviour by persons who are sympathetic to us and members of our side who head these Boards and sit on them, those fears may be unfounded unless you have something to hide. If you have something to hide, then do not sleep too good because everybody is going to know. We have open Government on this side as from the 2nd September. The public will be brought closer into contact with the dealings of Parliament and the functioning of the Government at every level in the future.

The Government of the D.L.P. in the last five years got too remote from the people. That is the same mistake Nkrumah made in Ghana. I want to assure them that if they look at some of the constitutions of the Boards; if they look at some of the Boards' compositions, they will see that we have been striving to have the Boards as broadly based and as broadly representative of variety of interest as possible. You will see that there is provision for the Workers Union and for the Confederation of Employers to be represented on certain of these Boards. We are trying, as far as possible, to maintain impartiality.

The Chairman has a lot of power, according to the hon. member for St. Lucy. The Chairman may have a lot of paper power

because, ultimately, the Chairman is answerable to the Minister, he is answerable to Parliament and at the end of the day he is answerable to the people whose votes he is seeking when the relevant time comes for casting your ballot. We want to assure the other side. The Hon. Prime Minister made a gesture to them to give us some of their people for the Boards so that we could have an Opposition scrutineer, if you like, close to the Board who would help to ensure that the Boards function properly and efficiently. They turned him down out of pique and, probably, following the leadership of the Chairman of that Party, not the Leader of the Opposition, behaved according to one report like a petulant school boy after he lost the election. He could not take it; so behave as you like. The offer was genuine. It was an attempt to get rid of the system of Party hacks, to eradicate the system of sycophants, and to kill as far as possible the system of yard fowlism with which they have been greatly concerned and which was part of their practice when they were in power.

You have heard Ministers, Mr. Speaker, in the past complain that the decisions of the Statutory Boards were very often kept away from the Ministers. In some cases, I must confess, I have heard Ministers complain that the people on the Statutory Boards refuse to take decisions and pass back everything, thereby holding up the smooth process of the Government. It is with a view to ridding us of that type of bureaucracy; the system where, perhaps, the Chairman of the Board was not *au fait* with the ramifications of Government's policy because he is not a member of the NEC, or he is not close to the policy-making body of the Party. It is with a view to putting people on Boards who are more closely associated with Government's policy and, therefore, in a better position to implement Government's policy that these amendments are sought. I wish to say that all of us on this side heartily support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one last statement. The erstwhile founder of this Party went out of politics and never was there an allegation of corruption against him. I refer to the late Sir Grantley Adams, Sir. We want to assure them that in the next five years we will face the electorate of this country fully satisfied that our characters are unblemished, and that the taint of corruption can never stick against any of us on this side.

5.20 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the debate on this matter has taken perhaps most of what will be said about it on both sides, and I have listened very carefully to the arguments put forward by the two hon. members who spoke from the Government side. As my colleague in the Opposition has said, this is a measure.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention that there were more than two hon. members who spoke from the Government side.

Mr. TAITT: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I only heard two of them.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope you are bearing in mind that all hon. members who spoke in this Chamber are hon. members of Parliament.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I only recalled hearing two of them, Sir, and if I indicated that I heard two, it is merely because I only heard two of them, Sir.

The Statutory Corporation is not something which has suddenly appeared out of the blue. The Statutory Corporation is a measure which historically relates more to North America than it does to Europe. Of course there has been the Coal Board and a couple of other Statutory Boards or Commissions in the United Kingdom but by and large, Sir, the public corporation has been an invention, if you will, of the North American system of Government. There are over some 5,000 Statutory Corporations or Authorities, as they are called, in North America, and many students of public administration have written as to why there has been need for a Statutory Corporation.

The basic reason, Mr. Speaker, has been to remove the public authority or the Statutory Corporation or the public Corporation away from the central government or the Government of authority, and because of the success which many of these corporations have had in the North American context, many of the developing countries have borrowed this form of public administration in their hope to become industrialized countries. So it was with Barbados. The Statutory Corporation came to Barbados in an attempt to get the public administration system in Barbados away from the bureaucracy.....

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I believe it is fortuitous that you should take over and sit in the Chair for the first time while I am on my feet, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr. TAITT: I say with all humility that I am very pleased to be the person who is addressing the Chair while you sit there because I think you know that I genuinely believe that you will carry out your duties with all the impartiality to which this honourable Chamber has become accustomed, and which the traditions of the Speakership in systems like these is regarded.

As I was saying, Sir, the public corporation came to Barbados in the hope that the system of public administration practised in this country would be upheld, and as we move towards industrialization and modernization of this country, that we would be spared some of the traditional problems associated with the central government and the central governmental system.

One of the problems which early attended public corporations was the problem of accountability. Now the hon. member for St. Philip North who spoke, just before me I believe, indicated that the Chairman is answerable to the Minister, to the people and to the Parliament, and I believe it is fair at the outset to indicate that no one can question or should attempt to question the integrity of the persons who will sit as Chairmen of these Boards.

It has been announced that certain hon. members of this Chamber will serve as Chairmen of Boards, and I for one do not know of anything about any of them so far which would lead me to feel that they are not men or women of integrity; and so Sir, if I speak in negative terms about this proposal it is not because I fear the particular persons who have been nominated to sit in these particular positions but because the system itself is open and lends itself more readily in my opinion, to the kind of corruption which the Government railed against and spoke against especially when it sat in Opposition. It is, as my colleague said, the right of the new Government to be innovative, it is the right of the new Government to try new things, but I do not believe that the new Government would wish to support that it is their right to go blindly barrowing forth merely because, to quote one of them, they have the numbers.

One of the unfortunate things about this system which we have is that today one side has

the numbers and tomorrow another side has the numbers, and very often there are persons who will vote in this system for a particular measure with which they might not necessarily agree, but it is the system to which we are committed. It does not follow that there will be a closer relationship between a Chairman who is a member of Parliament because he is a member of Parliament. Indeed, Sir, I hope you will understand that as I speak about what a columnist wrote in the newspaper recently in defence of this system — you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would be well aware of the particular article. I think the point made was that a Senator is equal to a member of Parliament. In terms of pure argument that may very well be so but the realities of life in Barbados, the realities of Parliamentary life in Barbados say that that is not so. It is not true that a Senator in the Other Place is equal to a member of Parliament in the sense that the article and indeed some of the arguments put forward suggested. For those reasons one has to question the principle which says that a Minister in the Government is going to direct another member of Parliament in the same way that he would direct an ordinary person were he appointing an ordinary person to be Chairman of a Board.

We know and you will find out that this is not so. It has been said that the Boards in Barbados have been packed by what is described — I think it is a most despicable description of persons myself — as yard fowls.

5.30 p.m.

I believe that to term persons who support political parties as yard fowls is not the most desirable thing for us in Barbados. I have always said, and have always been concerned, that when the Government was in the Opposition the persons who supported the members of the Opposition were termed "supporters" and those who supported the Government were termed "yard fowls". There is a high class variety of yard fowl, I am told, the Leghorn. I do not want to get into that because I think that you can distinguish between a yard fowl and a Leghorn.

It does not necessarily follow that a member of Parliament will respond to another member of Parliament in the same way because one is termed a Minister. You walk and talk in the hustings and all become members of Parliament. You will continue to feel that as long as you are in here there is none greater than you who also is in here. When a Minister is addressing a chairman of a board who is also a member of Parliament his attitude is bound to be different.

I will go further. What bothers me about this Bill is not whether parliamentarians will be chairmen of boards, but this is the beginning of something which I hope is not the intention of the Government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, you will recall that one of the issues in the recent campaigns was the issue of the one party state. You will recall that members of the present Government pressed and stressed that the worst thing that could happen in this country was to have a one party state. There are two aspects of this amendment which lead me to feel that this is an introduction to a one party state in this country. (*Asides*)

I think it was either the member for St. Philip North or the Deputy Prime Minister who talked about there having been members of Parliament sitting on Boards before. I recall that it was the member for St. Philip North. Those were members sitting on Statutory Boards which had grown out of the disestablishment of the Local Government Councils; and when the then Government was establishing boards, having taken over the functions of Local Government, in order to retain those persons like the now Deputy Prime Minister who was a member of a Local Government Council — in order to retain those persons with their experience and knowledge on the boards, those persons were left on these boards as a matter of policy; but it was decided — and the Schedule to this amendment would confirm that — it was decided that with the new boards being established we would not continue that policy of having members of Parliament sitting on them; because, Mr. Deputy Speaker, whether one believes in the two party system or the one party system, the fact is that there is too close a relationship between a member of Parliament who is making executive decisions and an agency such as a statutory corporation.

It is a moot point. Some people argue for it and some will argue against it. We will have to see how it works out. I am saying that from the traditional or historical position of parliamentary representation one will see invariably a breakdown and that the patronage system can be encouraged.

You will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the history of the American Republics. Some of the members of the Government might not fully understand, but I know that you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will understand. You will recall that towards the end of the 19th century in America it was decided that they would get rid of the patronage system once and for all. A man had been promised a job by a politician. When he

went to collect his job he was given the heave ho and it was written that this was the man who was responsible for the assassination of the American President.

There has been a lot of talk about commissions of inquiry. I look forward with a great deal of anticipation to the commission of inquiry which the Government will hold into one of the statutory corporations. I hope that they will have inquiries into all of the statutory corporations as quickly as possible so that the people of Barbados will know what the real truth is in spite of what the innuendoes have been.

One of the serious misgivings we have about this Bill is when you offer members of the Opposition seats of these boards. As I have said, we decided as a matter of policy that we would retain those persons who are members of Local Government Councils; and that is why it is possible for them to get on the other side and point as an example that one who sat on a Board was a member of Parliament.

Members of the Opposition who sit on these Boards, especially the Barbados Marketing Corporation and the Industrial Development Corporation — members who sit from this side on these boards would find themselves, and must find themselves in an untenable position when they come into this Chamber because they could not call for accounting from themselves because they themselves would have participated in the decisions made.

5.40 p.m.

If one has principle, one cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time, and you could not sit down in a board room and agree to a proposal and then run and change your hat and when you come up to the House of Assembly you attack the Board. So when the hon. member talks about our having turned it down as if by turning it down we committed a sin, let him understand that by turning it down we sought to preserve the same system which they in their rantings and ravings claimed we would seek to introduce. There is no more subtle form, and I note again that the hon. member for St. Philip North is saying that it is necessary for the person who is more intimately connected with the policies of the Party to be involved with the decision making. Once you believe that, then there is nothing wrong with the system. It however leaves the way open for there to be only one kind of decision making, one kind of system, and in the final analysis what you will have is what they claimed they did not want — a very

subtle and through the back door introduction of a one-party system.

On the question of the composition of the boards, I noted that the hon. member for St. Philip North said that if one looks at the composition of the boards one will see that there are broadly based. There are two or three boards, I believe, that I used to be responsible for and in observing the changes that have been made in these boards, it appears that not much has changed in terms of the composition of these boards, because as far as I can make out they have retained most of the persons who sit on these boards, and I dare to suggest that the reason these persons have been retained is that they did not quite qualify as yard fowls, and so it gives the lie to the contention constantly made in this Chamber that the Democratic Labour Party did nothing else but put yard fowls on their boards. The Industrial Development Corporation is a board which the Minister had an opportunity to review, and I believe that he found that the Industrial Development Corporation Board works in the way he would more or less like it to work. The Marketing Corporation is a board which the Minister of Agriculture and Consumer Affairs and a number of other things which I cannot remember, Mr. Deputy Speaker, will find that it has a number of members on it who will operate more or less the way he will want them to operate. (*Asides*) One has to assume that he is not going to get rid of them because he has retained the Deputy Chairman and most of the other members. (*Asides*)

The point is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that all of them who talk about impartiality and integrity, when it comes to examining the boards themselves will still find that they have appointed persons to boards in Barbados whose only contribution, whose only claim to fame can be that they are friends or cronies of one or other of those Ministers, and furthermore they have revoked the appointment of persons in this community who are considered to be outstanding persons. (Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Like whom?) A certain bank manager; I am talking about a commercial bank manager; I do not want to call his name to put it in the record. He had three months to go and they, like if they could not wait, ripped him off the board. I do not think it is necessary for persons to resign from boards. After all we are bound to retain all those persons who have certain integrity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am saying to you that it is wicked for them to be suggesting on the one hand that we must have unity in the country and that they are going to retain all those persons of integrity, but they have revoked and ripped

off members of a board who in this community stand as paragons of virtue, if you like. Another one is the Tourist Board. Look at the persons who were serving on the Tourist Board; examine them carefully and see if you can find that all of the persons they have revoked are persons unworthy in this community. They can fool some of the people some of the time, but they cannot do it all the time. They will learn. They cannot come and tell us that there is not going to be cutting off of heads when at the same time they are chipping off ankles. They do not go for the heads, they go for the ankles.

I do not intend to spend a lot of time in what in essence would be chit chat. I believe this measure is going to go through the House because as the Deputy Prime Minister used to say when we were both in the Other Place "Wunno got the numbers". And so, other than to record for them, for the people of Barbados and for posterity that this measure should have been given much more careful thought before it was implemented, this measure suggests that within the whole of Barbados there are only a few persons capable of helping with the administration of this country. I am having difficulty because I believe this is the first Government that has put the front benchers in the back and the back benchers in the front. You cannot argue that. And when I hear them talking, there are some in the front who would qualify as front benchers. I am sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you yourself would agree with the sentiments that most of the front benchers are sitting in the back; but you see, when they talk about a training ground, you do not take the opportunity to train persons when you are dealing with the destinies of all the people of a country, and I am sure that the hon. member for Christ Church East was not serious when he put forward that one of the reasons for this innovation was to provide a source of training for those who would aspire to higher office.

I believe they genuinely wanted to come with something new. I believe that having attacked the public corporations they had to come up with something, and they came up with an idea which will permit a number of the hon. member of this House to have positions of high authority while at the same time fulfilling a promise not to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries and to cut the number of Ministers. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that at some time in this Session the Prime Minister is going to come to this Parliament and indicate that because of the work load or some other such reason he has found it necessary to rearrange the

Ministries and upgrade them to increase their number.

5.50 p.m.

That is their business. They would have fulfilled the promises, they have fulfilled most of the peripheral promises, they have not got back to the substantial promises and there will be other times and other places in here when we can talk about those. We heard the Hon. Leader of the Opposition already and therefore, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are going to have another time to deal with these matters.

I know my time has run out, Sir, and I will spare you the trouble of having to tell me.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we have listened to a number of speeches on both sides of the House on this matter and I am not surprised at the quality of the opposition that has been given by the members on the other side to this measure. Fortunately for me the quality of the members on this side is such that from the very first speaker all of the arguments that were raised up to that time were demolished effectively, and all of those that were raised in the future were anticipated and demolished one by one.

I do not intend to repeat the revocations of the suggestions made against this proposal, but there is one point I would like to make very clear. The Barbados Labour Party has always believed that it is its duty to communicate, honestly and frankly, with the electorate. This we did not only in the 1976 Manifesto, but previously. Those who have a love of history and have access to previous Manifestoes of the Barbados Labour Party would appreciate that as long ago as 1966 the Barbados Labour Party has set out a positive and clear policy in relation to associating the machinery of Government with the elected representatives of Parliament.

We recognise that from the time there was the abolition of Local Government that there were certain areas of Government which intimately touched the daily lives of the people which the Government had decided were to be administered by Statutory Boards, and we felt that since those areas of Government intimately touched the daily lives of the people that the best people to look after those areas of Government were people who were accountable every five years to those people, and this is the difference between that Government and this Government. That Government tried, that Party tried indirectly to associate those areas of Government with elected members by appointing their stool pigeons as Chairmen of the Boards,

hon. members on this side repeatedly in the course of this debate have identified people who owed their election to the nomination of the Prime Minister in the last Government, and they were the ones they put to carry out the policy on these Boards. We never believed that this was the correct thing.

I also would like to point out that we see absolutely no conflict in the fact that the Minister is responsible to Parliament and is fully accountable in relation to Parliament for these Boards. The policy of these Boards will be determined by the Ministry, the day to day execution and the supervision will be determined by the respective Chairmen, and the Chairmen will be accountable to the Minister as the Minister is accountable to Parliament, so we see absolutely no conflict there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not believe that anyone who has followed closely the machinery of Government in this country could fail to recognise the sorry state of affairs in relation to these Boards. Time after time both in this Place and in the Other Place members have repeatedly complained of the failure of these Boards to account promptly in accordance with the provisions of the law. From now on the Chairmen of these Boards by their mere presence in Parliament will be evidence to the employees of these respective Boards that their conduct.....

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN:.....will be constantly under scrutiny of fellow members in the House of Assembly. I have absolutely no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that when it is realised that this is a genuine attempt on the part of the Government to provide a solution to a problem in a small country which has got to be innovated because we are attempting to fashion and use a system of Government which has been designed for large countries, we have to remember that we have a single tier system of Government and what we are attempting here today is to combine some of the elements of a single tier system of Government and some of the advantages of a dual system of Government. In many parts of the United Kingdom where there is Local Government, many of the areas of Government which are serviced by Boards in Barbados are serviced by politically elected committees of account who are primarily responsible for the supervision and day to day operation, and Housing is a classic example of that, so that we feel that this experiment should be judged in the light of these matters.

There is one final point I would like to make. It is said that this opens the door to corruption. I cannot conceive that the mere amendment of a law which permits a member of Parliament to sit on a Board can open the door to corruption. May I say, Sir, that corruption in my opinion does not result from the system but from the men who administer the system. It is my belief that whatever system of appointment of Chairmen you have, whether from the Senate or from the House of Assembly, if the men whom you appoint have a predilection to that kind of conduct they will in fact conduct themselves in that manner, so that is the answer to that problem. I have the greatest confidence that the disability which was in existence in respect of these particular Boards will by its removal permit people who have talent to contribute to the importance of the efficient administration of these important areas of Government, and I feel that this is an act on the part of the Government which in future years will be looked upon as a wise action which goes a long way towards improving the efficiency of the administration of Government.

6.00 p.m.

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

Ayes: Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. B. A. MILLER; Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM; Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS; Mr. E. E. ALLEYNE; Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. J. G. ODLE – 13.

Noes: Hon. F. G. SMITH and Mr. B. M. TAITT – 2.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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. ODLE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 and 2 were called and they stood part.

The Schedule was called and it stood part.

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass, and be cited as the Statutory Boards (Miscellaneous Amendments) Act, 1976.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that being the end of Government Business for the day, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th October, 1976, at twelve o'clock noon.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I did submit to Your Honour a matter which I had hoped to raise on the Adjournment, but, in view of the Ministerial Statement, I shall withdraw that matter.

The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 19th October, 1976, at twelve noon was put and resolved in the affirmative. Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.
6.05 p.m.