

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 19th July, 1977

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); R. St. C. WEEKES, Esq., J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Labour and Community Services); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Mr. E. E. GREAVES, B.A., Ed.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (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, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.

Prayers were read by Fr. F. A. Cayless.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members will have before them the Minutes of the Meetings of Tuesday, 21st June, 1977, Tuesday 28th June, 1977 and Tuesday, 12th July.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any suggestions for amendment from the other side or by any other hon. member, I beg to move that these Minutes be confirmed.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Minutes of 12th July, 1977. and as I recall it

there was some agreement between the Leader of Government Business and the Leader of the Opposition about giving notices of questions. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition did rise and ask for permission to ask certain questions, but I do not see any reference of his rising to speak in the Minutes. There is no reference at all to the fact that he did rise to seek permission for certain questions to be asked from this side, and I am wondering if to that extent the Minutes would not be inaccurate by this omission.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is my recollection also in accordance with that statement that the Leader of the Opposition did rise to speak, and I understand it was on the adjournment before the hon. member for St. Michael South spoke; so that between the words "noon" and "Mr. L. E. Sandiford", there should be "Hon. F. G. Smith spoke".

Mr. SPEAKER: The question then would be that the Minutes of the 21st and 28th June, and Minutes of 12th July, as amended, be confirmed.

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

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I am commanded to lay the following:

Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for one month ended 30th April 1977.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the Pensions (Pensionable Offices) (Amendment) Order, 1977.

On my own behalf I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the vesting of certain lands situated at Glebe, St. George, in the Barbados Cheshire Homes Association.

On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to amend the note to Item 2 — Head 109 — Ministry of Finance and Planning, of the 1977-78 Capital Estimates.

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

Resolution to grant the sum of \$360,000 out of the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates, 1977-78, Part I — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977-78, No. 6, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Bill to amend the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act.
12.25 p.m.

NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following Question. To enquire of the appropriate Minister:

1. Is the Minister aware that the majority of roads in the St. Michael South area are without concrete slipper drains for leading waste water efficiently away?

2. Is the Minister aware that even in the small number of cases where such drains are provided they are broken in several places and are in need of repair?

3. Is the Minister aware that the foregoing situation leads to the settling of waste water which soon becomes stagnant, noisome, and a threat to the cleanliness of the area and health of the residents?

4. Will the Minister state what plans there are for repairing the broken slipper drains and for installing slipper drains where they do not now exist?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, his question with respect to refuse collecting.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the Minister of Health and National Insurance:

1. Is the Minister aware that, in spite of the published schedules, refuse in the St. Michael South area is not being collected with the required frequency and thoroughness?

2. Will the Minister take steps to ensure that improvements are effected in the refuse collection system in the area mention?

3. Will the Minister indicate what supplemental measures are taken in cases where the regular refuse collection trucks miss their collection schedules?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question about persons previously working with the School Meals Department.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, to enquire of the appropriate Minister:

Will the Minister state:

(i) How many persons not previously working with the School Meals Department have been given employment with that Department on the unestablished staff since April 1, 1977?

(ii) What are the ages of each such person so employed?

(iii) From what dates was each such person employed?

(iv) How many persons have been recruited for employment with the School Meals Department's unestablished staff but whose actual employment is not scheduled to take place before 1st August, 1977?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I did give notice of some other Question at the same time concerning the dismissal....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member take his seat. The Clerk will....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Leader of the Opposition take his seat?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: We are members of this House whether we are being paid by the day or the week....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition take his seat. The hon. member for St. Michael South has already been communicated with by the Clerk with respect to the Question he has just attempted to ask.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South will not be heard further.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Crown Lands (Vesting and Disposal) Act be read a first time.

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

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

ORAL REPLY TO PARLIAMENTARY QUESTION

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the Reply to Question No. 38, asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is now ready.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Item No.1 be the first Item of Government Business.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

12.35 p.m.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78 No. 2

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Item No. 1 is the first Order of the day, and it is in the name of the Hon. Minister of Communications and Works.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, when this matter which is standing in my name came up for discussion on the last occasion a number of very important matters were raised, and as a result of the matters raised we decided that we would discuss this matter further and that we would have sought permission to postpone discussion for the time being.

As a result of such postponement and research into the matter we have come to the conclusion that we would seek the leave of the House to withdraw this Resolution in its present form. With the permission of the House I would like to ask leave to withdraw this Resolution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is seeking leave to withdraw this Resolution. There being no objection, leave to withdraw has been granted.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE NOTES RELATING TO CERTAIN VOTES IN THE ESTIMATES 1977-78

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, generally speaking I may say that the most of these notes are minor amendments.

HEAD 5(1) - CABINET OFFICE

Item 13 - Compensation

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is necessary to insert the words "or loss of property" between the words "person" and "in" so that it would read "Provides for claims for compensation for damage to property, clothing or the person or loss of property in cases where Government considers it equitable that some payment should be made." We are advised that this is required in order properly and aptly to describe the scope and ambit of the vote.

I beg to move that the note be amended accordingly.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 9(2) — TREASURY

Item 13 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There was some argument at Estimates Committee, as I recall, and it does seem that the fact that the Department of the Treasury was allowed a hot plate somehow managed to get omitted when the Estimates were drawn up, and now they have gone to buy the hot plate to warm their soup or whatever they use the hot plate for they discovered that there is no vote for a hot plate.

It is only \$80 but we are attempting to assist public workers to have superior conditions of work in the Public Service even at this level.

I beg to move that the words "Also provides for the purchase of a hot plate" be added to this note.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 11(1) — MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Item 18 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This, Mr. Chairman, was an omission. The note to Item 18 was altogether omitted and it should now be inserted. It reads as follows: "Provides for the purchase of 1 stationery cupboard, 1 mahogany desk, 1 mahogany chair, 1 mahogany bookcase, four 4-drawer filing cabinets, 8 upright chairs, 1 senior executive chair, 1 pine desk, 1 typist desk, 3 side tables, 1 typist chair, 4 double wooden desk trays."

I am sure that the Attorney General will explain why all this furniture to the amount of \$4,288 is required for his Department if called upon, but I imagine this would have been dealt with at Estimates if anybody had wished to call for it.

I beg to move that this note be added to Item 18.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

HEAD 11(2) — REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Item 12 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Again, Sir, this is a case of an omission. A sufficiency of funds was voted to include the filing cabinets but they themselves were not specified in the note.

I beg to move that the sentence "Also provides for the purchase of 2 filing cabinets" be added to the note.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I shan't be long, but I would like the Attorney General to tell me when something is going to be done in the Registry. If you buy more filing cabinets to put in there I do not know where the people are going to work. I know it is chaotic and they are very difficult circumstances under which the employees of whom the Prime Minister spoke just now work, except the School Meals Workers, he wants them to work, but be that as it may, could the Attorney General give us any idea as to how soon the Registry will be organised, because he is Mr. Fix-It-Right, he can tell me that as soon as he can.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I came into Parliament with the intention of fixing right all the wrongs committed by the past Government and all the omissions done by the past Government, including the hon. member when he was Attorney General, and I will fix them right as long as the economy of the country allows it and within the physical time available to the Civil Service and this Government.

So far as the hon. member's specific question is concerned, the hon. member is aware that the problems confronting the Registration Office have not been created between the months of September last year and July this year. They predated this Government. The last Government was aware of them, certainly during the time that I was in this Parliament, the last Government knew of them for the 15 years they were there, they found it impossible even to begin to attempt to do anything about it, and for the benefit of the

hon. member, so far I have asked for a survey to be carried out since no survey was done by your Government when you were in power.

12.45 p.m.

I have also inspected various other buildings in Bridgetown, including the Telephone Company building, and the Registrar and the people advising him have advised me that the building is not suitable for the Registry. It therefore means the construction of additional space. We are at present working on the five year development plan of this Ministry for adequate space not only for the Registry but for updating the courts in Bridgetown; and we hope that we will have enough space over the road in the old building which was formerly the Waterworks building; but it will mean the provision of offices.

Until these plans are available, the Registrar has done his best to re-arrange the internal arrangements in the Registration Office; and I am happy to say that since the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition, has been returned to practice in Lucas Street that he has for the first time become cognisant of the ills that have existed for a long time in this country.

I hope that during the time that I remain in the Government I will be able to put right some of those ills; but I must ask the people in the Registry to bear strain a little longer until we can get proper plans formulated. I am thankful to the hon. member for becoming aware of these matters and taking note of them on the floor of this House, although I would have liked him to have taken them up in a much better mode than talking about Mr. Fix-it-Right.

Since I am concerned as much as he is about people having great inconveniences in their working places, I can assure him that my department is working on the plan in conjunction with a Ministry which he once headed, the Ministry of Communications and Works. Whilst he was in that Ministry, that Ministry did nothing about this matter. We have this legacy of omission, and it is not an easy one to overcome in 10 months; but we will try to put it right.

The question that under Head 11(2) the note as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 111 — Ministry of the Attorney General — Item 7 — Vehicles — was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a slightly different case. The Police were voted two Valiant cars and one car;

but they are not purchasing two Valiants. They are purchasing three cars and we are asking to have the note amended accordingly, that is to delete the words "two Valiant cars and one car" and substitute therefor the words "three cars."

I beg to move that the note be so amended.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 15(11) — Libraries — Item 13 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a case where there was also an omission. It was forgotten that shelf units had also been agreed upon. I therefore beg to move that the provision for shelf units be added to the note to Item 13.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

Head 17(7) — Other Hospitals — Item 11 — Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which I believe was possibly known almost at the time of the Estimates. We all will understand that in such a long list it is possible to forget a few things. We forgot these items, — a bed elevator, two filing cabinets, one oxygen cylinder stand, one wheel chair, one deep freeze and one refrigerator.

I beg to move that the note to Item 11 be so amended.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question that under Head 17(7) the note as amended stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78
No. 5

Order 1(c) was called — A Resolution to grant the sum of \$918,750 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1977-78, Part 1 — Current, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1977-78, No. 5, which form the First Schedule to the Resolution, for payment of a Duty Allowance to members of the Royal Barbados Police Force and the Fire Service.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this matter of duty allowance for policemen has a long history, a history that has been canvassed in here before; but it is a matter of some importance, and therefore I think that some basic facts may well bear repetition. Up to until 14 or 15 years ago, the Police Force for salary purposes was treated very much as other parts of the Civil Service. The qualifications tended to attract the same salaries in the Police Force as those in the Teaching Service and the Clerical Service.

But, Sir, from 1961, it was recognised that a police constable carried certain responsibilities and is under certain dangers that do not normally attend the office of a school teacher or clerical officer; and the history of movements in police salary scales since 1961 has been a history of the recognition of these responsibilities and dangers in terms of an improved salary situation.
12.55 p.m.

As in Police Forces in other parts of the Commonwealth and, particularly, in Great Britain it was to reduce these different factors to monetary terms for the purpose of improving the salary of policemen, and a formula based on three factors on the recommendation of the Field Commission, which reported in 1962 has been evolved. The first of these factors, factor A, represents the average annual earnings of the skilled categories of the key-scale employees of Government. That, so to speak, is the basic factor on to which other amounts are added. Factor B was calculated as 45% of factor A, and it represented an estimated 20% to cover overtime, but the Police do not get overtime so they got a 20% increase on their basic salary in lieu of overtime, which would have been paid to key-scale employees, plus another 25% which represented additional overtime, you might say, or the extra hours worked by a constable and which took into account the hours of call. In other words, those hours when a Police Constable has to be at a Station in the event of being

needed urgently for law and order matters or other matters with which the Police Force deal. To represent this part of his deprivation of hours of recreation, he is given a 25% increase over and above the key-scale rate. Factor A adds 45% to the basic rate of other workers which a policeman will receive in lieu of special allowances for overtime.

Well, there is a third factor called for factor C which is 20% of factor A added to factor B, and this is the responsibility allowance. Inside that is embraced the responsibility that a Police Constable has to the community to assist in the maintenance of law and order and the dangers which a Police Constable may undergo in the course of his duty. This is the basic formula and it has led from a position of equality before the Field Commission was appointed — equality in basic rate which was then \$100.00 a month in 1961 up to a situation in 1967 on April 1 where the basic wage of a Police Constable is \$450.00 and the basic wage of someone in the key-scale services in the recruitment grade, teaching, agricultural and clerical is \$319.00; so there is a very substantial differential.

In 1973 the formula as such was abandoned under the previous regime, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of calculating increases of pay, and in that year the Police Service was given the same percentage rate of increase as other Government employees. Of course, Mr. Chairman, in spite of this the formula had been applied and, therefore, the Police Service will always have this built-in advantage at recruitment level over and above the other Services. A policeman, unless there is some drastic change in the formula, with the same qualifications will always get more than a teacher or a clerical officer when he is recruited into the Service.

The 1973 alterations did not give them an additional amount more, but it preserved the differential between them. Now about this time the 5-day week came into discussion. Other Government Officers were put on what was called a 5-day week. Now, there are a lot of misunderstandings about the nature of a 5-day week. The immediate impression is that you get a half day a week off. That was not how the Public Service was organised for the 5-day week. That half day a week off was divided into five and a proportionate amount added to the day's work; therefore, the same amount of hours are supposed to be worked by the Public Service but over five days rather than spread over six.

The Royal Barbados Police Force's negotiators, perhaps, did not see it in this light at

that time, and for a number of years negotiations went on, many of them, I think on the basic misapprehension that the rest of the Public Service had got an advantage in working hours which was being denied to the Police Force. For this and for other reasons the former Government, under the personal hand of the then Prime Minister, instructed the Chief Establishment Officer to inform the Police tactfully that their claim for a duty allowance to represent additional overtime and to take into account the factors of the 5-day week could not be allowed, but as the Election time drew near the matter was reopened.

Indeed, when I came into office, my first impression, without question, when I saw the file, was to agree with the former Prime Minister and say that there was no merit in the claim and to dismiss it. I was fortified in this initial conclusion by the fact that it did not seem to me correct that Policemen were working for 60 hours a week. There was an analysis done by the Establishment Division and it revealed that this did not appear to be entirely accurate. I think the difference may only have been 4 hours. I think the Chief Establishment Officer questioned whether the time taken by Policemen attending lectures should be regarded as working time or as time being spent to qualify a policeman for promotion and, therefore, something to which he should be glad to go. There were these various points which were put forward.

Nonetheless, although it could easily have been said that the present pay rates of the police already in factor B, which is 45% higher than the basic pay rates of other persons, take into account the element of overtime. I think very few people have earnings of which overtime rates represent so great a proportion. Despite this, I came to the conclusion that there were extra hours of difference over and above what it was reasonable to call on the Police to do in return for the amount of money being paid under factor B, particularly, I considered that the hours of duty in some limited grades of the Police, notably, the Constables on the beat are too long. I do not consider to the same extent that detectives, who may work just as long hours sometimes, have the same claim because they are not working under the close supervision that Constables on the beat are working. They are working, in many cases out of uniform. Obviously the Police Band, and the Writ Servers are not by any means working the same long hours as Constables, but the fact is that the Constables work for longer, I think, than it is reasonable to expect them to be carrying out

their duties, and this will be so irrespective of how much they were paid.

On that basis I came to the conclusion that there was some merit in the claim of the Police to a duty allowance to reflect these additional hours of work, and I did not see that it would be possible, nor indeed did anybody else see that it would be possible or only safe to say "constables an extra amount." We did consider that only Constables on the beat, who work for long hours, should get the duty allowance, but it was pointed out to us very correctly that the Commissioner of Police can and does transfer members of the Force very freely from one duty to another, and that it would be a very difficult job to trace who had actually worked these extra hours.

1.05 p.m.

It was pointed out to us very correctly that the Commissioner of Police can and does transfer members of the Force very freely from one duty to another and that it would be a very difficult job to trace who had actually worked these extra hours because a man may be on the beat for a few weeks and then may find himself appointed an Immigration Officer or may find himself doing duty crying in the Courts which I believe amounts to Writ officer duty and so on. Also the Police Force being a disciplined body has a certain *esprit de corps* and they represented that it would be alien to the tradition of the corps to pick and choose between members as if it were a straightforward industrial matter, and they asked and I conceded that the duty allowance do apply uniformly throughout the Force and that all constables should get it, and that there should be a scale of duty allowance as you go up the scale.

This, Mr. Chairman, is effectively what we have come to ask the House for today. This duty allowance is not intended to be a permanent fixture. It is intended to be paid only so long as the numbers in the Police Force are insufficient to allow reasonable hours of duty to be worked by all divisions; it is the intention of the Government to increase the number of Police Constables, those in uniform and those without so as to make sure that the work load is properly spread and divided. I will mention in parenthesis that we at an early stage made it clear that the policy of this Government was to spread employment rather than to increase the earnings of those already employed. You may even, Mr. Chairman, if you care, see this policy being worked out in the Police Force. We do believe that it is better to employ more policemen to have the benefit of shorter hours of work for constables on the beat and less onerous

conditions of duty for detectives than to maintain an under-staffed Force and pay higher wages to persuade people to accept adverse working conditions.

This duty allowance is therefore not intended to be a permanent duty allowance. There has been some discord over the amounts of allowances which you may very well imagine and over how far we should backdate it. I do not have to emphasise to hon. members that the Government of Barbados for some years have been facing a difficult budgetary situation. We have been budgeting for deficits, not the sort of deficits that we know will never arise, but deficits that you know will have to be covered by new taxation or new borrowing. We have had to impose restraints on wage increases in Government. The need for constraint is accepted as far as I know in both political parties and this constraint will apply to the Royal Barbados Police Force as much as to anyone else, and therefore we have not found it possible to say to the Police that we can give retroactive payments going back to 1st April, 1976, as they asked.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I had to be persuaded and it had to be wrung out of me that the payments be made retroactive to 1st January, this year. I felt that the 1st April, 1977, should have been the appropriate date, and it is only under the greatest pressure from the Police Association and the Senior Officers in the Police Force and indeed from the Establishments Division that this concession has been made. I do not mean to sound churlish in saying there are a few things worse than giving a man something and then telling him he should not have got it. Hon. members on my side of the House as well as those opposite must well know it is very difficult to get money out of the hand of the Minister of Finance, and I had to be persuaded that there was a case for backdating it from the beginning of this year, but since it was late December that the principle was conceded, I considered and I think the Police were notified at that time that there would really be a difficulty in the Police being asked to swallow that we agreed to something some months ago, but that we had kept back and kept back with it and then at a late stage we were only going to run it from this week.

From my own point of view it was only our own working out of the matter which has kept it back for this length of time. I am searching to see exactly when the Police would have been notified that we had accepted the principle. I met with the Police on the 6th January, and it would

have been just around that time when I was convinced that the earlier decision of the former Prime Minister and indeed my own consideration of that matter should be reversed, and it was just around that time what we decided, and so under the circumstances I felt it was reasonable to date back to 1st January, and not to the date on which other members of the Public Service received an increase.

The amount of increases for the Police are these: Constables will receive a duty allowance of \$60 a month, Corporals \$70 a month, Sergeants and Station Sergeants \$80 a month, Inspectors \$100 a month and Gazetted Officers \$120 a month. I would like to congratulate the Inspectorate and the ranks of Police Officers who have been gazetted for the restraint in the allowances for which they had asked in the light of the allowances being granted at the lower level of the Force. I think it only right that all constables in the Force should know that the Gazetted Officers insisted that if there were limited amounts of money that the Constables should be given priority and that it was important that the Constables should receive satisfaction while those in the higher ranks were prepared not to ask for their pound of flesh and ask for an increase which for example represented a differential between Constables and a Deputy Commissioner or Senior Superintendent. Senior Superintendents certainly get more than twice as much as Constables, but the duty allowance is only twice as much and of course the taxation, just as it applies with the gazetted level, will apply to the \$120 a month more heavily than it will apply to the \$60.

It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that payment of this duty allowance while it is continuing will be phased out in relation to future increases of staff. These future increases of staff will come about not only by an actual increase in the establishment, but by some reorganisation in the fringe services, if I may say so, particularly in respect of the Writ Officers and very probably in respect of the Harbour Police. As far as the Writ Officers are concerned, I may say that plans are well under way to transfer the Writ Department of the Police Force to the Registry, so that the Courts of this Island will have in their hands a service of their own process. The Writ Officers however will not be taken out of the Establishment of the Force. That number of posts will still remain within the Police Force and can be distributed among other duties. I have forgotten the number of officers but I think it is sixty. There are 70, I am told by the Attorney General, but the first amelioration which the

Force is likely to get by way of increased numbers will be the taking in of Writ Officers for ordinary police duties. I believe that the present plans being worked on will provide that every Writ Officer who wishes to transfer his service and continue as a Writ Officer will be given every facility in terms of his pension and other rights so to do, but those who wish to remain in the Police Force as Corporals or whatever ranks they have achieved, will also be allowed. I imagine that those who have reached the age of 55 and wish to be paid a gratuity and pension and retire will even be allowed to do that without any protest from the N.U.P.W., the Police Association or anyone else, or the hon. member for St. Michael South.

1.15 p.m.

I imagine that those who have reached age 55 and wish to take gratuity and pension and retirement will be able to do so without approval from the NUPW, the Police Association or anyone else.

Now the Fire Service is also a part of the present Resolution and the present arrangement. The Fire Service is a body very similar to the Police Service although it may not have the same *esprit de corps*. It is not a disciplined service in that sense, but on the other hand, firemen undoubtedly have very long hours during the time of greatest fire hazards, during the sugar season, averaging 84 hours a week — not actual working hours but including hours on call. This is inherent in the nature of a fire service; you agree to work under these conditions. Nevertheless we consider that the same favourable conditions should be granted to the Fire Service by way of duty allowance as for the Police Force, and under this Resolution firemen will also receive allowances to the extent of: Firemen, \$60 a month; Leading Firemen, \$70 a month; Sub-officer, \$80 a month; Station Officer, \$100 a month; and officers above that level will receive \$120 a month.

We had hoped to be able to include the Prison Service at the same time, but unfortunately the National Union of Public Workers has rejected these proposals on behalf of the Prison Service.

I have a great deal of sympathy with unions which are trying to appear militant and make their voices heard. Confidence in the officers of the union is a major factor in the union's effectiveness in dealing with workers. The NUPW as organised at present has a difficult job to bring the confidence of its members to the same level of confidence which members have in the

Barbados Workers Union. The Barbados Workers Union as a well established union has managed to overcome the problems which it has faced from time to time when it had a membership politically divided and a leadership politically united; and it has a General Secretary who, one cannot deny is a trade unionist of international stature. Therefore the NUPW sometimes finds itself striving against the image of the Barbados Workers Union, and where it has jurisdictional problems to contend with, as in areas which fall under its aegis, such as casual workers, it feels it has to make more noise and behave in a more militant way to show its members that it is doing its job.

We have had a recent example with casual workers and a certain service of Government. The Barbados Workers Union represents some of these workers too. They actually wrote a letter to the Government requesting a meeting; the Government's case was put to it but they did not accept the Government's case. The meeting was held and they went away asking for certain actions to be taken and that action is now under consideration. The National Union of Public Workers failed to put its case to Government; it put its case to the Press, and now it puts its case to the hon. member for St. Michael South and to the steps of the House of Assembly. This is the difference between a well established union whose members know the ropes and a new union that is trying to make its way up the ropes; and as far as the present service is concerned, the NUPW finds itself in the position of wanting to appear more militant than the other representational bodies, the Police Association or the Barbados Workers Union or the Fire Service Association.

Now, as it happens, the position of the Prison Service has deteriorated in terms of hours of work more than the police or the Fire Service. I seem to remember that in 1961 or 1962 when I first heard how few people they were in Glendairy Prison, the average daily population of Glendairy Prison was 99 inmates. I believe the average daily population count including those on remand is now about 200. So the work load has doubled in 15 or 16 years; but the authorities have not been blind to this situation. In 1975 the Prison Service received 38 additional posts of prison officers and four posts of instructors, that is, a civilian instructor in order to allow the Prison Service to institute a five day week, because there is this about the Prison Service, it requires continued supervision. You cannot translate a five and a half day week into a five day week just by adding the hours; and you can only divide 24 hours into three; you cannot

divide it into eight and half hour periods. You cannot add on the Saturday work to the week's work; you actually need to have more prison officers if each prison officer is to get two full days off a week.

Now this was recognized and the prison officers received these 38 additional posts. From time to time the Establishments Division has approved temporary posts for the prison service in order to enable it to cope with increase in the prison population and other temporary situations, and there are now 20 temporary posts in the Prison Service. We have under consideration an extension even to the present conditions of service at the prison. We therefore find it very hard indeed to see upon what basis the Prison Service that has been handled more generously than the Police or Fire Service, which has received additional posts in infinitely greater proportion than the other services, which has its conditions constantly under review, can make a claim for conditions substantially different from those of the Royal Barbados Police Force or the Fire Service. Indeed, I am told that their hours of work compare very favourably to those of police officers. It may be argued that Factor C in respect of the Prison Service, the responsibility factor, would be higher than with the Police Force because overwhelmingly the Prison Service is dealing with known criminals and with violent men, whereas the Police Service only deals with one in a thousand of such cases, maybe.

1.25 p.m.

It may be argued that Factor "C" in respect of the Prison Service, the responsibility factor, should be higher than in the Police Force, because overwhelmingly the Prison Service is dealing with known criminals and with violent men where the Police Service only deals with one in a thousand as the case may be. Nonetheless, if Factor "C" may be of more importance to the Prison, Factor "B" is of considerably less importance, and I cannot see and I am saying here and now that the Government has recently — indeed, I think it was either yesterday or Friday — Government has recently repeated, I do not know if the NUPW has yet been given this information, that it is not prepared to go any further with the Prison Service than with the remaining two services.

All that the NUPW is achieving with the Prison Service at the present time is delaying the time when the Prison Officers will receive their back pay and begin to get their duty allowances. That is all that is being achieved at present. I am told by the Attorney General that

the Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers has even said in an interview which has been published that if the police would agree he also would agree.

I would counsel him this. The sort of circumstances which gave rise to a re-opening of the Transport Board matter do not happen every day, lightning strikes very seldom, Mr. Chairman, and I would suggest to him that one of the characteristics of a strong General Secretary is the ability to stand up to his Executive and tell his Executive when they are wrong. That is what he must understand. If he comes to a decision he must be prepared to tell the Executive "I have come to a decision based upon all the factors which were taken into proper consideration," he must not be pushed from pillar to post by an Executive with some people on it who perhaps received their position only as a result of years of irresponsibility. If you look carefully at certain Executives of certain Unions you will see a lot of sound and reliable persons on them, you will also see on them persons whose chief qualification is the volume of nuisance they have created in the areas where they have been called upon to work over a period of time. I am being asked to be kinder to them, Mr. Chairman, in the present situation, but I would just....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of explanation. At least, I wonder if the Hon. Prime Minister would indicate whether or not this is an attack he is launching on the National Union of Public Workers, the Union which supported his party.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think that the hon. member has anticipated his own speech, and I think it unfortunate that he has gone off like a damp squib when in fact he might have gone off like a major firework. I am not attacking the National Union of Public Workers. I am advising it, I am wishing it well. I am not aware that any Trade Union for some time has supported the Barbados Labour Party, we owe no Union anything, and that had better be carefully and positively understood, and I am just suggesting very respectfully to the General Secretary that if he wishes to rise to the heights occupied by another General Secretary in Barbados that he cannot do it by weakness, he must rise by strength. If he sits down and he solemnly decides one thing, he must hold on to it. It is only going to be a waste of parliamentary time now to come back with another Resolution for the Prison Service. It will have to be done in the fulness of time and it will be done.

I will put it this way, Mr. Chairman. I would ask him what does he think the alternative is, what is the alternative dealing with the Prison Service? We have been negotiating over a period of time, we have always treated the three services as one. What is the point of putting up a show of militance in respect of one service and then have to back down? It is as bad as putting up a show of militance with a service which, if everybody struck there would be a sigh of relief going up over Barbados. I do not mean the Prison Service, I mean a service with which they are now concerned. I am absolutely sure that if there was a strike in the School Meals Service there would be many, many hearts gladdened throughout this island, and hon. members can extract from that every possible nuance or shade of meaning that they care to extract. I am suggesting that there is really no case for the Prison Service to continue to appear to hold out about this matter, and that the Union will get nothing but the doubt of the Prison Officers that they have been properly represented in this entire matter.

I myself like to see a strong National Union of Public Workers, just as indeed I like to see Unions strong and responsible in all spheres of society. I have held out over many, many years in our party against any steps which would weaken trade unionism in Barbados in the worst days of Frank Walcott, in the worst days of the NUPW, and we have had our bad days from them too before now, we have had other bad days, and I have always held out against taking any political step that would undermine the forms of Union organisation in this country; always, and I am not at this stage going to lend myself to being a party to any anti-union activity. The Minister of Labour, I am sure, is absolutely of the same mind, but I ask that the responsibility shown of the Ministry of Labour and the Ministries responsible for public service activity must be matched by an equal responsibility on the part of the Unions, otherwise sooner or later the Unions' members will get to feel that it is an empty vessel that makes the most noise, that it is the negotiations which were carried on privately with an element of responsibility on both sides that very often do the best for their members.

Mr. Chairman, I have been some time with this matter. Clearly it is a matter that could not be skimped. The Resolution is for the sum of \$918,750, \$870,150 for the Police, including back pay, \$48,600 for the Fire Service, including back pay. It closes, I hope, as far as the Police are concerned, a chapter that has

gone on for a very long time, and I very sincerely hope that the Royal Barbados Police Force will go from strength to strength, that any grievances — and I would like to congratulate all, from Constable to Commissioner, for the restraint shown particularly in the last few months while the final details were being worked out. They have upheld the traditions of what Barbadians expect to see from the Police Force, that is, to maintain law and order in this island at a high level in many difficult circumstances. I am sure that this will continue.

I beg to move that Head 11(6) stand part.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that and reserve my right to speak.
1.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I just wonder if we can take a vote on that and then move to Head 11(7). We are in Committee and we do not restrict people's rights to speak. Hon. members can talk as long as they like.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has spoken up to 20 minutes to 2 because he knows that after lunch the Press and other media do not return to this Chamber.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member really must not reflect on the motive of another hon. member. Whichever hon. member looks to see whether the Press is in the House it is not I. The Hon. Minister for Labour especially will tell you that he has to pull me down or push me up by saying that the Press is here or is not here. I do not pay any attention to the Press. If a case has to be put up, it has to be put up; and I am suggesting that what the hon. member said is a reflection on my motives in this matter.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want to assure the Hon. Minister that I have no intention of making any reflection on him. I am just stating that the Press does not come back in this House after 2 o'clock; and if any Government measure is introduced prior to that, you would not think that the Opposition ever exists as far as the news media in this country is concerned in relation to the House of Assembly.

On behalf of the Opposition I would like to pay tribute to the retiring Commissioner of Police first. I think that he is the only man who has the distinction of being named by the

Rt. Hon. Prime Minister when he was Leader of the Opposition in this House, and of being accused of inefficiency; and a whole day was spent on the inability of the now Commissioner of Police.

I wonder when I hear now what the Hon. Attorney General is saying about how distinguished the now Commissioner of Police was in the last few months if he read the debate or would care to read the debate continuing the speech of the then Leader of the Opposition now Prime Minister in this House. He was named and accused by the then Leader of the Opposition. Now that I can hear what a great Commissioner he would be, coming from that side, it is not reflecting the views of the then Opposition in this House.

On behalf of the Opposition we would like to pay tribute to him for his years of dedicated service to the Police in this country and in the Caribbean. We have always found that he has discharged his duties with integrity and ability, and we certainly wish him well in his retirement. He certainly contributed a great amount to law and order in this community, but I do not know if that is the Government's view of it; but the Attorney General has quite rightly paid tribute to him on the eve of his retirement.

I would also like to take the opportunity to wish the new Commissioner of Police, Commissioner Prescod all the very best in the arduous duties that he now has to discharge; and it is commendable that two persons could rise from the ranks of the Force in our country to become successive Commissioners of Police. I remember the days when Superintendents were brought in from Palestine and Hong Kong. There were all of one complexion and today I think that it is a credit to Barbados that throughout the Police Force you will find that people of my complexion occupying the office of Commissioner of Police. I remember the first Commissioner we had who was of my complexion was not in any Adams days.

However, be that as it may, I would like just to pay tribute to these two officers. I would also like to say that I heard the Prime Minister castigating the National Union of Public Workers when our party was in Government, and the same person is now a Parliamentary Secretary. He asked for 100 per cent for the Civil Service and we said that we could only give 35 per cent; but no sooner than the election was finished that same gentleman, the

then Secretary of the National Union of Public Workers was appointed Parliamentary Secretary in the Prime Minister's Office.

If the NUPW today can merit criticisms by the Prime Minister, he has caused it; because it now shows that that General Secretary was either a party member or was out to embarrass the Democratic Labour Party when salary revisions came up in 1976. That is obvious because the returns to the Governor-General were not even dry before he was translated, transcended or sent to higher office; and what is worse, he has been

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. It is not fair for the Leader of the Opposition to make such accusations against Senator Trotman. The only person I know who embarrasses the Democratic Labour Party is the Leader of the Opposition. He does it, and he will continue to do it as in "Issues and Answers". He will continue to do it as long as he is alive.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not think that that is a point of order, but a point of ignorance. If he is sick, let him stay out of the House. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that for the hon. member to get on his feet and refer to a point made as a point of ignorance is very insulting, not only to the hon. member, but to the Chair; and I would suggest that the remarks should be withdrawn.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I respect the views of my colleague for asking you to call on the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw those remarks; but he must understand that I have taken care of myself before and I will continue to take care of myself. It is not at this time with the gin bottle and Night Train. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Anyhow, I will not deal with that, because I have had to refer to him as a common dog already.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has just indicated that he has in the past referred to the hon. member for St. James as a common dog. I am submitting that that is grossly unparliamentary and that it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I agree with you all the way. I ask that the remarks be withdrawn.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I respect my colleague's view. I am not.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Two hon. members are on their feet. Will both hon. members take their seats?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: When the hon. member was asking me to ask the Prime Minister not to have him locked up, I was not any common dog then.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member for St. James take his seat? The remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I will withdraw; but he will have to withdraw his remarks about gin bottle and Night Train. It is insulting, and it is not true.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: If the hon. member is calling on me to withdraw "gin bottle and Night Train", I feel that that is a favourite drink of his, because we have shared it together. If he feels that gin and Night Train is a bad drink I do not support that; because I am quite sure that we have had gin together and chased it with Night Train. That is his favourite drink. He must have taken a little bit more today, Sir.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I have never taken gin and Night Train with that man. The hon. member is telling lies. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Carry on with the debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I expect that the debate will degenerate and less points of order are taken and are ruled on and hon. member co-operate with the Chair. When anybody calls an hon. member "man" across the Chamber, it is unparliamentary. To say that the hon. member is telling lies is again unparliamentary and I submit that they should be withdrawn from the record.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Those remarks must be withdrawn.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, everything was going all right for the few weeks

that he was out. Now it is like a house afire. I do not know what he came in here for.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, he can only be referring to you when he said "he", seeing that he is addressing the Chair.
1.45 p.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take it that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has withdrawn those remarks. Please continue with the debate and stick to the subject under discussion.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: It is peculiar that the Prime Minister should be castigating the National Union of Public Workers today, because the very General Secretary who, during the salary negotiations in 1976 was asking for near a 100% from the Democratic Labour Party Government, within the next day of the forming of a Government was appointed a Parliamentary Secretary! Since he has been Parliamentary Secretary he has not asked for one cent for civil servants or teachers, when he was telling the last Government that he thought the demands were reasonable! I am showing you how overnight the Secretary has moved away.

A new Secretary has been appointed, and we can hear today the strictures which are being made against the new Secretary of the Union, his weakness and his not standing up to his executives, and his not getting any more for Prison Officers and a million and one other things. The very person who tried to embarrass the Democratic Labour Party encouraged the civil servants and teachers to run along when they heard that they were going to get more if the new Government got in, and up to now they have not got cent one, and they would not be getting cent one. I have not heard the former General Secretary raise one finger in the Other Place, or make one utterance in the Other Place, to say that the civil servants and teachers, for whom he had submitted exorbitant claims, deserved a penny more. Today the Union is being castigated for holding, as I hold.

When you look at the allowances paid to policemen starting from constables, you will notice that they do not even work out at \$2.00 a day and they, progressively, go higher. They go higher and give to people who — if the Government is concerned with the fireman who is called out to fires, the constable on the beat or the corporal, their work is much harder and longer in the long run than the persons at the top. An Inspector or a Superintendent certainly does not have to do the amount of work in terms of physical effort and the investigation of crime which the average man on the beat is

called upon to do, but this is typically the Barbados Labour Party type of adjustment. One of the first arguments I had when I was a member of the Barbados Labour Party in bygone days was the question of salary revision, which always presumed to give the people at the top considerably more than the people at the bottom, even although the burden of work as well as the cost of living obviously falls heavily on the persons below.

I think it is very peculiar that the head of the Police Federation is promoted a few days before — I am not saying that he does not deserve the promotion, but the promotions were gazetted and made on the eve of this Resolution coming to the House and one of the persons involved.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member wants to be nasty, it need not be done from the floor of this House. The hon. member is impliedly suggesting that the Police Service Commission has made a promotion motivated for reasons that are improper. The hon. member must be decent in debate, and he must try and stick to the Rules. He knows that that is completely uncalled for, and if he wants to see the file on promotion I will undertake to make it available to him, as a Privy Councillor on the oath, so that he will not mislead the public and be cheap in the way that he is advancing an argument. I resent it very much as the Minister responsible for the Police. It is a cheap point unworthy of him and unworthy of an hon. member. I ask that he withdraws this sort of.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying facts now that promotions were.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, the hon. member is misleading the House. That is not true; he does not know the effective date of the promotion. He should stop misleading the House in this way. It is cheap, nasty politics, Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Do you see how he is getting on? I will not follow him. He should withdraw that. I am saying that I read in the newspaper that the promotion was gazetted a few days before this Resolution. Is that not a fact?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He does not have the decency to come and ask the Minister to show him the file. Why does he not do it? Why does he not find out when the recommendations were made; how the Police

Service Commission dealt with the matter, and when the matter was approved instead of coming to the House and using his position in the House to make insinuations that are unfounded and without the courage of his conviction to make them outside where he can be sued?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am stating as a fact, and the public knows this to be a fact, that promotions in the Police Force were mentioned in the Press last week on the eve of this Resolution. I do not have your files and I do not want them. I have had them long enough. If you want to reply to me and point out when it was done that is your business. You can do it how you like, but I am going to do my opposition how I like and you cannot tell me how to do it either.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. I am not telling the hon. member how to do anything. I am telling him not to make himself a fool on issues and answers.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Be seated! I cannot have two hon. members on their feet!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You are a hypocrite.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you be seated! Be seated!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying, Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you be seated, please, while I discuss a matter with the Clerk.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Your Honour, I was on a point of order, and I am asking the hon. member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition cannot use remarks about the propriety of the appointments in the Police Force.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I withdraw them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And your other remarks you will please withdraw them now. Will you please confine your remarks to the subject under debate, and will you please behave yourself in a manner that is parliamentary!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying is, and this is a fact — if he has an explanation for it he can explain the matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you repeating something that you have said several times?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not know. You must listen; that is your function. I am saying that promotion including officers of the Federation appeared on the eve of this salary revision. I do not know when they were recommended. It might be fortuitous, it might be coincidental, but it did happen. I am telling you that members of the Police Force, even in court yesterday, were of the opinion that they were bought out. A member in court, said that to me.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I have taken this point before. I am normally a very peaceful person, but I am going to insist on decency in debate in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please withdraw the inference you have made that the Police were bought out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that a policeman told me so.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member comes in here and makes a statement that somebody said that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stick to the subject under debate! 1.55 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am only drawing that to show that the present rank and file of the Police Force are not satisfied with the settlement and they told me what I have said. Do you mean I cannot say that to members who are interested in the thing? I can take care of myself too, you know!

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be quite clear. As the Prime Minister admits, he did not at first see any need for an increase in the Police emoluments by a duty allowance, and at first according to what he said in this House his initial reaction was that they were not entitled to any increase because, as he says, in the emoluments which they were formerly given, had been built in this element of overtime for work which they had done. Now I do not know about the former Minister of Finance who preceded him, and I think the Prime Minister will agree that there was no Cabinet decision by the Cabinet at any time that there should be no duty allowance for the Police, and I defy them to show that this matter of duty allowance for Police ever went to the former Cabinet of the Democratic Labour Party. As far as I am aware

the matter of a duty allowance during the time of the Democratic Labour Party was a matter which was being discussed with the Police Federation and with the authorities of the Police and at no time was any clear or definite decision made not to give the Police duty allowance during the time the Democratic Labour Party was in power. That is as far as my knowledge goes. The matter was under discussion, and since of course I knew and always felt that the question of back dating was a matter of great concern to the Police, I think that was one of the snags on which this whole issue floundered. But 1st January, 1977, if the Government has accepted a five day week, certainly is not a very generous offer to the Police to compensate them for the overtime which they are putting in. There could have been a possibility of carrying it back a little further even to the point when the salaries were being revised in April, 1976, but in a matter like this I imagine that one has got to consider the cost of the total exercise, but that certainly should be no barrier if the cause which merits the increase is really deserving.

When you look at this Resolution, you will see that there will have to be another Resolution for Firemen in due course, and I would like some explanation from the Minister of Finance about paragraph 5 on page 2 of the Second Schedule where the allowance is not being paid during some period of sick leave as well as certain periods of annual vacation leave. I would also like to know from him what was the date when the final agreement between the Police Federation and the Government was settled, whether it was last month, month before or at what time, because as I say, when you move about the Courts and come in contact with policemen from time to time, you cannot but know what their reaction is.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 O'clock, and this sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Parliamentary Question No. 38 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you repeating something that you have said several times?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not know. You must listen; that is your function. I am saying that promotion including officers of the Federation appeared on the eve of this salary revision. I do not know when they were recommended. It might be fortuitous, it might be coincidental, but it did happen. I am telling you that members of the Police Force, even in court yesterday, were of the opinion that they were bought out. A member in court, said that to me.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. I have taken this point before. I am normally a very peaceful person, but I am going to insist on decency in debate in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will you please withdraw the inference you have made that the Police were bought out?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that a policeman told me so.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member comes in here and makes a statement that somebody said that.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Will the Hon. Leader of the Opposition stick to the subject under debate! 1.55 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am only drawing that to show that the present rank and file of the Police Force are not satisfied with the settlement and they told me what I have said. Do you mean I cannot say that to members who are interested in the thing? I can take care of myself too, you know!

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I want it to be quite clear. As the Prime Minister admits, he did not at first see any need for an increase in the Police emoluments by a duty allowance, and at first according to what he said in this House his initial reaction was that they were not entitled to any increase because, as he says, in the emoluments which they were formerly given, had been built in this element of overtime for work which they had done. Now I do not know about the former Minister of Finance who preceded him, and I think the Prime Minister will agree that there was no Cabinet decision by the Cabinet at any time that there should be no duty allowance for the Police, and I defy them to show that this matter of duty allowance for Police ever went to the former Cabinet of the Democratic Labour Party. As far as I am aware

the matter of a duty allowance during the time of the Democratic Labour Party was a matter which was being discussed with the Police Federation and with the authorities of the Police and at no time was any clear or definite decision made not to give the Police duty allowance during the time the Democratic Labour Party was in power. That is as far as my knowledge goes. The matter was under discussion, and since of course I knew and always felt that the question of back dating was a matter of great concern to the Police, I think that was one of the snags on which this whole issue floundered. But 1st January, 1977, if the Government has accepted a five day week, certainly is not a very generous offer to the Police to compensate them for the overtime which they are putting in. There could have been a possibility of carrying it back a little further even to the point when the salaries were being revised in April, 1976, but in a matter like this I imagine that one has got to consider the cost of the total exercise, but that certainly should be no barrier if the cause which merits the increase is really deserving.

When you look at this Resolution, you will see that there will have to be another Resolution for Firemen in due course, and I would like some explanation from the Minister of Finance about paragraph 5 on page 2 of the Second Schedule where the allowance is not being paid during some period of sick leave as well as certain periods of annual vacation leave. I would also like to know from him what was the date when the final agreement between the Police Federation and the Government was settled, whether it was last month, month before or at what time, because as I say, when you move about the Courts and come in contact with policemen from time to time, you cannot but know what their reaction is.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The time is now 2 O'clock, and this sitting stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: It is now Question Time.

Parliamentary Question No. 38 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North

Central. I observe that the hon. member is not in his place.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I will ask leave to lay the reply.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no other Question standing on the Order Paper, it is now Private Members' Business.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is only one item under Private Members' Business, and I am asking that this Item be now taken. It stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Philip South.

RESOLUTION RE PAYMENT OF ROYALTIES

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, this matter seeks to move the passing of a Resolution urging that royalties be paid immediately to persons from whose land oil is being extracted. I have no doubt that it is non-controversial, and it will have the blessing of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, in moving the passing of this Resolution I do so with a full sense of responsibility as not only a member of this Honourable House who represents the parish of St. Philip South, but as one who represents the people of this Island.

2.50 p.m.

There is no ulterior motive in introducing this Resolution. As you know, Sir, I served as a representative under double member constituencies, and therefore when it comes to St. Philip I am speaking for both constituencies, St. Philip North and South, because the oil which is being extracted is in the parish of St. Philip North and South and also in the parish of Christ Church; and therefore, Sir, knowing me as you do, having served the people for all those years, I am not here to have any kudos showered on me in my political life. My only reason for bringing this Resolution to this Honourable House of Assembly is to satisfy the various land owners that this new Government will take care of their royalties. As you are aware, Sir, when a new Government takes office, it is the consensus that they will not comply with former arrangements and agreements, and therefore you would get the various land owners being a bit disturbed about their royalties. I want to state here that I am not in any way attaching any blame to the present Government which has only taken over the reins for approximately ten months. I am only acting in the interest of the

people who have been telephoning me, and conversing with me, and who are worrying about when they will receive their royalties.

Mr. Speaker, it is approximately ten years since oil has been extracted from certain lands in the parish of St. Philip and a part of Christ Church, and the people concerned have not received royalties for the oil which has been extracted and transported from their lands. They are not aware that when a new Government takes over the reins there are files which give the necessary information on what was transacted in the past; and consequently in many cases they get frustrated and despondent, particularly those elderly people who feel they may soon be called to go to another world; consequently they feel that they should be given the opportunity to enjoy some of the compensation which should be paid to them for this long period of ten years. One lady has been telephoning me weekly on this matter.

In addition, other people whose lands are in close proximity or adjoin lands where oil is extracted have also become worried and are wondering what consideration would be given to them since the value of their home has depreciated owing to the fact that oil is being extracted in the district. Before oil was being extracted and a person wanted to sell his home, I am sure that the price which he will get for it today is less than half the amount which he would have got for it in the past. In addition I would say that in some cases, as you would expect, some people will feel that it is a health hazard to them and therefore they should be compensated for the sufferings which they bear at present.

Mr. Chairman, it is of vital importance that we give this matter serious consideration, and I have no doubt whatever that this present Government will do its utmost to alleviate the fears which these people at present have.

Ten years is a very long time, Sir, and if you put yourself in their position you can understand how they feel about the matter.

3.00 p.m.

Therefore I consider it my duty as a representative of the people of Barbados to draw to the attention of this Government that people who reside in St. Philip North, in St. Philip South and in Christ Church are expecting us to do everything possible for them at this particular time and therefore it is my opinion that we should give this Resolution our wholehearted support and we should let the public know how

this Government feels about the matter, how this Government is dealing with the matter, and when this Government feels that an amicable settlement can be brought about.

I have introduced this Resolution in the interest of the people. Some of them feel that they may never receive one cent, but I am confident that when the Government explains its position that they will have no doubt in their minds about the payment which is due and owing to them.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second this Resolution and reserve my right to speak.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the House on this matter, and it is obvious from the Resolution that is moved and from the speech of the hon. member that the hon. member is not attributing blame to the present Government in this situation. Indeed he specifically exculpates the present Government.

The position is that as long ago as 1974 the last well was drilled, and it is only now in August this year that we expect a resumption of drilling in the Woodbourne area. Therefore, with those facts it can be clearly seen that any blame attributable to anyone could not be attributable to this Government, but I want the hon. member to appreciate, and I am sure he appreciates it, that owners of part of the area who are entitled to petroleum payments also come within constituencies which people on this side represent.

Under the Petroleum Act, the quotas for distribution of the compensation is based upon what is known as a pooling area. That is, all those parcels of land which are situated within a certain geographical proximity to the wells. The formula as set out in section 8 of the Petroleum Winning Operations Act, Cap. 281 of the laws of Barbados, which says that the proportion of payment attributable to each land owner is the percentage of 25% which the particular area of land bears to the total pooling area. The Act sets out the machinery for surveying the area and this is where the problem arose.

It took the Surveyors in the Government Departments in Barbados approximately 10 years to get these surveys out, and without the surveys of the pooling area you could not see what proportion the individual owner bore in relation

to the total pooling area. When I went into the Ministry in September I asked about this and they told me that they had received the survey plans in July 1976 but that there were certain disputes between a number of land owners as to the area of land shown on the master map which they own by the Government Surveyor and their own individual plots. These disputes obviously had to be reconciled so that the Chief Surveyor between July and February had to go around and reconcile the plots with what he found in fact.

We do not have registration of plots in Barbados, we did not have a central grid system in Barbados, and as we have recognised, over the course of years line marks could not be found so that the Surveyor had to go upon what was recognised as evidence of usure. In February this year, in pursuance of the Act, a letter was sent to each of the land owners setting out what the Chief Surveyor found to be their land and what proportion in relation to the pooling area. There is no dispute at all about the pooling area, everybody has accepted that, but there is one land owner now, only one land owner who is not satisfied with the area which the Chief Surveyor says is his area in relation to the pooling area. That letter, as I said, went out to each land owner in February, 1977, there is only this one outstanding, but this is where a problem has arisen in the Act.

It appears from the Act that since there is no agreement, since the proportion of compensation is determinable by reference to the proportion that an individual owner owns in relation to the total area, the machinery which says that you can pay the disputed land owner's amount into the Public Treasury and await arbitration cannot exactly be applied because if his contention is correct you may pay out a higher percentage to other people and then there would have to be a question of a refund.

3.10 p.m.

Now, this landlord — and I am going to call his name because I think that this is a matter that should be settled — this is a gentleman by the name of Mr. Terry Hawkins. Everybody who has been around the law courts in Barbados — I have been around 20 years — knows that this gentleman is a rather skilled lawyer. All the money has been worked out, the proportion has been worked out — his proportion — and that is all that is holding us up: so we are really waiting on the Attorney General's office. We have sent the file to the Attorney General's office because he is still to produce these plots; because his plots that he has produced is by a certain surveyor; and the Chief Surveyor thinks that that

old plot has an inaccuracy in it; and that is all that has been the hold up.

All the money that has been calculated is there; but I think that it was never envisaged that one man could hold up everybody. It is a matter of great embarrassment to us too. As I said, the hon. member will understand that there are people in the Christ Church constituency that I represent, and they come to me too and we have ordered that the thing be done; but there is still this "Jack" that we have there, because this man is holding up the whole thing. He says that he has more land than the Chief Surveyor can find. That is all it is; and it affects the percentage.

If his contention is correct, his percentage will be .000 something but he is still insisting that it is his land, and the Act makes it very clear that the Minister must be satisfied that the people who are to be paid are in fact the owners of the land. Of course there have been a few transfers since that day; and you are only entitled to get the proportion for the period of time that you owned the land.

Well, we have got all of that reconciled now. There is only one person holding it up. It is a very embarrassing thing because I do not see how it could have lasted for 10 years; but remember, the surveyor could only produce, although the first well was drilled in November 1966, the survey was only produced in July, 1976. It took them 10 years to get the master pooling area. So I agree with the hon. member that this is a matter that should concern us all. Government machinery should work faster than this. I am the first to admit this. I have done all that I can do, and I give the hon. member the assurance that a decision will have to be taken to have a contingency amount provided in case this man is proved to be correct; but the machinery says to go to arbitration, and you know if you go to arbitration what will happen.

It is not worth it. We are talking about cents; but this gentleman insists that his plot is right; and anybody who knows the gentleman knows that this gentleman likes the law courts. That is the position, but we are trying to get this resolved and we are hoping that we will be able to point out to the Attorney General's office the gap in the Act to deal with that. If the Minister was given power to settle it and pay out, pending arbitration, everything would be solved, and it is as simple as that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think that we are very grateful to the Leader of Government Business for the explanations that he has given

and the assurances that he has given on this particular matter. There is no doubt that there is extreme concern by the people who live in the area about the payment of royalties or some kind of money as a result of what may be considered their good fortune may be, in living in an area where oil has been struck.

However, the problem is that the advantages that they have been looking for and expecting have not so far materialised; and while the Minister has been at pains to point out that the present Government is not at fault for the fact that these land owners have not yet received what is due to them, I think in so doing he has made it clear that no one on this side is really responsible for the fact that they have not yet received royalties. The fact is that he has pointed out that there were difficulties in producing the survey plans; and that is a technical matter which is beyond the scope of the policy makers, and the politicians who were on this side.

That is the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, because I believe that the member has ministerial responsibilities. (*Asides*).

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order on the Government Benches.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I hope that the member for St. Michael South East realises that he is no longer on the front benches. I see the Minister now coming into the Chamber. I regret to see him hobbling, and I would like to regret that he had an untoward incident and that....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us talk about oil and royalties.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, He has to oil his feet. He got into an accident which I regret. I think that what is clear from what the Minister who has responsibility for this subject is saying is that due to the difficulty in producing the survey plan which is a technical matter — and I would like to get this on the record because there could be misunderstandings on this point.

There was no policy decision from anyone in the previous administration to the effect that these residents should not receive their payments; but in order to pay, as the Minister has explained, it is necessary to have the necessary plans in relation to this pooling area or however it is styled. Now, as I understand it, this pooling area is based on the Petroleum Winnings Act, I think of the 1950's; but in terms of the production wells, and in relation also to some hexagonal area — I see the member for Christ

Church East is appreciating the technical points that I am making — and I believe that the area involved in terms of these productive wells was something like 100 acres.

This particular piece of legislation, as I understand it, was based on the Alberta law, which is quite different from the legislation prevailing right next door to us, in Trinidad and Tobago where the pooling area is in relation to a square, and I believe that the productive area is probably about five acres, so that you can get more wells into a given area of land, so that you can drain the area efficiently and productively.

However, I would like to get it quite clear that it has been due to technical problems involved why these landowners have not so far got the monies that are due to them. We are glad for the assurance, and we certainly hope that now that the surveys have been produced — and we note that the surveys have been produced according to the Minister in July last year, prior to the change of Government; we were going into an election period at that time — we do hope that now that these have been produced, and the other legal problems that have come up could be resolved, so that this matter of the payment of royalties could be resolved.

3.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it is really a difficult thing when people in this country, who live in a certain area and who believe that they are to be the beneficiaries of a certain windfall as a result of striking oil — I must say at this stage that the whole history of oil has tended to be written in terms of the glamour of the oil industry, in terms of the benefits to countries from the location to discovery and the exploitation of those resources, but it has not been written from the point of view of those landowners, that is, from the point of view of the consumers in terms of those who may own some lands and who will be looking forward to the fact that this particular resource is being exploited and that they themselves should share, not only in the high prices charged for oil, but in terms of some of the great profits that come out from the exploitation of oil. This is a new situation and a new problem for Barbados. We are not yet in the oil league in terms of the quantum of oil that is produced in this country.

Barbados is not an oil producing country, and by this I do not mean that Barbados does not produce oil. What I mean, and this is a term used among those who are in that particular league, an oil producing country by definition is a country that is a net exporter of oil. As far

as Barbados is concerned, we are still a net importer of oil. In other words, the oil that has been discovered so far is not enough to categorise Barbados as in that particular league because we still have to import most of our oil resources. If it were possible, and if that type of nature would be as bountiful to us as we are hoping, both in terms of development on the land as well as exploitation of the resources in the sea, it may be that some of the problems which Barbados faces would be solved and we would be able to improve our standard of living in this country. For the moment that is not possible. What we are concerned about is that those landowners, whether they live in the constituency of St. Philip South, or whether Christ Church East comes within close proximity to that Woodbourne area or, indeed, Christ Church South Central — I believe there are about three constituencies which are contingent upon that Woodbourne area, and hence this is not....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Contingent? You should know better than that. You mean contiguous.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order from the Government benches, please. Will the hon. member continue to address the Chair!

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the subtleties in using this language, depending on what date you are using the etymology of the word, may escape some of the members over there. Words have a history. We hope that the problem that has been identified can be quickly ironed out because those landowners have been waiting for some time, and I believe it has now been clearly established that the delay has been due to genuine problems, technical problems, which could not be solved by the fiat or by the order of any Minister or any politician. It depended on technical details which could only be produced by the professional persons involved.

I think we are all grateful to the member for St. Philip South for bringing this matter to the attention of this Honourable Chamber. We are grateful for the assurances given by the Government that the matter was being worked on by both Governments and that a solution is somewhat in sight. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this particular Resolution will be given a speedy passing by this Honourable House.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I just want to explain, or to make clear, a point that was made by the Hon. Minister and which was

taken completely out of context by the member for St. Michael South. The Hon. Minister was at pains to point out that surveying problems was one of the reasons responsible for the delay in the payment of such royalties, but the hon. member for St. Michael South, in his quota on this Resolution, would make this Honourable House to believe that there were no other problems. I want this Honourable House to understand that, in 1973, the former Government amended the Act and the amendments made further complicated the whole issue. After 1973 the surveyors would have had to go back and carry out other surveys. It was not as easy as that. The former Government must bear some of the blame for amending the Act and further complicating the problems which existed.

I am not going to say much on this Resolution, because the Minister had dealt adequately with it, but I wanted to rise to explain this matter because the hon. member would have sought to exonerate the former administration and it cannot be exonerated because they changed the Act, in 1973 and they should have had at their disposal the appropriate number of surveyors in order to resolve this matter. The Hon. Minister has proceeded with swiftness and action to see that this matter is resolved. I must point out that in August last year out of 16 wells only 13 wells had been reported on, and 3 wells were left outstanding when the former Government went out of office. Surveys were carried out on these wells, the matter was resolved, and everything was done in the Ministry.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation. May I ask what is an outstanding well?

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of elucidation.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, an outstanding well is a well that is completed. I am going to explain this to the hon. member.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already pointed out that there is no question of a point of elucidation raised by the hon. member. Will you proceed to address the Chair!

3.30 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I have heard members speaking about the Woodbourne area, but it must be pointed out that there are other areas in which operations took place. In Society for instance a well was dug and in Fisherpond as well. There are several other areas

in Lowlands that must be taken into consideration, so we must not confine this Resolution to the Woodbourne area. The Government is seriously considering and looking into the possibilities of exploring wells in other areas. It was only in the Woodbourne area that we had sixteen wells, but it must be pointed out that wells were drilled in other places. Prior Park in another area. If hon. members are interested in the welfare of Barbados, they must be careful in pointing out that the operational areas are not confined to the Woodbourne area; They should know what they are talking about. As I said, Mr. Speaker, everything has been done in the Ministry to expedite the payment of these various claims, and as the Minister has pointed out there is a particular individual who claimed that he had a piece of land within the pooling area and the pooling area is five miles from where the well is being dug. You heard the hon. member for St. Michael South talking about hexagonal but this only means six sides, so he is not using any big term. It is as simple as that. In 1973 the Act was amended thus making the area or the location point different, and that has added further to the complication. What I am saying is that from 1973 until 1976 the former administration having amended the Act should have equipped itself with the appropriate survey so that the people could be paid their money; so do not let them come in here and claim that was not the fault of the former administration. It is far from that.

The hon. member for St. Philip South has said and I do agree with him that no one can expect a new Government ten months in office to resolve the situation which took the former Government some ten years to resolve. As a matter of fact, in resolving it we are trying our best and I hope from the explanation given by the Hon. Minister that the hon. member would understand and that this House would learn that the payments are ready, but where there is a dispute there must be some hold-back, and that is what has caused the delay in the payment of such royalties. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure this Honourable House that within the next three months or so those persons who are entitled to royalties will have them paid, and I must further add that we hope that there will not be any delay, and that year after year those people who are entitled to payment of such royalties will receive them in time so that we will not have a situation where ten years after a well is dug people are asking how soon they are going to receive such royalties.

With that explanation I know that this side will support the Resolution.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, in winding up this debate I would like to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the Minister for the comprehensive report he has given us from the file. He has explained all aspects of the matter to this Honourable House and we are indeed happy on this side to know that in approximately three months the people will be compensated by being given royalties on their lands. I feel this is such an important matter that it should be given full publicity by the media. As a matter of fact, on numerous occasions frivolous matters are given full publicity, and therefore I can only hope that the media will realise that they owe a responsibility to the public to let the public know that these landlords will receive their royalties in the very near future.

I must still say this to the Hon. Minister, that the Government cannot afford to allow one man or one person to use his influence in any way to prevent others from receiving what is due and owing to them, and I would suggest that if this particular man continues to be a big problem to the other people that legislation should be enacted or some kind of amendment should be brought to this House so that the land owners and others whose land adjoins the lands where oil is found could be given their royalties. I can only hope that the Government, having pledged itself to dealing with this matter expeditiously, will do everything possible to settle the matter at the earliest opportunity.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Private Members' Business.
3.40 p.m.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Mr. SPEAKER: When this sitting was suspended today the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

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

Mr. GREAVES: When the Prime Minister introduced this Resolution, he travelled over a long wide road. He dealt with matters that had no relation to this matter, including a scorching attack on the NUPW, but this is a matter for the Prime Minister and the National Union of Public Workers.

On this matter relating to Policemen and Firemen the Prime Minister has admitted that having considered the matter he came to the conclusion that the Policemen were entitled to some kind of duty allowance; the question of the amount would seem as if it was subject to a certain measure of negotiation. I say a measure of negotiation because of all the explanations given by the Prime Minister at this time he has not said whether or not there was an agreement by the association with the settlement which was reached. The Prime Minister also made reference to the question as to whether or not the Police had been notified of the settlement and he was obviously indicating that this was not a matter which had been properly negotiated. Therefore I think the Prime Minister owes it to the House to let us know beyond a shadow of a doubt whether or not this matter was settled by the process of negotiation or whether the Prime Minister had become tired of negotiations and had imposed a settlement; because I think it has some very serious implications from the point of view of the whole question of negotiations regarding the public sector. And it is on this point I want to speak, because as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, there are a number of policemen who are dissatisfied with this settlement. When it comes to negotiating agreements in the public sector there is always a feeling which seems to suggest that the Government once it had made up its mind about a matter would proceed in that particular way and it seems very clear to me that the whole attitude which was coming through from the Prime Minister was one in which he had adopted the position that he was no longer prepared to negotiate any particular matter fully when he has made up his mind. I raised this matter in 1976 during negotiations and was critical of the approach which was used at that particular time in settling a matter relevant to the public service, and again I say that if this particular line is pursued by the Prime Minister it is wrong; for if we are to respect people negotiating on behalf of workers, this respect must be carried through to the end. Therefore when we examine the situation there are a number of factors to be taken into consideration.

In determining a duty allowance the Prime Minister indicated that for some time since 1960 or thereabouts the Public Service Commission was looking at the conditions of workers in the Police Service and a particular formula was arrived at, and he indicated that this formula was abandoned in 1973 when negotiations were being carried on; and it was interesting to hear the basis which was used for determining the rate for overtime and to hear that it related to the piece scale of the workers. This first of all seems to be a little bit

off. I had a little difficulty in determining how you could use the piece scale of workers as a basis in negotiating overtime of policemen or firemen or any officer whose salary is determined by a total duty formula. It seems the whole question needs to be reviewed. And on this question of review one basic point arises. The Police Association is not a trade union under the Act. Indeed, Section 44 of the Act excludes policemen from joining trade unions, and the more we look at this particular situation the more we recognize that those negotiating on behalf of policemen and firemen have their hands tied to some extent. It seems that tremendous power is placed in the hands of one side of the negotiating table, and in order to establish some kind of proper relationship it would appear we have to do something about revising that aspect of the legislation and make it possible for policemen to join trade unions or have an association with trade union status. This is a natural development, and policemen, who are workers like any other category of workers, should have the right during negotiations to have recourse to any type of muscle to get their point of view across rather than having themselves in a situation of limbo hanging in the air and not being able to use the kind of force which the other workers can use. And I am saying the time has come when we have got to give policemen and firemen this kind of status as the only way by which their just demands can be met.

So what the Prime Minister was doing was to outline the position of his Government on the question of approach to trade unions, and we see very clear where he stands on this matter.
3.50 p.m.

I want to say, certainly later on there is another matter which is coming up on which I would like to raise another issue, but in the course of his wide and rambling presentation, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister made some reference to the Barbados Workers' Union and I have got to set the record clear, because I suppose reading the debates one would get a different impression and would get a particular point of view, and I think it is important for me to put the record straight on this particular matter.

He indicated in a matter which the Barbados Workers' Union and the NUPW are involved, the school meals workers — I do not know how he got it in, but the fact that he made reference to it I feel that I am entitled to make reference to that particular matter also — but he indicated

that the National Union of Public Workers rather than following the example of the Barbados Workers' Union by quietly writing a letter to the Government. I do not know if one can write a letter noisily or quietly, but the Barbados Workers' Union has always respected procedures even although the Prime Minister might not respect procedures, but the point is we have always respected procedures and we follow the procedures which we have agreed to and which we have laid down.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman — I see you smiling — you are well aware of this because I noticed some copies of correspondence with which you are intimately involved as the person who brings in all the cement in Barbados and the problem that we have had at the Port with the handling of the cement, and you would understand what I am talking about and you would appreciate the fact that we do follow procedures and that once the procedures have been exhausted then obviously we resort to whatever action we feel we should resort to to get the particular matter straightened out.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: To the best of my knowledge, on a point of order, I do not know if the Chairman imports cement, and there is nothing wrong if the Chairman imports cement, as long as he does it in a legal manner.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken. This debate is not about cement, nor is it about school meals. Will you please speak to the question?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think Your Honour perhaps is very forbearing on that matter, but when an hon. member stands on his feet and makes reference to the Chairman importing all the cement in Barbados, it is not really as easy a matter and you have no right to reply to him in debate. It goes down in the record and so on. It is an implication. We know we have had a rampant cement corruption with Mr. Leo Leacock being given a licence to import cement. It should be made clear that there are no more cement licences to be given out by anybody, and if a businessman is agile enough to serve the people of Barbados and take smaller profits than other businessmen by keeping the price of cement down in this country, that businessman should be congratulated, not pilloried by hon. members in here.

Those who import cement into this country now, as far as I know, import it because they are willing to take less profit per bag than anybody,

they do not have to ask anybody for the privilege of bringing in cement, their own commercial enterprise takes them into places where cheaper cement can be brought in. They do not have to offer a Minister anything in order to get a licence because there are no more licences, and I think it disgraceful for any hon. member to make remarks like this.

The hon. member for St. Lucy may be well accustomed to saying things about the Chair in and out of the House. It may interest him to know that very shortly he is to be reported to Mr. Speaker for remarks made contrary to the Parliament (Immunities and Privileges) Act and may indeed, if Mr. Speaker so decides, be reported to the Director of Public Prosecutions for appropriate action. But that is one matter. He has shown that he is disrespectful of the Chair, he should not be allowed to show it any more.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, well this matter was ventilated by the members of the Government, not by me, and you know, a little trick sometimes seems to get a whole set of people upset. As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I think that the matter has to be put very squarely on the question of procedure, and as far as the reference which the Prime Minister made relative to the approach of the Barbados Workers' Union in a particular matter, we are dealing with the matter and we are following the procedure, and I would hope that the Prime Minister would be in a position in his reply to indicate to us whether or not the Police Association agreed with the amounts with which we are now dealing, and if not, then why is it that he did not seek to ensure that there was agreement with the Association to wipe out what seems to be a fairly widespread dissatisfaction amongst the Force with this particular settlement?

I would want to repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am of the firm view that the time has come for us to look very seriously and for the Government to consider removing section 44 of the Trade Union Act which at this present time makes it illegal for policemen to join a Trade Union and for the Police Association to gain Trade Union status. This, as I said, is a matter which is of fundamental importance. It concerns the rights of a group of workers and I do not consider that they should be placed in any less advantageous position from a bargaining point of view than any other category of worker in Barbados.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, it appears as though no other members on that side wish to speak on this very important matter. It could not be that they are just playing a waiting game and afraid of the firing power that comes from over

this side, because they are always saying that they have the numbers and they have the brilliant lawyers and all that, so I would hardly think they are playing "bo peep" and merely waiting for all the Opposition members to speak, so I take it that no other hon. member wish to speak except for the person who may be speaking finally for the Government.

I think the Prime Minister has set out the background to this whole matter, and indeed it goes back, as he indicated, to the year 1961 when the method of arriving at the pay for the police was decided upon.

4.00 p.m.

Now, following, I believe, it was a report of a Police Commission in the United Kingdom on the best method for computing the pay which should be given to policemen, a particular formula was arrived at for paying policemen in that country; and that formula was, I think, almost identical with the recommendations proposed for the U.K., that there should be three factors which should be taken into account. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that the formula worked out in 1961 was a formula put forward by the Commission which made a study of the remuneration for policemen in the United Kingdom, and three factors were involved. As the Prime Minister quite correctly indicated, Factor A, Factor B and Factor C; because any community is faced with the problem of how to pay its policemen, of how to arrive at a just method by which to determine the worth of the work that is done for a community by the Police Force.

I believe that the Police Act indicates the range of functions which the Police have to carry out in this country; and I believe that that Act indicates that they are to work for the preservation of law and order or to maintain law and order. They are to preserve the peace. They are to detect incidents of crime; and I believe that they are to administer any particular regulation which by law they are called upon to do.

I believe that these are the four main duties that are imposed on the Police Force of this country as far as the law is concerned; and we know that in carrying out those functions and in executing those duties, they have to work unusual hours because those duties have to be

carried out not in terms of an 8 to 4 period of time, like the ordinary office worker, or 8.15 to 4.30 in terms of the Government Service, because this is a 24 hour job.

Those functions, if we are to continue to live in a society and in a community that is peaceful, one that respects law and order and in which the rights of the individual are observed and in which fair play and justice take their place, then the functions of the Police are very important, and there are functions which have to be carried out 24 hours a day.

When most of us are asleep, except for the hon. member for St. Michael West when he is roving late at night — when most of us are asleep — policemen are on their duty, whether it is in terms of the security of buildings, whether it is in terms of keeping the peace and ensuring that those who sleep by day and are alive at night — the night people — keep the peace and maintain law and order to ensure that the differences which may exist among citizens, that all of these are kept as they ought to be. These are the duties carried out by the Police. Then there are traffic problems and the rendering of First Aid assistance.

Those who wear their uniforms, comfortable or uncomfortable, those who are in plain clothes, or whether it is those who specialise in the work of photography, or those who are in the finger printing business or in the communications field, all of these are duties which have to be carried out by an efficient and well functioning Police service.

I would like to say that in Barbados over the years the Barbados Police Force, now the Royal Barbados Police Force, has carried out these functions and has done its part magnificently in maintaining Barbados as a law abiding and peaceful country; and it is only right that those who have that type of responsibility in this community should be adequately paid for the duties, onerous as they are, that they have to carry out.

Even when they are off duty they are on call, which means that even though they are off, they are still on duty because they belong to a disciplined force. Now, in 1961 as the Prime Minister indicated, in order for this country to give some true and proper assessment of what pay should be given to policemen, these three factors to which the Prime Minister made reference were applied as the basis for computing the salaries of policemen; and this worked out as

the base of paying the key scale worker which was the category then.

I do not think that the Prime Minister indicated the actual category of the key scale worker; and on top of that you had a payment in addition to what the key scale workers were getting; because if you start at that base, then you added on something for the additional hours that policemen had to work and something for the overtime which the key scale workers would earn and then computed all of them. I believe that it came out in the region of 45 per cent above the key scale workers.

Now, this continued, I believe, to the satisfaction of most persons until the 1970s when there was a salary revision, or rather when there was an interim payment to a member in the Public Service to which policemen were also entitled and which had built in, when the final settlement came, annual increases as well as annual increments. I believe that I am right in saying that it was recognised on both sides in terms of those who were negotiating on behalf of policemen, and also on behalf of the Government's side that that particular formula could no longer apply because if it was applied, the salary scale would have got out of joint altogether and out of conformity with what should be prevailing.

4.10 p.m.

I believe that this was recognised on both sides. In addition to that you will remember, Mr. Chairman, I indicated that this formula was plucked from the United Kingdom experience, and by 1970 those recommendations in terms of a 3-point formula worked out for the United Kingdom Police Services were abandoned by the United Kingdom itself as not being relevant to the method for arriving at the proper remuneration for those who serve in a disciplined Police Force, and so in Barbados also with the normal cultural lag — I believe the Minister of Education is familiar with that concept. I believe he studied sociology. I believe he understands the concept of social lag; so with the social lag a few years after, just as we took the formula from the United Kingdom, when they abandon it with the social lag it was abandoned here as well.

We then had to get a new formula, altogether, but putting something in place of that and arriving again at the proper remuneration for the Policeman remained a ticklish problem. I think it is true to say that we have always from this side of the House realised that those who work in these Services, particularly the Prison Service, the Fire Service, the Police Service, the

Hospital Services, the Customs I believe at the Airport, and I believe, the Met. Services as well, all had a particular case to advance when the question of the 5-day week came into being. We have to watch now that this particular settlement — (*Asides*) I would like to say that there is an agreed settlement. I have not heard that yet. I may be wrong. I am not certain whether there is agreement between those who negotiate on the part of the Police and those who negotiate on the part of the Government. (*Asides*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross-talk, please!

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, the member for St. James, obviously, thinks that I am like my leader and he can draw me into some type of conflict or combat with him. I can resist those temptations. I do not know if this is an agreed settlement. I have heard sufficient during this debate to indicate to me that there are differences existing still between the Police Association and those who negotiate, the policy makers of the Government. I believe so. In fact, if my memory is serving me well, I think in introducing this motion, the Prime Minister did indicate that there are some areas of difference. I do not recall whether he said there were small areas or not, but I believe there are areas of difference in terms of the time when these payments should come into effect. He arrived by a process of development and from the position that the request for a duty allowance should not be payable to those persons in the Police Service to a position by 6th January, or some time early in January, that they should be given this duty allowance, hence, the duty allowance now becomes payable to the members of the Police Force from the date of conversion of the Prime Minister. Now that is a very strange way to arrive at the date from which any retroactive payment should be based.

Sir, it is like DC and AD, TAT, Tom Adams time. We have TAT, and now we have some time for the Police when they should get their retroactive pay. In all negotiations — I heard someone saying on the Government radio station that he does not mind what Tom Adams says. (*Asides.*) I heard it over C.B.C. The member for St. Michael North East said: "I do not mind what Tom Adams says. It is three o'clock. It might be three o'clock by the watch, but the real time is two o'clock." (*Asides.*) I heard this on C.B.C. just as TAT, we are now having some special time when policemen should be given their retroactive pay. That is the date on which the Prime Minister is converted into realising that the policemen are due some duty allowance. (*Asides.*)

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No cross-talk, please!

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, will you protect me? I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe in terms of negotiations other types of criteria are employed in arriving at the date on which retroactive pay should apply. One of the established methods, I believe, is the date from which the particular request was submitted. I am not a negotiator, but I believe that this is one of the criteria that applies in arriving at the date from which retroactive pay should be applied is the date from which the particular request was submitted or, I am advised, if both parties agree on a particular date which may be subsequent to the date submitted by the aggrieved parties.

Mr. Chairman, what we have here, apparently, is a unilateral decision based on that conversion date in January, and so the policemen are being deprived of additional funds and money because of that January date when they had submitted an earlier request for this retroactive pay.

4.20 p.m.

They are not satisfied about the January date, and we believe that the retroactive date should have been much earlier, and it is not fair to the members of Royal Barbados Police Force to believe that January is a satisfactory date for that retroactive pay to commence. To come and gloss it over and sugar coat it with the statement that well I do not believe in this type of thing, in fact I felt it should have been April 1 but I was persuaded by a multitude of persons including the Association itself and the Minister responsible (*Asides*) I only saw you with Waldo Ramsey; what else did you bring back?

To try to sugar coat it and try to make it more palatable by suggesting that the Minister of Finance does not believe that the retroactive pay should go back anywhere further than April, but he was being so very generous to the Police, so very kind hearted, so very understandable of these problems that he has gone back to January, is in fact to pull wool over the eyes of those who were listening to those words and who will read them as a result of the meticulous work of the Press Aide who is producing a lot in the newspapers.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this is one area which we mean to know a lot more about and on this side we are not satisfied that the January date for the payment of this retroactive amount is satisfactory to the Police and we do not believe that justice has been done in this particular regard. We believe that the date should be much earlier than January. Now

another area of difference as we understand it is that the amounts worked out for the Constables and for those in the other ranks of the Royal Barbados Police Force, right up through the Corporals to the Sergeants and into the ranks of the gazetted Officers are not satisfactory, particularly at the bottom, because when we realise the work that has to be done, when we realise the value of the Police to this community, when we realise the risk to which they put themselves in carrying out their duties, when we realise that they expose themselves to all types of dangers which the ordinary citizen is not entitled to, we do not believe that these allowances as finally agreed upon, well I am not certain; I said agreed upon, but it might have been imposed, and we had a lot of imposed settlements. The words are fresh in my memory. The Prime Minister says I know his speeches by heart; that is quite true. If I do not know them by heart, I know where I can find them, and we can get back to those words on imposed settlements when only a year ago almost we had that memorable debate in this Chamber. So there are two grounds on which the Opposition is dissatisfied with this particular matter than has been brought to us here. First of all the date for retroactivity should have been much earlier, not January 1977, and secondly(Asides) You said go back and negotiate around the table and arrive at a settlement freely arrived at, do not impose. And secondly, the amounts for these allowances we do not believe are generous enough when it is taken into account the work that the policemen do, the dangers and unseasonal nature of their work and all of the other hazards and difficulties that they have to undergo.

Now there are some other problems which relate to this. We understand that there is another matter relating to the Fire Service, but we have now got to ask ourselves what is the position in relation to other workers who are watching very closely on this particular settlement. What is the position in respect of them? I have indicated some of these workers, those who work in the hospitals. They have a 24 hour period of duty as well. The hospital has a 24 hour service and these workers are also looking at the type of settlement that has been arrived at and the principles that are embedded in this particular area, and the Minister responsible for Establishments must tell us how this settlement affects or will affect those workers in that particular service. He must tell us how it is going to affect those persons in the Customs who work at the Airport on this type of shift work and he must tell us of all of the other categories of persons, those in the Met

Services and all the other services who are looking. Do not think this is mere talk; they are considering these matters and the National Union of Public Workers I am sure is taking an interest in this particular matter.

I just mention this. Of course the Unions are taking an interest in this and are looking at it, but what we have got to arrive at, and there is no escape from this, is that the Minister responsible for Establishments, the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister must come to this particular House and tell us in fact what is his employment policy, what is his wages and incomes policy, because all of this has got to fit into this particular area, and there is no way of escaping it; there is no way of playing you can push this particular matter here and I have solved that as far as the Police is concerned, and the Firemen and Prison Officers will come up in due course, but it has to fit into the total pattern and we would expect that there would be some explanation on this score.

4.30 p.m.

So the burden of our contention, as I have explained, is that this particular matter has a history. It goes through the formula in 1961, the interim payment and salary settlement in the early 1970's, the introduction of the five-day week, and now toward this settlement in 1977; and all these things have got to be set against the background of the wages and incomes policies that should be pursued in this particular area; and we are still waiting for full statements on these matters.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to enter into this debate at all but I heard my name called and perhaps I should say something.

The hon. member for St. Michael South until today might have had a mind of becoming Leader of the Opposition, but he has sadly failed his examination and he will now have to languish in more obscurity for the rest of his days in this House, because the sterling performance which has come from the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has earned him the right to the position of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Chairman, on the matter of payments to police, I do not think we need to spend long hours trying to evaluate the services policemen perform in this community. I believe there is no question at all but that the Police Service is a very essential service in any community and that it performs in most instances with a great degree

of distinction. We ought not to spend a long time deciding how they should be compensated, for they should be well paid, and what we are trying to do at this time is to see that they are paid in accordance with the work they are called upon to perform. Barbados is a poor community and I don't think it takes much to convince any police constable of this; and not even "Gear Box" would be persuaded by the speech made by the Hon. member for St. Michael South. This matter has been hanging fire for a long time and it is only now the Minister of Finance is trying to bring about a settlement and a settlement has been achieved. As with any settlement, not everybody is going to be satisfied. Some people are given \$3,000 a month and still feel they should have more. But policemen are reasonable men and will realize the limits to which the Government can go. What I am particularly pleased about is that a certain measure of sophistication has been brought to the evaluation of this particular service, because I hear people arguing about what persons in the civil service should be called upon to do. But we must realize what these men have to face; firemen go into burning buildings; a policeman may get his arm chopped off in the line of duty, and in such a case I do not believe that \$80 a month will make much difference in relation to the suffering sustained, but we are trying to recognize the kind of service rendered. We are attempting now to evaluate all the services performed within the civil service; and some form of monetary compensation is desirable for those who are called upon to put themselves in jeopardy during the course of performance of their duty. Compensation should be related to the measure of risk and inconvenience involved, so that a man who cleans the streets may well be paid somewhat more than a person with three or four "O" Levels who faces no risks or dangers in the performance of his duties.

The member for St. Michael South also spoke about nurses. I think nurses now work in eight hour shifts; 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.; 4-12; 12-8; I don't think they work a twelve hour shift any longer. But a policeman goes home and if an emergency arises he must return to work. When canes are being burnt the police have to be patrolling various parts of the country, on Sundays and holidays, night and day. Certainly there can be no argument that people who do this kind of service should be paid a differential to compensate for those kinds of hours of work. Nurses who work the midnight to 8 a.m. shift might also well have legitimate claims for a differential pay for night duty. It is done in some countries and Barbados must

realize that these categories of workers must get compensation for the work they do.

So there is no need for anybody to downgrade policemen. I do not think there is a more responsible job in any country than that of maintaining law and order; and the policemen that we have deserve any differential that the present Government is able to afford. But policemen are reasonable citizens and they will know that it will take more than a half hearted twisted statement from the hon. member for St. Michael South to get them that differential. The country must be in position to afford the cost, and since they were the Chancellors of the Exchequer for the past fifteen years and left nothing for us to work with, I am sure they must realize we must be congratulated even for a little pittance until we can treat them as they really deserve.
4.40 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to exhort the member for St. Michael South to seek the attention and the praise of the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force by getting up on the floor of the House of Assembly and recognising that they work hard, they work well, they certainly work harder than he works, and as a consequence they ought to be paid, but he should be courageous enough to point out that we in Barbados must come to the point where we recognise that we have limited resources with which to work, and we are trying to make sure that those resources reach a wider base and we are interested in getting some of the youngsters who are equally qualified to perform in the service and off the streets liming where they get themselves into trouble and have their hopes and aspirations dashed by bringing them into the Barbados Police Service and into the Fire Service and into all branches of useful and productive employment in our country, and if he says that I think he will gain... (Mr. SANDIFORD: Fire those over 55). Mr. Chairman, I am talking about anybody but the policemen today, I am here to congratulate this Government, the Minister of Finance. I know perhaps better than anybody else, certainly on the back benches, how tight it is, how hard it is to get the gentleman to release money for worthy causes far less to go around trying to impress everybody by handing out dollar bills as if they were invented down at the Government Printing Office.

We know better what fiscal responsibility is all about, and I am submitting that the Royal Barbados Police Force, barring perhaps a few

exceptions, know the value of money, they all know that they would like to have more, but if more is not available at this point, I am sure they will settle and they will continue to perform the same kind of sterling performance they have always given in times of emergency and in times when normal business prevails.

Sir, I would like to close by stating that we would expect from our services the same top quality performance, that they will accept the differential that has been offered in the same graces and in the same spirit in which it was offered and let our country go forward to perform all of the major and complex tasks which we as a nation must perform in the short space of time allocated to us. I do not mean to this Government, because we are here till the end of time. I want you to understand that.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by offering congratulations to the present incumbent of the post of Commissioner of Police, and I am speaking for myself on this particular occasion. When I held responsibility for the Ministry of Home Affairs, in reviewing the operations and structure and so on of the Police Force, and looking at the problems that confront the society, and also looking to the future of this country, I made a bold suggestion, and that bold suggestion unfortunately did not meet the likes of the Police Service Commission. That bold suggestion at that particular time was that Mr. Prescod could have been elevated to the post of Commissioner of Police and sent overseas to Britain and Canada to get some training, especially to deal with modern detection, because we have to appreciate that criminals have become more advanced, they have become more clever and the police must be able to keep pace with that type of development that takes place amongst us.

While it is a bit late, from my point of view, I would like to say quite strongly that I am very glad to see that he had reached that position, and I look forward very keenly to see a lot of improvement taking place in the Police Force under his direction.

Turning now to the matter before us, it is obvious to me after listening carefully to the Hon. Minister of Finance that the formula which has been in vogue for a very long time in this country for arriving at a satisfactory salary for the policemen is no longer tenable, and since that is the case, it is incumbent upon the present Government to set into operation some method of deriving another formula or some

other method or other means of arriving at the formula for establishing a satisfactory salary range for the members of the Royal Barbados Police Force. Why has it become no longer suitable? There have been a lot of social changes taking place in Barbados over the years and as a result of these social changes you find that people have developed likes or dislikes which make it difficult for them to accept things of the past. Nowadays you find that the average worker likes to spend more time with his family, he likes to know that he has time for leisure, and he likes to know that he has time for his hobbies, and he does not like to know that the only thing available to him is work and more work even although he might be compensated for it, and it is quite likely that many members of the Royal Barbados Police Force are not interested so much in getting more money, but they are interested now in getting some time for themselves and not to be under the pressure of the heavy hours of duty which they now face. It is also true that if they are going to be given money they expect to see worthwhile money.

Sir, when you look at what has transpired in Barbados since 1973 with the introduction of the five day week into Barbados, you find a lot of pressures have been created in Government circles. At that particular occasion I was Minister of Health and I experienced certain difficulties in trying to get a certain category of worker to accept that a five day week should not mean Monday to Friday. I think I lost the battle, and the Government lost the battle, and as a result of that a lot of pressures have developed in this country. It is only natural that when you make a concession for a particular group of workers it becomes extremely difficult to refuse to make a similar concession for other groups of workers. It is only natural that when a headway was made the other people employed by Government would also seek to get similar conditions, that is, a five day week. It is only natural that the police, the nurses and many other categories of workers who have to work long periods, 90 hours a week, 96 hours or maybe slightly less, would now seek to have their 40 hour week or their 44 hour week contained in five days.

In the case of the policemen we have to face up squarely to the problem that they also expect at some time or other that they will have a working period not dissimilar to the working periods now enjoyed by certain members of the Civil Service or other categories of Government employees. They want it and I will have to agree with them that it is their

right to expect that something is done about it. It is my view that in seeking to redress these imbalances one must look very critically at the structural organisation of the Royal Barbados Police Force and also at many of the fringe duties which it has been called upon to perform.

4.50 p.m.

On an earlier occasion in this present system I have pointed out that it is important to look seriously at the question of removing certain functions like immigration, traffic and other duties from the Police Force thereby freeing them of these duties, and permit them to concentrate on true police work. Short of that, one will have to look very seriously at a substantial increase in the members of the Police Force; and there are dangers about this, because one might very well frighten people into believing that you are trying to have a police state by having a large number of policemen, although a case may well be made out in terms of what you are asking them to do; but in proportion to the population of Barbados it may seem too unwieldy.

I do not believe that we can go on maintaining that by having these things done by the Police they are being done more efficiently and that the Police are more satisfied. The point which has aroused my interest is that if the original formula which was agreed to years ago was applied now, I would like to know what type of salary one would arrive at; and I hope that either the Minister responsible for the Police or the Minister responsible for Finance, if not now, would look into this matter and inform me; because I think that it is very important in trying to determine whether the duty allowance which is now being paid to them is justified, and if not justified how much should be paid to them. I have been looking a short while ago, after a brief consultation with the Hon. Prime Minister that if these factors were applied to what is considered key scale workers, I would arrive at a very frightening figure if these were applied in the present circumstances.

On the other hand, if you are not applying this formula, you are depriving policemen of a substantial amount of money; and one has to see that the duty allowance which is paid to the police does not really compensate for his loss in salary.

I am addressing my remarks to the Prime Minister who spoke about difficulties. I would like to know if there is some dissatisfaction among some members of the Police Force. I am not in a position to know, but I am looking at the matter on the factors spoken of by the Prime Minister. I know that there can be very good reasons for abandoning this formula. I cannot say that he is abandoning the formula, but he might have very good reasons. It seems to me that if one is going to advance the argument that the Police have to work long hours, and that they have exceptional responsibilities, and you will recruit them in terms of money, we hope that the method by which the reduction is done is something acceptable to the Police.

I have never taken part in discussions about the Police, and therefore I am not in a position to deliberate on the matter as forcibly as those people who have taken part in these discussions. I think that it would have been worthwhile if the previous Minister of Finance was here to be able to elucidate on some of the points made by the present Minister of Finance.

Sir, when a concession is made to a particular group of workers the Government finds it difficult not to accept demands or requests from workers in other areas. Therefore, like my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South, I am wondering what effect these arrangements will have on people like nurses, not to mention others; because they also have to work at a time when other members of the society have gone to take their leisure. They have to work on Saturdays, on bank holidays and other times when other members of the society are doing something, not necessarily work.

If you accept that these people are entitled to have their Sundays off and their bank holidays off, not by requesting it, but having it as a right, and making allowances for the service which they render as such because these services cannot be curtailed on these days, you have to try to reduce their responsibilities and the services which they are called upon to accept, you have to do it in terms of money.

There is no point trying to say "hold strain"; we had to make a concession to the Police because they are important. You will have more claims of this nature and you will have to try to stave off the demands of people in the Nursing Service, Sanitation workers etc. The whole structure of arriving at adequate salaries for the

various categories in the Government Service, and the relationship which the salaries of one category bears to another group of workers should be viewed in the light of social changes and very often in terms of the ability of those who are in these various categories.

It is a very great task, and nobody can deny that; and doing it makes it greater because as soon as you satisfy one group, the other group will stand by to make their requests. I do not believe that it is good for a society to have these types of pressures repeatedly put upon it from time to time, as the hon. member for St. Michael West has said. It is a point on which I feel very strongly.

This is a country which does not have the resources of, say, Trinidad and other countries in this part of the world. We have assets of land which is decreasing, and of a population which is increasing. We have to be very careful about how we spend money. While we make allowances for all groups of workers, we have to make sure that in so doing we are not creating dissatisfaction among other groups of workers. It is not an easy task, and I will expect the Government to realise that it is not an easy task.

5.00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the Firemen a similar argument can be advanced because they also are called upon to work or to be on duty for long hours. They are also exposed to risks and the responsibilities which they have to shoulder are not adequate to the responsibilities of other workers in other Government Departments.

In the case of the Prison Officers, it is quite likely that their case may not be as strong as the case for the policemen and the Fire Officers. I am saying quite likely, but very often people like to feel that if money is being given in a particular area that they should try to get some of it. Speaking from that point of view, if you accept that, then one will have to say that they have a case. The point I am stressing is that if you are thinking in terms of the Police and the Fire Service there are special responsibilities or special risks, to which these people are exposed.

One of the things that comes very forcibly to my mind is whether the time has not come when each one of these people should be insured against the type of risks which we know they have been exposed to in the past and can be exposed to again. It is no point one of these

people getting injured and then Government is called upon to make some special award or compensation. I think we ought to look closely at the question of insuring each one of these people in the Police Force and in the Fire Service against the probable risks to which they have been exposed in the past and will be exposed to again. Of course these risks do not extend to the same extent, if they do exist, in the case of the Prison Officer. One will have to look very carefully to see if their case can be considered as being on all fours with that of the Police and the Fire Officers.

I would like to state that while it is good to know that, whilst some agreement has been reached at this stage in regard to the duty allowance, I submit that this is not the end of that problem. What is really needed is for the Government to set the machinery at work to derive a new formula or method for arriving at a salary which is suitable to the Police after taking into consideration adequate allowance for all the risks, all the added responsibility, all the normal overtime and exceptional overtime that we accept are part of the duties of a Policeman. Unless this is done it is quite likely that in the very near future we may, again, find this matter coming back to us because of dissatisfaction among the people, or the knowledge of the fact that this duty allowance has become inadequate.

In addition to that one will have to weigh the question of increasing the members of the Police Force against the question of removing many of the fringe duties which the Police Force has been called upon to do over the years and giving them to somebody else. If these things can be done and these things can make it easier for the policeman to have leisure time and to have days off where he can spend them with his family and he knows that when he is off he is not likely to be called back out unnecessary, these will go a very far way in making the policeman happier in his work. In trying to make the policeman happier in his work, there is a lot more to be done than just giving him more money. One has to look at the physical conditions of many of the Police Stations in Barbados. One will have to look at many other things affecting the performance of the duties of policemen.

In passing, I would like to point out to the Minister of Home Affairs that my Ministry some time ago drew up proposals for the establishment of a multi-storeyed building at District A, which would go a far way in removing a lot of congestion at Central Station and giving better facilities and accommodation to those people who would go there but,

unfortunately, up to this day nothing has been done in that direction. All of these things are important. It is time that something be done to look at the physical conditions, social conditions, and many other conditions of service which may make the policeman more comfortable and which will go a far way in making a policeman more concerned in getting more money, because he may argue that if he has to suffer certain inconveniences, one way of compensation is to get more money if you do nothing about them. I can only appeal to the Hon. Minister responsible for the Police, and I have every reason to believe that, like myself, he is interested in reducing a lot of these inconveniences and improving the lot of the policemen and also improving the quality of the Police Force to cope with the ever increasing amount of crime that is going on in this country and to cope with the increasing ability of the criminals who commit crime in Barbados and get away with it.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this has been a very long and, in many ways, a very useful debate indeed on the matter of the Police Administration and the Police Force in general. If I may say so, as the debate progressed, it improved every minute. The Prime Minister in opening the debate tried to set a very high tone, and I regretted very much that there was not a ready response in like manner from the Leader of the Opposition. It is very easy on occasions such as these when one is dealing with a responsible segment of the Government Service, or a Public Service like the Police Force, to go over on the other side and try merely to court short-term favour by making certain wonderful and nice statements that may be high sounding but have no true meaning in the future.

I have been arguing the case for the Police before I was in the Opposition, since 1961, and arguing that case from a position of conviction and not really from the position of getting money for it. Indeed, I was the Honorary Adviser to the Police Association, and the formula which was arrived at in 1961 was the formula which, together with the Police Association, I advanced before the Field Commission which reported in 1962. Indeed, at that time it was not easy to convince the Civil Service Establishment that, in their words, a mere policeman should be properly remunerated for his work, and, in order to get around this, we adopted some of the formula of the English

Commission on the Police pay at that time and looked at key-scale workers, because we recognised that the Civil Service would not have wanted to think that a policeman was in the same social ilk, but the key-scale workers in the industrial sector of the economy had forged ahead in relation to their remuneration based on the criteria of inconvenience, extra duty, danger, etc., and it was much easier for us in using that approach to convince the Commission of the righteousness of the Police case.
5.10 p.m.

Even in 1962, if I may say so, the full police case was not accepted by the Field Commission and indeed there was a minority report put in by Senator Carew which upheld the contentions which we advanced on behalf of the Police; so it is not a new problem in a way. The Government then accepted some of the factors which the police were asking for but it never accepted all, and the result was that of course the Police pay began to bear some relation to the duties which they were called upon to perform. I want to get this out of the way early, and I do not want to repeat past history because we are a new Government; we are a Government that has come in with a Treasury that is by no means in a position of surplus; we have come into a situation of a tight economic strangulation; it is a situation where there has been very little growth rate in the economy, and we are trying to get the economy to move forward and we are confronted with some massive problem of unemployment. Now I am stressing these factors because they are factors in the public's interest and in any negotiations, be they with the Police, Fire Service, Pension Service, Civil Service or any sector of workers in this country, even Parliamentarians, one must bear in mind that there is also an area where the public's interest must have some weight, and it is not merely the particular interest of a group of people.

Now I am probably known for my bluntness; I express the views that I am convinced about right or wrong. If I am wrong I am the first if I recognise that to admit it, and therefore I have no complications as far as I am concerned in talking about these things. I believe that the settlement which has been reached, and I have said this to the Police, and I have minuted it on the file, is the best settlement that could have been reached in the circumstances of Barbados today. I have told the Police that. I am not going to come in here for the position of courting political favour and make wild allegations like the Hon. Leader of

the Opposition had done and then run out of this House. I am not going to come in here and castigate the head of the Police Association and make innuendos about his character that are totally unfounded and then have not got the courage of my convictions and have to slip out of my seat and go away until the Minister replies, nor am I going to come in here and make any laudatory remarks about the Police simply for short term interest unless I am satisfied that the praise or the remarks are justified. It is easy for me to make political capital looking to 1981 by saying you can give the Police the whole of the Treasury, but the Police would not believe that, and I have pointed out that the Police know enough to know who their friends are.

When I took up this file in September, 1976, I discovered that the past Government, the Minister of Finance, the Minister in charge of Establishments had rejected the Police claim, and I do not care how much the hon. member for St. Michael South may try to recall and talk that away, I do not mind how much the hon. member for St. Michael South Central will today try to find all sorts of excuses, the point remains that his Prime Minister who was the ruler of that party and had all the ultimate voice in that party did not think in 1976 that the Police had a case, and he has minuted it on this file in no uncertain terms and rejected the case and had it closed. That is the position that is there and I will give you the date on which he minuted it too if you wish to know that. I think it was some time in February 1976 in his minute to the Chief Establishments Officer. I am going to hear now that we have got a settlement in which the Police have accepted these rate that are brought to this House, that the same Government which rejected that the Police had no principle at all is going to state today that they consider the settlement is not justified. That is political somersault of the worst order based on looking to 1981, and not being rational about the situation, not caring less what they did last year, but coming in here to court the favour of the policemen, all of a sudden the Police have a lot of friends. The Hon. Minister of Health as he then was did not raise a voice in Cabinet and asked what had happened to the Police case that had been outstanding for four years, but today he is going to say that there is cause for concern.

I am not in public life to make money nor I think are any of the hon. members present in this House at the moment, but one thing I am not going to take in public life within my portfolio is any sort of approach

that is based on just looking for a little political plum rather than looking at the true facts. I have said that I consider the date of 1st January as fair. I have told the Police Force that having regard to the public interest. That was not TAT time, and I argued with the Minister of Finance on the whole point as far as I can say, and let me say for the Minister of Finance that he was not like the former Minister of Finance whom you could not tell anything; his Ministers could not approach him; when he had a view, that was his view. In this Government you can approach this Minister of Finance, and although he may have a point of view, he can be persuaded; and in this case we were able to persuade him that in the over-all public interest and particularly with the policemen, there was some justification not only for the duty allowance, not only for putting up the rates that were acceptable to it, but at least to meet them part of the way on the question of retroactivity of pay. I want to get this clear and out of the way.

Now it is not a fact to say that the Police have not agreed to the rates. There is a letter which says that they agreed to the rates. I hope the Hon. Prime Minister made it clear that there are only two areas in which the Government's position and theirs did not cohere, but so far as the rates of pay which they are going to be paid are concerned, there has been no argument on the final settlement rate at that point. It is in the file and if the hon. members doubt me I will read the exact section of the Police letter dealing with this matter. It is a letter dated 23rd June, 1977. I am not going to make it a document of the House, and I do not have to, but I am entitled to quote from it, and I am not quoting anything the hon. member does not want to hear.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am rising on a point of order. I think you will recognise, Mr. Chairman, that there is no quorum in this House; that would get the Hon. Minister to cool down because he seems to be very heated in this matter, but there is no quarrel in the House at this moment.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: There is more than a quorum now. I want to say that the Police stated that the delegations which were conducting the negotiations have found that the rates have been accepted and that negotiation on that point was no longer necessary. Now let me state that both at

the lower end of the scale there is a gross figure of \$60 and at the upper end of the scale there is a figure of \$120 for duty allowance, that hon. members who have discussed this matter other than the Prime Minister have not paid regard to the different incidence of taxation. Indeed with taxation as applied to the duty allowance being given to the Commissioner of Police as well as to the duty allowance of the Constable, their actual take home position is only a difference of about between \$5 and \$10 between the two. We reckon that of the \$60 the Constable will take home in his hand about \$45 because of the rate of taxation, whereas the Officers at the \$120 level will probably get about \$60 or possibly less than \$60 of that after taxation.

5.20 p.m.

So that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central's contention that one is giving people at the top more and having no regard for people at the bottom is totally unjustified. Indeed, when I discussed this matter with the Police Association, one of the things I pointed out was the incidence of taxation and both the police and myself were adamant to try to get the best for the constables which would leave them in a favourable take home position and the \$60 is the figure which the Police Association put up. Another thing to bear in mind is that there are more people at the bottom than at the top, and therefore if you increase the bottom by \$10 it can work out at more to the Government than increasing the top by \$20, and I think by and large the police are very happy about the settlement. I realize that there are one or two people in the Police Force who are very loyal to the Democratic Labour Party and who would make any sort of statement on the settlement so as to give the hon. member for St. Michael North Central a wrong opinion. The Association has conducted these negotiations in the strongest manner possible.

And I want to deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He must not be allowed to come in here and besmirch the characters of people and then run away. He has made an unwarranted attack on Sergeant Sealey. He is suggesting that Sergeant Sealey, then Corporal Sealey, and President of the Association, was bought out in relation to these negotiations. I want to deal with this.

The first recommendation for the promotion of Corporal Sealey, as he then was, came up in a letter to the Chief Personnel Officer on April 21, 1977. Now a Minister does not appoint people; if former Ministers did, this

Minister certainly has no intention of breaching the Constitution of this country. But as a matter of courtesy the Public Service Commission passes to the Minister and enquires of the Minister if there is any objection to appointment. When this matter was sent to me in the normal course, I minuted the file to my Permanent Secretary saying that before I signified whether or not there was any objection, I wanted it brought clearly to the Police Service Commission that there were people with greater seniority who seemed to have been ignored in the recommendations, and it was only fair that each of these cases be individually considered and looked at. This would not have affected Sealey's position; there were other appointments, and my Permanent Secretary minuted the Commissioner of Police as well as the Chief Personnel Officer drawing to their attention those people in the service who had been passed over despite their seniority and asking that they be looked at. The Police Service Commission did that in each case, not only with the promotion in April but to the promotions in the Band as well, and then I indicated that if the Police Service Commission was satisfied on these points I would have no objection. I have examined this file; I have seen Ministers prior to me minuting only "no objection" and signing their names, not taking into account people who may have been passed over. And I submit to this House that I discharge my duties better than anybody else who has had this portfolio before me, because I believe that I adverted to the correct point that should be taken by a Minister; I was not concerned about the names that were put up; I am more concerned to see that a fair system operates; that is the only note posterity will find on these files when I leave this office.

You hear hon. members getting up and suggesting that this was not done, that something else was done. I have done some research on this. The Police Service Commission dealt with this on May 4, 1977; deferred the matter for more information in order to look at the people who had been passed over, and dealt with all nominations on June 15, 1977. The appointments were to be effective from July 1, 1977. There were typed on June 14, 1977, two letters sent to the Commissioner of police who would have distributed them to the officers on or soon after July 3, 1977, and the appointments were gazetted on July 4, 1977. Mr. Chairman, I have got nothing to hide. I have not bought land from the National Housing Corporation and only divulge it when I leave Parliament or cease being a Minister; I have no transactions with any Government to

hide; I want hon. members to understand that. I am not going to come in here and make allegations about people that I cannot substantiate, and I find it a low trick to pull that type of political innuendo in order to cast a shadow on the character of a police officer who discharges his duty fairly and honestly, and on the character of the Minister by way of innuendo. I feel very strongly on this. I am not getting anything out of public life other than the praise and glory of service. And if we have some people who are going to stay around because they are condemned to not getting to the top of a political party and it is hurting them, do not let them come in here and throw stones at me and try to get away. The hon. member has not got the guts of his convictions to stay in this Chamber and listen to my reply. He can only make his statements and run. One of these days I hope he will stand up in public and repeat the remarks he has made. So let me say that the Government did not have to put anybody in a position that they should not be in, in order to come in here and discharge its duties to the Police Service as well as to the public of Barbados. The police may not agree with me on the retroactive day; they may not agree with me on the question of duty whether they should be paid while they are sick — although some of them did and some did not; but I felt that this was so and I told them in the public interest and having regard to the circumstances that this was the situation; that Barbados is an ongoing society and there will be other occasions when they will be negotiating, and in changing circumstances — economic and otherwise — there may be a case for review.

And I want to clear up a few misconceptions in the minds of some members as well as the public. The police in Barbados do undertake certain duties that are not normally police duties. They are a paramilitary force which police in some jurisdictions are not. But we have to weigh against this that the ratio of police to population in Barbados is higher than in other Caribbean countries; I think it is something like one policeman to 200 persons here or something like that, while it is something like one to 400 as the average you normally expect; in other words, there are more police per head of population in Barbados than there are per head of population in Trinidad or Jamaica; so our police here are in a much more favourable ratio position than in other countries.
5.30 p.m.

I said that as we go on to add to the strength of the Force, which would even their ratio, would get even better, and as we go on

to take away, as the hon. member for St. Michael North Central has suggested, to take away some of the duties that are not truly police duties, then we would have improved their situation.

In terms of overall costing, we must look at the total bill to see whether in all these factors there would be any justification for continuing the duty allowance. Some of the conditions under which the duty allowances were payable came from the police themselves, like the suggestion that the policemen whilst in training at the Training School would not get a duty allowance. That is theirs, it is nothing we have pulled out of a hat, we sat down and tried as honest people looking for a solution to a difficult problem in difficult economic circumstances to come up with one that would recognise their merit and at the same time balance the public's interest. I have said before, when we are negotiating we are not giving away Henry Forde's money or any other hon. member's money, it is the public's money, and we are not fighting a Minister, we are dealing with the whole public interest in Barbados and how best to balance it, and nobody has any enmity against any particular sector, but at times you may not be able to give assent to what a particular sector wants, because the whole public interest would not allow you to do so, and I resent allegations that are based on irrelevant considerations, as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central got in here and made and then ran out and went home. He does not have the guts to stand up. Those who fight and run away may live to fight another day, but there is a word for them.

Let me just make the following point, Sir. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central raised the question of the physical conditions under which the police work. It is a fact that some of the physical conditions are subnormal and sometimes sub-human. Those up at Station Hill in District "A" are some of the worst conditions that you could see where the police sleep, and indeed the hon. member is right, it is he who started off the development plan for District "A". Now we are about to complete that. It has started and it is going on; this is true. It was in his time that the physical plans were made and I am now executing those plans, and I have asked them, along with the Minister of Communications and Works, we are pushing that as fast as possible to get some relief from cramped conditions.

I have held up the development of Crab Hill because we have a further study of

probably moving the station from District "E" into St. Peter and a re-allocation of the police from Holetown in much more commodious stations. I hope to include in the five year development plan of the Government a proper plan for police accommodation and physical circumstances for them. I may not be there to complete it, but I am sure that the Barbados Labour Party which will remain in power for at least another 25 years will complete it and the police will be as happy as anybody under the sun. Let me tell you that, at least another 25 years. Do you know why? We could have come into power and gone down the road and created all sorts of crash jobs, throw away money here and there in a reckless manner, but we do not approach life that way. The Minister of Finance is quite right when he makes Ministers justify why they want money, or Statutory Boards justify it, because he has a heavier duty in dealing with money that is not his than in dealing with his own money which he can give away lightly. After all, we have to collect taxes belonging to each one of us in the public at large in order to pay for public services and we have a duty to see that that money is properly spent and that there is proper accountability for it, and if this Government is taking time to see that it is done, it is something that I believe the public in their heart of hearts will recognise, and I am prepared to walk through all sorts of banners, to listen to all cheap gibes, once I am satisfied that this Government is working in the long term interest of furthering Barbados and moving on to a position that we can get people better off in their own interest for the future and eradicate poverty in this community.

No amount of cheap political gibes, no amount of nastiness will move me from this. In fact, I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central had better leave politics quickly, otherwise we will run him out. The next time it will not be his winning by 20. This speech that he made today will guarantee that he will never stand in politics again, I am going to persecute him out of public life for his cheap way of coming into politics and trying to do that sort of thing, because people must rise up to proper standards. He has been old enough in here and long enough as a politician that in his dying age he should be able to make a better speech than that. He will not be able to beat Charlie Hinds if his performance is at that level. Charlie Hinds is a genius as compared with him in the sort of standard that he brings in here in this Parliament. It is not often I get annoyed, Sir, it is not often that I speak in this way, but I do not like to see people who should be making a

contribution look only through a limited lens without looking at the total future.

I am happy to say that as the Minister responsible for the police I have about the best relationship with them. I do not always agree with everything they put up to me, but I am going to fight for them if I believe that they have a case. I will also be candid enough to tell them when I think that the public interest cannot take another squeeze. I may be wrong, I am not saying I am right, but I act honestly in everything that I do, and I will keep that way despite the gibes.

The Fire Service, I do not want to go into that right now, I just want to make a comment about the Prison. Part of the Prison problem can be solved by a reform of some of our laws. That is not a thing I could do overnight. I have set up a committee to look at all the laws dealing with penology and punishment in this country. Already I can see that I will be recommending to Cabinet, if Cabinet accepts to this House, a reform of prison sentences for debt. That would halve, or at least a quarter of the population who go to prison would be out. We can attack that problem that way so that we do not go on just adding people as Prison Wardens to keep people in prison. It costs the country \$14 a day to maintain - the prison services for a prisoner. That is a high price we are paying, whereas some of the people up there could be out doing community work and being made to earn their keep. I can find nothing on the file that the last Government looked to reform all the laws in this respect.

The first Attorney General of an independent Barbados either did not have the commonsense or he did not perform his duty, otherwise by now he would have solved the problem, but no ideas were coming from him, he was just walking around boasting about being the first Attorney General of Barbados as though that is running the public's business in any way, and that is the sort of thing we get. I am trying to do the job with the limited intelligence that the good Lord has given me and I hope to come up with some of the solutions with the help of the people who advise me, and listening to worthwhile suggestions that come from the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. I must say my friend, the hon. member for St. Michael South, is more interested in the party race in August than in making his usually high standard of contribution, but I am receptive to ideas. If the Opposition comes in here with any idea that is

worthwhile we will take it. The Hon. Minister of Communications today withdrew a Resolution on a worthwhile contribution made from the other side. We are not frightened of the ideas coming from the other side, we do not believe we have all the answers, we believe that at this point in time we have better answers than the Opposition had during their last two years in office, and I am open to ideas, but I believe that criticism should be constructive, it should not be destructive, and it is a pity that he was interjected into the debate in this House today. I hope that before next year is out we will have proper legislation dealing with the Prison Services and by that means to satisfy some of the problems and the pressures on Prison Officers.

I believe that the NUPW will accept the settlement. They are a bit touchy about certain things, but talking to the Prison Officers themselves, some of them are very happy that they have got some attention that they did not get before. Some of the files will show the Prison Officers making these complaints before I was there, going on and on and on and no Minister paying any attention to them. I go up and I open the file and we take some notice of them and we are being criticised in here for noticing the Prison Officers.

5.40 p.m.

What more must we do? In 10 months this Government, I believe has done more to allow people to speak freely and openly about their views. You have not heard any one of us get up and say that people should not be in the precincts of the House of Assembly. I heard the former Prime Minister saying that people should not come into the building yard and saying that this should not happen to him. I admired the faces of the ladies. Some seem to be from St. Michael South, and they were merely expressing their rights. I like to see women and I hope that they would do more constructive work in this country.

On that note, I have asked my Ministry if it could incorporate women in the Fire Service. There are certain physical changes which will be necessary. Once we get the money to change the existing conditions in the stations, we will get women into the Fire Service. I also hope that there will be a greater recruitment of women into the Police Force as well. I also want to see the Police Commission pay some regard to promoting women in the Police Force as well as the Public Service Commission doing more to promote women in the Civil Service.

These are problems that they are looking at. We could not solve them within 10 months, but I hope that we will be able to solve them certainly within the period of time that the people allow us to be here as the Government of this country.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of two Money Resolutions in Committee.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I beg to second that.

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

On separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE seconded by Hon. L. R. TULL, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND THE OVERSEAS SERVICE AGREEMENT ACT, CHAPTER 24

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I am asking for leave to deal with this measure in the absence of the Hon. Prime Minister.

There being no objection leave was granted.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to give effect to an Agreement entered into between the Government of Barbados and the Government of the United Kingdom dealing with certain personnel provided to the Government of Barbados by the United Kingdom. The Agreement came into effect in 1961 and was renewed in 1971 for a further period of 5 years.

It is proposed that this Agreement should now reflect the new situation arrived at between the two countries. Under the arrangement the U.K. will pay for the service cost of personnel who are mostly expatriates. There have been some changes in the provisions of the scheme over the past 15 years. For the most part Britain meets most of the cost involved in providing this personnel here. An allowance which is the differential between the local cost and the British cost is paid by the British Government. At the same time a gratuity on

the termination of service is paid for by the British Government. Part payment of any compensation which becomes due to officers recruited in the British Civil Service when they retire is also met by the British Government.

These officers are employed in skilled areas such as architecture, quantity surveying, engineering etc. It has been recognised that in these technical fields it would be difficult for us to recruit people of this expertise at the sort of salaries which we could afford. Therefore the Government has signed a new agreement of which we schedule to the Bill is an example. The purpose of the Bill is to give effect to this agreement and make it part and parcel of the law of Barbados so as to enable the Government to carry out the Agreement between the two countries.

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

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.
5.50 p.m.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that and to reserve my right to speak at a later stage.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this particular measure will meet with support from this side of the House. We do not have any objection to this particular Bill that is before us, but I think we should point out, as the Minister himself has pointed out, that the Agreement itself has a history to it and this is based in the fact that with independence coming to a number of former colonial territories a problem arose, not only with those territories, but also with the Metropolitan dominated country as well. The problem with the Metropolitan mother country, as some people used to call it and still regard it as a nostalgic word, is that, if there were a large number of civil servants returning from colonial territories back to the home country, they would be faced with the problem of trying to absorb and to give some compensatory payment to those who could no longer find a place in the Service of the former colonial territories because those territories were on the track of localising their Public Service and, wherever possible, were using local persons where foreign personnel were used before.

In order to meet the needs of both territories, both the dominated countries as well as the dependent countries, such an Agreement was worked out. As far as the independent

country was concerned, there was an additional factor and it was that because of the scarcity of trained personnel, particularly in areas necessary for development, it was necessary for these dependent countries to retain, or to recruit, personnel from the developed country in order to assist in the development of the country.

The type of Agreement we are having here now is one which is in the interest both of the home country as well as in terms of the newly independent country. One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker. We cannot get development in any country unless we have trained human resources, and it is this type of situation which is recognised in an Agreement such as this. As far as we can recall, the first Agreement between Barbados and the United Kingdom was signed, I believe, in 1961 and it was to preserve the rights and interests of certain officers in given areas. From time to time, as I understand it, certain changes were made by the United Kingdom Government. This Agreement is for persons benefiting under this Agreement, and it stated that the categories in which persons would be recruited would be scaled down. We look forward to the time when the programme would be phased out altogether, and from time to time the actual abolition of the scheme has been contemplated.

I believe that some public officers look with displeasure at other public officers from overseas, who may be holding positions in the Public Service and who are getting these additional perquisites and fees as it were in terms of this allowance, whether it is an education allowance, or whether it is an allowance for hospitalisation, which might not be available locally, or whether it might be an allowance for going back home, as they used to say. Whatever was the type of the allowance, I know that certain public officers were not too happy with persons who were doing the same job as they were doing and were getting these additional perquisites. Certain public officers were not in favour of that. When this matter was canvassed, it was realised that to change the scheme and give notice to the officers who were benefiting under the agreement would or might constitute a change in service, or a change in the conditions of service of these officers, and so the Agreement has never been terminated.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this country is faced with a number of alternatives. It is clear that development depends upon trained officers to make good use of our resources. It is clear that we cannot increase the total number of goods or the amount of goods and services produced in this country unless we have trained

personnel particularly in certain areas. It is clear that we cannot increase the *per capita* income of this country unless we become more efficient. It will be necessary to employ these overseas officers until we are able to train our own people to take over from them. It will be necessary to improve the standard of living of the people in this country not only in terms of competition, but in terms of our economic needs and services, and, indeed, in terms of health, welfare and the well being of the people in this country. All of these things are dependent upon having skilled persons in key positions in this country.

The very definition of underdevelopment seems to indicate that the underdeveloped country does not have in certain key areas the type of skilled and trained people to carry out and to push forward any particular development. I believe that it is in the interest of this Government to have this Agreement continued for a long period of time, and that is why we will be supporting this particular measure. As I understand it the number of persons who benefit under this programme is very small. The number is being reduced over the years and persons are only being appointed on contract, I believe. Maybe the Minister can tell us how many persons are involved and what is the cost of employing them. If the Minister will tell us what is the cost of operating this particular scheme it will help us a great deal.

I think we are satisfied from the information given that it is a programme which has served this country reasonably well, and we believe that it should continue to serve this country for some time to come. I would like to make this point and to issue a warning to the Government that we cannot continue to depend upon a programme such as this one for providing the trained manpower resources for this country's needs and for its development. This has been recognised very long ago, and this is one of the reasons why the training programme should be given serious consideration in the Prime Minister's Office. The persons concerned should look into these areas of the Public Service where there is a dearth of trained manpower so that these people can be sent on training courses and return here to give us the benefit of the training they have received abroad.

6 p.m.

That is why too in 1971 we developed the National Development Scholarship Programme to meet the training needs of the population as a whole or to try to meet them because as we have heard expounded today and the type of statesmanship that we heard on this matter, we

regret that we did not hear it when we were dealing with increases for the whole public service last year; but we heard how we have to consider the resources of the country; these are limited, all quite true, but in 1977 when you are the Government you recognise that you have this type of responsibility, but in Opposition the need was not that clear or certainly was not articulated with that degree of knowledge. So we developed the National Scholarship Programme in 1971 and by 1975 I believe some 35 persons were offered training scholarships under this particular programme in very scarce areas, areas such as medicine, dentistry, diathetics, sanitary engineering, pharmacy. We made at least one award in each of those areas, and then you had architecture, quantity surveying, veterinary science, and training in petroleum engineering indicated that we were looking ahead to the development of the natural resources of this country. Some 35 scholarships were offered and some of the persons who have been awarded National Development Scholarships are now returning to this country and making a contribution in the areas in which they have been trained.

That is part of this particular Resolution; it is about training the manpower resources of this country and instead of having to rely on a foreign country to give us that particular expertise, we have to look to our own resources, develop our own people so that they can make a contribution. I would like to say this much too, that I believe the Government itself might look to the development and implementation of its own agreements in these areas. In other words, instead of relying let us say on the United Kingdom to top up the salaries of United Kingdom officials who come to this country, the Government may try to develop arrangements with other countries and develop a fund whereby they can attract in very scarce areas of need other overseas personnel to serve this country. I believe that is an area to which some attention could be given because after all the programmes are not developed for the benefit of the persons who come; they are for the benefit of the people of this country, and if we have to use external resources to develop our country, well so be it until we can develop our own resources. But the two things have got to go on in parallel; they have to be done in sequence. While we use external people we could also be developing our own resources.

Now there are a few areas in this particular Bill which I believe we might wish to look at. While we see this is an agreement whereby the allowances are topped up by the United Kingdom

Government, I believe that one of the clauses in this Bill — I cannot find it at the moment; I am not certain if it is in the Bill itself or in the Schedule and may be the Minister can assist me here — indicates that persons going on overseas visits or returning home must travel on the United Kingdom carrier, and I am wondering if the Minister, I am not certain if it is the Prime Minister or the Minister of External Affairs, in negotiating this agreement looked at this particular area to see whether persons being recruited could not also travel on the Barbados National carrier, Caribbean Airways. It is Clause 4 I am told where it is indicated that it should be in the carrier of the United Kingdom, British Airways, and where practicable by excursion or charter flight. This is safeguarding the interests of the United Kingdom, and this is on a reflection of the policies which were instituted way back in the Seventeenth Century into the free capitalist system in which you had to travel in British bottoms, or the goods had to be carried in British bottoms — I was speaking of ships, Mr. Speaker, — so we have this perpetuation here where this is the kind of tie, and I do hope some reply can be given on this particular matter.

The other bit of information I would like to get in fact relates to how many people are actually involved in this particular programme, who are the designated officers and what areas they are operating in not necessarily their names. I believe one was in agriculture at one time and another one was probably in land surveying and one probably in law in the Attorney General's Chambers, but maybe the Minister can give us some information on this whether in terms of the categories in which these designated officers now serve, the cost of operating this programme and whether the Minister is contemplating the time when this particular programme might come to an end.

6.10 p.m.

So Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that it might be in the interest of this country inasmuch as it relates to the development of our human resources or the resources of this country to try to work out similar agreements with other countries in these areas, because the benefit of this particular programme has been established and if it were not so I do not believe this particular measure would be before us. I believe the Government should set up its training programme so that Barbadians can get training and qualifications in these areas where we now have to rely on overseas personnel. I believe that in our own institutions we can improve so that we can produce our own manpower to command the services of this

country and ultimately produce more goods and services. And I would like to call upon the Government at this stage to define its own manpower services in terms of projection in the more difficult areas.

I remember at one time I was told that there was going to be a big boom in the hotel industry and we were to provide more carpenters, masons etc., in the construction industry. But instead of a boom we had a slump, and the crash programmes which we were enjoined to implement just did not work and people found it difficult to get employment. So we must define our manpower resources; I think this is something which must be recognized.

And finally I think we must develop our own services to attract personnel from abroad. For instance, if we are dealing with the question of soil erosion or beach erosion, I believe there are developed countries which have a lot of experience in terms of dealing with water and the problems created thereby and we could welcome possibilities of assistance from that direction. As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, we are not speaking against this measure but I wanted to mention a few areas where the particular programme for the development of this country could be improved and we have asked for information which might be beneficial.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if I may reply to the hon. member, the scheme began in 1961 with 36 designated officers, 31 of whom were on contract and five were holders of permanent pensionable office. The highest number of officers designated was 39 in 1967, of whom 29 were on contract and ten were holders of permanent pensionable office. Since 1973 the British Government has been seeking to reduce the number of people designated and they have allocated quotas to various countries, and it seems that under the quota for Barbados the highest number of persons designated will be fourteen. In dealing with the designation the Barbados Government is to be consulted.

The fields that were chosen were special fields such as medicine, engineering, architecture, town planning, etc. A man power planning committee is already in existence within the Prime Minister's office as part of the exercise. This Committee consults with various committees and as a result sets out the principal areas in which assistance would be needed. But the man power Committee is conscious of the point made by the hon. member and in a Report to

the Prime Minister they did draw to his attention that every effort was being made by planned training to reduce and eliminate dependence on the scheme so that it will be phased out shortly. I think the hon. member can be satisfied that the Government has the matter in hand. Indeed, I believe that various Ministries have been reviewing their training needs and putting up these needs to the Chief Training Officer who in conjunction with the Minister of Education will be coming up with an overall plan for the next ten years.

I have noticed in my Ministry that many scholarships have been offered to the Government in the past but have not been taken up. I can think of the Japanese Government offering a number of courses, and my files reveal that since 1968 there has been a consistent failure to take up training opportunities offered by the Japanese Government. The High Commissioner for India has also complained to me that this Government has not taken up scholarships offered. In addition, the French Government has offered training scholarships in the field of petroleum engineering and again this had not been taken up. But we are now trying to coordinate information coming to the Government so that the information can be passed on to the Ministries concerned — especially the Ministry of Education — and the Minister of Education will tell you that we are sending down information as it comes to hand. The Government of Nigeria has also offered training scholarships. Last Friday I happened to be at Marine House for a conference and I gave the Minister of Education a list received from the Japanese Embassy showing opportunities available in areas that his Ministry would be interested in and his Permanent Secretary is looking at the matter. The Minister for Civil Aviation and Tourism will confirm that I drew to his attention that the Japanese had courses in tourism of primary importance to his Ministry. I think therefore that hon. members will see that previously there has been a lack of communication between the Ministries.

6.20 p.m.

The Minister for Civil Aviation and Tourism will confirm that I drew to his attention that the Japanese have a course in tourism, information and development that is of primary importance to his Ministry. Indeed, again this was offered before but was turned down. I think what the hon. members may be satisfied about is that there has been a complete lack of co-ordination between Ministries. The files show that there have been letters which

went unanswered, offers that were not even passed on to Ministries, and they remained on the file, so that we are looking wherever possible to maximise the opportunities that are available and to use those that are offered to us and to identify other areas. This is one area in which the Foreign Service is now being used, and I trust it will be used effectively so that more technical assistance will be available to us and our training needs will be answered to some extent.

The British Government, during talks I had with them, have indicated their interest probably in increasing the level of aid given to us for training and technical assistance, and I hope that later this year a special emissary will be here to discuss this aspect of the matter with the Ministers most concerned.

I trust that I have answered the points raised by the hon. member. I do not think there is any point I have omitted to answer.

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

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

The clauses of the Bill were called and passed.

The Schedule to the Bill was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill and that it stand part.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I did raise a question under clause 4 of the Agreement about the United Kingdom carrier and I do not recall whether the Minister responded to that particular question. I may have missed it, and I wonder if the Minister could on this occasion tell us something about the necessity for the designated officers to travel only on United Kingdom carriers where these may be available.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I have looked at the file and I do not see there is any specific minute on negotiations on this part of Clause 4, although there were negotiations on the wording of clause 4. I will say, however, that the passages are paid by the United Kingdom and I believe that it is the practice of the United Kingdom on reimbursing Governments to make sure that if the British taxpayer is paying the money that a British carrier gets the benefit of it, and it is more a case of beggars cannot be choosers rather than anything else in this instance. It does not mean that in every case that a United Kingdom carrier will be used, it is only when it is practical so to do that the person using the carrier must go by a United Kingdom carrier.

At the end of March 1981, we will then look at the position in the light of the point made, but I think that the United Kingdom Government will insist, as indeed donor Governments do insist and multi-lateral institutions do insist, that the money be spent either to produce their goods or to go in their ships once it is their money. In this instance we are not even paying interest on the money so we could merely express the hope that they will use our carriers in particular rather than the United Kingdom carriers. I do not think it is a point we can negotiate with any strength.

The question that this be the Schedule to the Bill was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.
6.30 p.m.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Resolution is to approve the terms of the lease between the Crown and the First National City Bank of a portion of land at the Grantley Adams International Airport. The First National City Bank operated at what was then Seawell Airport, and it has been so operating from the 1st January, 1969. The terms and conditions of the lease are set out in the Resolution; and the terms have been varied so as to ensure that the clauses which purported to grant a monopoly to the First National City Bank

no longer exist. This is to facilitate the Government's scheme for establishing at the airport a division of the proposed Government Commercial Bank. Other than that, the terms of the renewal are in accordance with the former lease.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, there is one point that I wish to raise on this matter. I want to make my position very clear on this. I will vote against the measure, and I will explain why. It is not to do with the principle or the idea of creating or providing banking facilities at the Grantley Adams International Airport. I feel that at any airport facilities for banking must be provided on as wide a basis as possible, and for as long a period as possible.

However, Sir, there is a matter relating to First National City Bank which I want to draw to the attention of the House and which causes me, or influences me to vote against this Resolution. Now, the First National City Bank has been the subject of a document which was circulated here recently, and which had to do with their employment policies, I have copies of the document which were circulated in Europe, and one part of the document contains something which is distasteful to us, and I want to put it in the records of this House.

It talks about the policy of the First National City Bank and Trade Unions. I want to place it in the records of this House what they say. They talk about the policy of the bank on unions and the documents states that the management of the First National City Bank firmly believe that the bank can function best without the presence of a union and to that end the management makes an effort for the maintenance of an environment which makes unnecessary the intervention of a third party.

They set out very clearly the way in which the personnel officer at any of the branches should deal with a situation where he sees any evidence of a particular union's presence, or a particular union organiser, if the representative of the union appears at the bank in person; whether witnesses are equal to or greater than the number of individuals negotiating with the union organiser; if possible to make record of the conversation by whatever means. Do not argue or discuss the matter. See that the union organiser

leaves promptly. Do not allow him or her to linger in the work place etc. They are all set out in this particular document.

We should take into consideration that in 1974 we amended in this House the Trade Union Act. I refer to Section 40 of that Act which makes it an offence for any employer to in any way prevent or attempt to prevent any worker in Barbados from joining or becoming a member of a trade union. I think that we should recognise the active way in which First National City Bank is attempting to prevent workers exercising what after all is recognised as their actual right.

Therefore, I do not think that I can in any case vote for this particular Resolution and I have indicated the basis on which I cannot vote for it. If I had been aware of this document before, I would have drawn it to the attention of the Chamber before hand. I am quite prepared, as I have said, to make this a document of the House. I hope the Minister of Labour and the Attorney General will look into this matter.

It is part of an international policy which the First National City Bank is pursuing; and I think that it brings out very clearly the kind of way in which multi national corporations operate when they come into various territories. They do not want on occasions to abide by the laws of a particular country. We have to insist that we have a law here, that we have a particular practice, and that is what we consider to be in our national interest; and we must insist that these laws be obeyed, no matter how powerful a particular company might be regarded, as I feel that the national interest must prevail. I said that I would draw it to the attention of the Government and indicate that my stand on this is that I cannot support the Resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are grateful to the hon. member for St. Lucy for drawing our attention to the fact that this international bank, the First National City Bank, felt that it is entitled to dictate to countries how they should carry on their operations. I would go further than the hon. member and say that it is not really a question of law, or rather of the Act of 1974, but under the Constitution of this country every person has a right to join whatever association — including political associations — that he may choose; and it would be impertinence for them to come to Barbados and tell workers that they cannot be unionised.

I hope that the Government will draw it to the attention of the bank, now that it has been aired in here, that we are aware of some of the

surreptitious practices of that bank, and will not tolerate it in this country. There is one aspect of this Resolution that I wanted to deal with, and that is the question of the rent. I cannot see how you can negotiate in these days to rent a bank space at \$275 a month. Consideration will have to be greater, not because it is a bank, but because of current market prices for commercial rental. A rent of \$275 a month? No, Sir. I would like to know what prompted those who agreed to this rent to put it at so minimal a rate.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up here it brought me back to last Tuesday when we discuss for some considerable time the matter of contracts. Here we have a lease which will be another contract. Under the Board of Tourism we have had a number of contracts which have backfired. It draws to our attention the matter of Government's contract as a whole. I think that the Government will have to take a very serious look whether it is a question of contracts with overseas tour operators or otherwise. We have had other contracts before we came into office which have caused considerable problems to certain Statutory Boards.
6.40 p.m.

I would also like to draw the attention of this Honourable House to a matter about which I spoke to the Prime Minister in the Lobby a little while ago. I telephoned the Permanent Secretary on his instructions, and I have been told that what has been done is in accordance with the contract. I refer to the reclaimed land at the Deep Water Harbour. There is a shoal in the middle of the basin. I do not believe that anybody who has studied the navigation in the Port with a view to signing a contract would have signed that type of contract. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking now about all contracts coming out of this one that is about to be signed. I do not see how anybody could have left a shoal in the middle of the basin of the new extension of the Deep Water Harbour.

Mr. SPEAKER: I appreciate the hon. member's concern about contracts, but I believe he will agree that seaports and airports. . .

Mr. WARD: I was a little off, Sir. I was just dealing with the broad aspect of contracts and Government making sure that when they sign contracts with any company such as the First National City Bank, or with the Company that dredged the Port, every detail will be mentioned in these contracts.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member now sounds better.

Mr. WARD: The Government must see to it that every detail in the contract is carefully examined, and then a thorough examination is made to see if the contract has been carried out *in toto*. I have merely drawn that to the attention of this Honourable House because we are also having problems with contracts at the Tourist Board at the present time.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the contributions that have been made have certainly raised some points on which we would like to hear from the Minister of Finance. A question has been raised by the member for St. Philip North in terms of the rental of \$3,300 per annum for the area at the Airport. It might be as well for the Minister to let us know how this compares with other rentals; whether it is space inside the Airport itself, or other land which has been rented to other interests at the Airport. It may be that these things are compared. I do not know, but the Minister could really tell us how this rental has been arrived at.

The other point raised by the member for St. Lucy is one which we have to pay especial attention to ensure that the interests as set out in the Constitution are preserved. I refer to the interests of workers to join any union of their choice. We all know the problems that have been going on recently and occurring in the United Kingdom, I believe, outside of the Grundig Factory where a struggle for a basic right is on the way. We would certainly like some assurances on this matter. I believe this is one which was also stressed by the member for St. Philip North.

I am particularly interested in the last sentence of the Schedule to the Resolution:

"The lease to provide that the Barbados Savings Bank, but no other Bank, should be permitted to set up operation at Grantley Adams International Airport if it is so desired." I believe I read somewhere recently, maybe, in the Press, or I may have heard it over one of the Radio Stations, either Rediffusion or the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, that the Government Savings Bank will be operating at hours when the other Bank at the Airport would not be operating. I am not certain whether the newspapers got it correctly, or whether this is, in fact, the intention. If I am incorrect in this, I wonder if I could get that indication now because I would not like to base my argument on information that is not accurate. I would like to know whether the Government Savings Banks,

when it sets up its operations - I understand it will be in the area of changing money as a start rather than providing other banking services. I would like to know whether, in fact, it is intended that the Barbados Savings Bank would be operating only when the National City Bank is closed, or whether it would be in full competition with the First National City Bank.

I hope that the information which I came across is incorrect, because I would hate to think that if we are going into a National Institution and expanding the operations of the Barbados Savings Bank into a full-fledged National Bank, and this is something which we on this side support we are not against this, but we certainly would like to know that the operations which they are entering upon would be as broad as that of the First National City Bank and that the hours would not be hours when most of the business would have disappeared from the Airport or that business would not be available.

I can quite understand the member for Christ Church North Central wanting to get into the seaports, the shoals and so on. We know that he has a programme in which he talks about tourism, and the Airport is a port for that. I know he has certain things on his mind now, but I hope that we can get on with this particular matter and get some answers on the questions that have been raised.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise as any friend or to defend its bad union record, or any of the other matters raised by hon. members on this Resolution. As far as I am concerned, I congratulate the hon. member for St. Lucy on drawing to the attention of Parliament the internationally circulated information on City Bank as an employer. But it is a pity that all these things were not known about City Bank when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, or City Bank would not have been granted a series of exceptional favours to support a whole wrath of exceptionally shady transactions in years gone by.

Now, City Bank is the Bank concerned with Bath Plantation. City Bank is the Bank concerned with International Seafoods. City Bank has such a contaminated portfolio as a result of the deals put up by the former Prime Minister's friend and guaranteed by the Government of Barbados that it has come under scrutiny by the Federal Bank Inspectors from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. City Bank Manager, Mr. Stallwitz, who approved all these shady operations, has been fired from the Bank and has made over 60 applications to other Banks and has been refused employment.

6.50 p.m.

He has reached the stage, so I am informed, of saying that to get back in a bank he would be content to go and open and shut the door for the customers as they come in. You cannot say anything about City Bank from this side of the House as managed at the time by Cozier which I believe is too much, but there are two points to be made. The first relates to City Bank. The First National City Bank of New York is one of the great financial institutions of the United States of America, and we can find it very easy to get down here perhaps and categorise the bank on the basis of its financing of doubtful persons. Joy Edwards after all owes City Bank over \$2 million, he and his various bucket shot companies, but we cannot categorise the bank for ever and ever because of this, and I think that all of us should try at this time to draw a veil over the past activities of City Bank of Barbados, and with new and enlightened management at the Ministry of Finance indicate to City Bank and indicate to persons within City Bank who are corruptible.

Remember the most corrupt Barbadian Bank Manager that we have so far produced — I believe he wins by a short neck from the gentlemen at Barclays Bank, he was so corrupt that even the rest of the management at City Bank noticed it and got rid of him — was a City Bank Manager, a man who eventually in return for making dangerous investments, investments that had contaminated the portfolio very considerably, was rewarded with permission to cut up plantations and get sales, and the whole story is not finished yet about Mr. Cozier and his dealings in property. The whole story has not been told yet, but as I say remember all this, but this should be over. Cozier was fired even when the other regime was in power, Stallwitz has been fired and I believe that City Bank must be given a chance now it understands that it is dealing with people who take a serious view of the financial responsibility of Government to work its way back into financial respectability in the Barbados money world. I am not in any way gainsaying what the hon. member for St. Lucy has said. That is a separate problem and believe me, if the hands of the Government were free I would give that problem all the weight it deserves, but the hands of the Government are not entirely free in this matter. Very soon after coming into office I indicated that I was doubtful about the transaction which now comes before us. City Bank's option to renew the lease expired during 1974 and no exercise of that option was forthcoming before the expiry date. I therefore considered that the re-rental proposal was so generous to City Bank, because undoubtedly the hon. member for St. Philip North was correct when he said that we were giving the land away,

and since City Bank's record had really not impressed me as a bank to whom I should entrust the responsibility of being in a monopoly position at the Airport, for bear in mind it is not only travellers who go in and out of City Bank — this is a very highly profitable branch. City Bank has a captive audience there at the airport; it has a very large number of taxi drivers, it has the airline employees, it has the Customs Officers, all of that it has; it has one of the largest captive audiences of any bank branch in this country. It is in a plaza position, but it has the best plaza. There are branches of banks at Sunset Crest, at Southern Plaza, at Wildey and so on. City Bank undoubtedly has the best Plaza and I am told that there are branches of banks at plazas less well favoured than the airport that pays \$15,000 a year and upwards for rent.

This was referred on 17th September, 1976 to the Attorney General for an opinion as to whether we were obliged to carry out these obligations. Now I am really astonished to hear the hon. member for St. Michael South and to see the hon. member for St. Michael North Central sitting down silent with these criticisms, when I see that on April 2, 1976 Cabinet decided to renew the lease on these terms; you cannot approbate and reprobate; you cannot sit down in Cabinet and be aware of all these criticisms and then come back a year later and because it is a different political party being forced to carry out your decision criticise that political party for carrying it out. Did the hon. member for St. Michael South know of these things in Cabinet or was he too afraid of the former Prime Minister to raise a voice and strike a blow for what was right? Does he think that is the stuff of which good leadership is made, that you can attack the Leader of the other party but not the leader of your own, that you can demand answers from the Minister of Finance of the Barbados Labour Party, but you cannot demand answers from the Minister of Finance of your own party? He has got the answers, and if he chokes on them I much regret that I have to thrust them down his throat. This is a decision of the former Cabinet which we have resisted putting into force. Public Officers minuted that the rent was too generous; public officers minuted that the opinion of the Commissioner of Valuation had not been taken; public officers minuted that although the rent appeared to go up from \$1,650 to \$3,500, in other words doubling, they pointed out that the amount of land being occupied was greater than under the old lease, so the rent was in fact only raised 50%. All of that can be found on the file. The amount of space, the rationale is based only on twice the amount of space; this represents in

fact only a 50% increase over and above the original amount of \$2.00 a square foot. \$3,300 a year is giving the land away.

City Bank was given a monopoly at the same time as City Bank was given a contract for International Seafoods, Bath and so on. City Bank was right involved in the financing, and Mr. Speaker, they were even smarter although I do not rate Mr. Stallwitz or Mr. Cozier as intellectual equals of the hon. member for St. John, but they were still smarter where money was concerned. It is only now that we are discovering that at the time of the International Seafoods loan which we in the Opposition as we were then reluctantly agreed to in here which the hon. member for St. John and yourself, Mr. Speaker, had a discussion on and agreed to these terms, how City Bank came to urge on the hon. member for St. John to take a 50% share in International Seafoods. Although we took a 50% share, we did not have 50% control; we only had the illusion of a 50% share.

7.00 p.m.

We did not then know that at that time the American Treasury was charging a special surcharge on loans made by American banks overseas at rates of interest in excess of the prime rate prevailing in the home state in which the bank was registered; or at the time that the New York prime rate was 5% and City Bank was lending at the inflated rate in Barbados. City Bank should have been paying a surcharge of the interest received on the loan. But there was a subclause that money lent to a friendly Government of a developing country would be exempted from the surcharge. It was not you, Mr. Speaker, that persuaded the hon. member for St. John to increase the Government's shareholding in International Sea Food; it was City Bank in order to avoid paying the United States Treasury the surcharge on interest which would have been earned on the loan. And we are only now getting down to the whys and wherefores of some of these things.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that hon. members can tell us that we have not already given careful consideration to. However, the Cabinet decided upon this on, I think, the 2nd April. This decision was conveyed to First National City Bank. The Attorney General at first said that it raised at least some moral obligation but when the matter was really analysed the Attorney General pointed out it had been accepted by City Bank, and a letter accepting the terms of a lease is as good as a lease; that is, an agreement for a lease which is enforceable. It is a

memorandum in writing sufficient to take the matter out of the statute of frauds. If the member behind me is asking *sotto voce* or is questioning what the Attorney General informed me, it is the correct interpretation of the law.

Mr. SPEAKER: I know the hon. Prime Minister is addressing the Chair, of course.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: And our hands are tied. The Democratic Labour Party decided this lease should be renewed. City Bank was told, they agreed, and that is the end of the matter. If we wish to void the lease it is my belief that the bank could probably sue us for loss of profits less the amount of rent they would have had to pay from now until April, 1979, and I believe the amount of rent they would have to pay is about \$7,500. I believe they could turn that over in a week. So we would find ourselves financing a very expensive operation if we do not now grant this lease; so it must be regarded as *force majeure*. This is a concession wrung out of the Government; it is one of the bad decisions of the Democratic Labour Party; a bad decision tainted with fraud, and unfortunately we find ourselves having to carry the can. We carry the can for International Sea Foods and even now I am negotiating with the Public Works of this Island, and when the Government needs to spend money on major public works I am having to try to borrow over \$7 million to pay City Bank a part of the loan to International Sea Foods; and City Bank themselves are offering to lend us the money, but they are charging us a finder's fee and a commitment fee to lend us money to pay them. So I am trying to get another bank to raise Euro dollars; I am trying to borrow \$7 million in Euro dollars, that could be otherwise used to ease our balance of payments situation, to pay City Bank for some of the past liabilities that have been thrust on this Government by the Democratic Labour Party regime. So I am very resentful when I think that City Bank by the end of this month will have got \$10 million out of this Government — \$3 million for Bath and \$7 million for Sea Foods.

Dr. CADDLE: Does City Bank have a licence to operate, and can that licence be revoked?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: The hon. member has made a point, but as I have said, we are trying to draw a veil over the past. In a way I am sorry to some extent for City Bank because when they get the \$3 million from Bath I believe the only investment they are going to find for

the money is Barbados Government's securities, because they are not that many outlets for private funds at this time. City Bank is not misbehaving; they are telling us about finder's fee, commitment fee, and so on; but we have a solution. You don't have to withdraw the licence; you go to somebody else and give them the business. If City Bank wants to lend you money to pay themselves and make a profit out of the deal, there are other banks in Barbados that have kept a low profile in past years and this is what we are going to do. You cannot raise Euro dollars through the Savings Bank; so we will go to another commercial bank and let it raise the Euro dollars to pay off City Bank. I see the point of the hon. member, and I will no doubt be advised in due course by the Governor of the Central Bank, who will be invited to take note of the comments made by the hon. member for St. Lucy and St. Michael North Central, and I will be advised in due course whether he is satisfied that City Bank's employment practices in Barbados conform with the standard of public life in this country and with our Constitution; because I am guided, as the hon. member for St. Michael North Central may know, by the Central Bank who is the supervising authority of banking in this country; and all of these matters will be taken care of. In the mean time, we have this obligation and we must discharge our obligations. So under the circumstances I regret I have to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Mr. SPEAKER: The time now being 7.10 o'clock this sitting is suspended until 8 o'clock. 7.10 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there are two points I believe which were raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South which need to be answered. One is in relation to the position of the Savings Bank. It is the intention of the Government that the Savings Bank would carry on banking business at the airport, and one of the reasons why we held up the passage of this Resolution previously was to have negotiations to amend the existing terms of the lease to prevent a monopoly by the bank and make it clear that the Barbados Government Savings Bank or any branch of it would be able to carry on business at the airport.

The other point someone raised was the question of the period of time of this lease.

This lease will expire in 1979 and by that time the new terminal building will be open, we hope, and I think it can be made very clear to City Bank that as far as we are concerned in the new terminal building the banking facilities that exist there should be carried on by the Government Savings Bank and not the City bank, but as we said before, we were tied to an agreement which had an option for renewal and that has been generally renewed, but it backdates from 1974 for five years, which brings it to 1979.

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

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Hon'bles. L. S. CRAIG, H. B. St. JOHN, H. deB. FORDE, L. B. BRATHWAITE, L. R. TULL, Miss B. A. MILLER, Messrs. WARD, SISNETT, SIMMONS, ODLE, His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Dr. CADDLE and Mr. SANDIFORD — 13.

Noes: Mr. GREAVES — 1.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY
ACQUISITION OF LAND AT ST. PATRICKS,
CHRIST CHURCH, FOR ROAD
IMPROVEMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Resolution is to compulsorily acquire a parcel of land situated at St. Patricks in Christ Church. Hon. members who are familiar with the area will recognise that there is an area of land at the junction of the St. Patricks junction which is a four-cross-road which prevents, because of the high ridge and the contour of the land, visibility if you are driving on the way from the junction going towards Packers Valley and into St. Philip. There is a high ridge on the left hand side of the road which is very, very dangerous and a number of accidents have taken place there.

The Central Planning Committee as long ago as 27th August, 1975, recommended that this small area of the junction be acquired for the purpose of setting back this junction and to have good visibility. A plan has been made of it and I have it available if hon. members would like to see it. The object of this is to acquire the land so that the Ministry of Communications and Works can get ahead with

it. I believe that there is some uncertainty as to title in respect of this land. That is the object of the Resolution and the public purpose is for the purpose of improvement of the junction at St. Patricks on Highway 6.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that I am familiar with this area. As a matter of fact, I use this road almost every day and I recall an experience on the road going from St. Patricks towards Woodbourne about three or four years ago when I almost came into a head-on collision with a car which came through the major road from Yorkshire side going to the airport, and anybody who uses that road would recognise the very dangerous situation which exists there.

I am glad to see that this is being done, because I think that we have to in this day and age pay much closer attention to our highways and to any areas which present any kind of danger to vehicular traffic, and hence to people who are in vehicles and who obviously would be near around when accidents occur and may be harmed or lose their lives in this way, so that I am glad that this is being improved. I am sure that the Government and the Minister concerned would be having a look at other areas which are in need of this kind of improvement.

I am not, of course, the representative for St. Philip South, but there is another area over in Mangrove where I believe for the last three or four years almost every year some person is killed right at that corner there, and it is a slightly similar one, because if you are coming from Farmer Bim side and you are going up towards St. Philip, the person who is coming from over Mangrove going towards Six Roads — and very often there is a collision right at that point — but it seems as if it is because either the signs are not clear or because of the lie of the land that it is very difficult for people, particularly using that area for the first time, to appreciate it is a major road, and I think we should look around the country and try to improve these areas.

Of course, as you are aware, we have two other situations which fall for improvement and I am sure that you would not want me once more to impress — for example, it is not the same kind of attention as the one here at St.

Patricks and the one at Mangrove I have outlined.

8.10 p.m.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, you will know the junction at Church Corner in St. Peter and St. Lucy which are also in need of improvement. I think that the Government should really look around properly and identify those areas which are in need of improvement and get something done, because I think that when you consider that vehicular traffic has gone tremendously over the past number of years, and the roads and junctions have not been improved to meet the situation, you will recognise the point that I am making. I am sure that when you also look around at the size of vehicular traffic, talking in terms of the growing number of commuters that we are seeing on the road, one shudders to think what will happen when you come to the point when commuters use the roads more regularly than at present, and what this will mean from the point of view of the narrow corners which we have and the amount of space which this amount of traffic will be taking up.

I think that we should be planning for the 90's to take of this situation. I hope that we will do an effective job in this particular area because we are legislating in the case that there is need for this particular equipment to come in.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this particular Resolution, as my colleague indicated deals with the question of improving visibility on the roads and providing for safer traffic conditions, which is something with which we all agree. That is not the point which I wish to advert to on this occasion but when I look at the Addendum to the Resolution, it indicates that the approval of Parliament is being sought for the compulsory acquisition of this parcel of land for the purpose set out in the Resolution in order to acquire a feasible title to the parcel of land.

This indicates that there is some problem with the title and that there is therefore the necessity for a clear title to be established. This perhaps will give the Minister responsible an opportunity to indicate what developments are taking place in respect of facilitating owners of land and prospective owners of land in the whole business of land transactions.

Some time ago there were proposals for land registration and the establishment of land registry. I do not wish to canvass the whole situation here now, but may be the appropriate

Minister can tell us whether these things are proceeding apace and give us some indication as to how soon we may expect to get a little further along the road with this matter which I am told is a very complicated one.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in respect of the areas mentioned by hon. members. I can give them the assurance that the Ministry of Communications and Works is carrying out a meticulous review, and as soon as the areas have been identified, and the usual attempts made to have private agreements made the areas will be acquired. Obviously, the Minister will make a note of the suggested areas and draw them to the attention of the proper officer.

With respect to the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael South, the file does not disclose the extent of the dispute. Broadly speaking, there are two areas of dispute — one in relation to the title and one in relation to price. I think that there is some difference on the question of price. So the normal procedure, if one does not want to hold up the work of Government is to use the Acquisition Act.

In respect of the point about land registration, I am pleased to assure the hon. member that this is a subject very dear to my heart. I sat on a committee which dealt with the proposed draft bills and they were to the previous Government some time ago. There was a serious difference of opinion between us and them because they were looking at this as a long term project, while we regarded it as a very urgent project; and we have contracted with Professor Marshall to come to Barbados later this year and look at the two Bills. One is the Land Surveying Bill, and the other is the Land Registration Bill.

The latter deals with the title aspect. When you bring in a land registration system, it takes a considerable period of time to get on the title under the system. You have to do all the titles in that survey and then you put them on the register, and then you go to another area and you do it all over.

On the other hand, you have a registering system over a period of time and you have both systems in operation; and when you bring it down you do not want any confusion. You want to have a harmonisation of the particular portions of land with the register of land. We have speeded this up because we regard it as a very urgent matter; and we are hoping that

before this calendar year is out the legislation will be before this House and passed. There is absolutely no reason why not, having seen this system in operation in the Virgin Islands. There is no reason why we cannot get this in operation in the early part of next year. As I have said, I have seen it done in the Virgin Islands who had no history of proper registration but they managed to do it in three year periods.

I think that we have about 65,000 titles in Barbados. When you are satisfied that a particular parcel of land has a good title you put it on the register, and the ones that you have doubts about you send for adjudication. In the 1950s a large number of titles were fixed so that I do not think it is as great a job as people think it is. It is a matter of urgency and this is what we are trying to do at the moment.
8.20 p.m.

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

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1977

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the Second Reading of a Bill to amend the Electric Light And Power Act, Chapter 278. This is really a very simple Bill. This is to impose a licence fee on the Barbados Light And Power Company. In the fullness of time there may be some developments in this direction and the Government may make various statements, but I really would not like to pursue any matter relating to the Light And Power Company while the rate case is pending, Sir. You cannot limit debate, but I regard the rate case in the nature of a judicial proceeding. I would ask hon. members to bear with me on this occasion.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that, and reserve my right to speak at a later stage.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I very well appreciate the request of the Hon. Prime Minister, but there are just a couple of points I would like to raise here. The first point concerns the new type of meters which are being used by the Light & Power Company. They are causing problems in this country. Several people have found that the meters are not functioning correctly, and quite often they are being billed for the use of more electricity

than they have been accustomed to use. Some people, on protest, have been able to get these meters checked and it was shown that a fault existed.

It has also been drawn to my attention that these meters can be the cause of fires. I know the handicap of the Government in getting a fully qualified person to be their Electrical Engineer and, maybe, this handicap would make it difficult for Government to have a worthwhile inspection of the meters. The other point which I would have liked to raise, I will not raise it at this stage, but I will just mention it. It concerns the fuel charge. People have just noted that there has been an additional increase in their fuel charges although, in some cases, they are burning less electricity and this has been a matter of concern.

I accept the request of the Hon. Prime Minister, and I will not deal with that point. I think an attempt should be made to get an Electrical Engineer to check these meters because they come from the Far East and they are not functioning correctly.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Speaker, the member who has just sat down has raised a complaint which I have also been getting, and I would certainly like to endorse the point which he has made. There seems to be some inconsistency in the way these meters are functioning, and several persons are concerned about the rates which they are now called upon to pay. As a result of that, certain persons have been keeping a fairly close check on their bills and they have been restricting the use of electricity merely to find that they are called upon to pay more money for electricity than they expect to pay. I think there is some concern about the operation of the meter system which is being used by the Light & Power Company.

The hon. member has not indicated whether or not it is the type of meters that are used, where the fault is to be found, or whether it has something to do with the calculations which are made on the results which go into the Light & Power Company, but certainly the complaints are widespread enough to warrant some kind of action or notice to be taken of it. As the hon. member has suggested, the Government should monitor the situation much more closely. I do not know what is the practical position or whether or not the Government Electrical Engineer has the authority to carry out spot checks from time to time on the Light & Power Company from the

point of view of checking to see that the meters are operating correctly. I hope that this is a matter which will be looked at very carefully.

The Prime Minister has indicated that we will have a full-scale debate on this particular matter. I respect that point of view because I recognise that the Company is in the midst of an important rate hearing which I suppose, one way or the other, could affect the Company. There are some fundamental questions which I would like to raise regarding the operation and the ownership of the Company, but I will certainly reserve these things for another occasion. I voiced it in here some time in March when we were discussing the question of electricity for Government Departments and the payment of bills. However, I would not like to launch into a full-scale debate on the question of ownership and the profits which the Light and Power Company are making. I will reserve that for another time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, the points made by the hon. members are noted, and I will ask the Permanent Secretary in my office to deal with the matter of the meters since several Ministries are involved. There are three Ministries which have some kind of responsibility in respect of the matter of electricity: the Ministry of Industry, the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, and the Ministry of Communications and Works. They all have varied responsibilities. I cannot answer for any of them, but I can say something about the fuel charge. The fuel charge is what the rate hearing is about. The present fuel charge is calculated on the price of diesel fuel although diesel fuel is no longer used at the company, or very little is used.

The rate case has applied for a different type of fuel charge to be levied. Meanwhile the price of diesel fuel is increasing and, therefore, the fuel charge on people's bills is increasing. All persons who think that they have been restricting the use of electricity and yet the bills are going up are right. That is exactly what is happening, and this is why, perhaps, it is urgent for the decision to be given in the utilities matter, because the old type of fuel charge, I think it is safe to say, will be removed. Both the Electric Company and the objectors are applying to have it removed. I do not believe the Public Utilities Board will have much difficulty in that regard.

As regards the electric meters, I will ask the Permanent Secretary in my office to

co-ordinate with the Minister of Industry and the Minister of Communications and Works in respect of that matter. The hon. member for St. Lucy mentioned wider issues. The time will come later on this year for a very full discussion of those wider issues.

8.30 p.m.

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 were called and passed.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 2 — HEAD 109 — MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, we wanted to amend the note in respect of Head 109 and there is a very great urgency about this matter. Notice has been given of the amendment to the note to Item 2. I would ask the hon. member for St. Michael North Central if there would be any objection to doing it in all its stages. This is a Government measure and relates to the Government's intention to purchase a substantial shareholding in the Barbados Telephone Co. I am not pushing it unreasonably. The application for the shares has to be made by Friday, 29th July, and if we wait until next Tuesday and by some mischance the Senate does not pass it in time, we may be in a slightly embarrassing position. The Resolution has been circulated to hon. members, and all the Resolution says is "Barbados Telephone Company — Purchase of Shares." That is the only note; there is no more or less to it, and it would facilitate us to purchase 300,000 ordinary shares at \$4.80 each. It is not a Resolution that requires much study. The substance of the Resolution is the purchase of 300,000 shares in the Telephone Company. If we got it done I would be very glad. I ask

whether there is any controversy about this. I thought all hon. members accepted the Government's response to Government shareholding in utilities. This was an economic measure referred to in the Budget Speech and perhaps the best thing is if they indicate at this stage. If we can reach it we will do it, because there is some urgency about the Central Bank Act. If hon. members on the other side would give an indication whether they would permit us to do this quickly, we would be happy to do it now and still have time for the Central Bank, otherwise we will go straight to the Central Bank Act.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister that only a few seconds ago we on this side received a copy of this Resolution. We are not really objecting in principle to acquiring shares in the Telephone Company because this party supports such a principle, but we would have preferred to have been given earlier notice of this Resolution, and I think that some explanation should be offered for the reasons why, if it had been on the Table of the House judging from the way it was brought, we had not received it earlier, because we do not intend to hold up the Government in its operation. We are quite prepared to cooperate with them on matters as worthwhile as this, but I think, as the Hon. Prime Minister will be aware especially when he recalls his days as Leader of the Opposition, that he took stringent objection to this type of behaviour and this party maintains that we will also object to this type of approach. While we are agreeing and will be prepared to let it go ahead with this, we are due an explanation as to why this matter was not given to us at an earlier time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well the explanation is really quite simple, the source of the funds. Hon. members will observe that by bringing this Resolution we have decided that the funds from the Central Bank will be the source from which to purchase

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: I am not really concerned with the source. What I am trying to get across is that it seems that this matter was given to the Clerk or Clerks some time earlier and we would like to know why it was not passed on to us earlier today, but we are not objecting to the principle. We support the principle, but why should it now be given to us a few seconds ago when we were in the House the whole day? I would like to know if permission was asked, when notice of this matter was given, to deal with it in all its stages today.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I was trying to explain the question of the source of the fund as really the point. When this matter came before the Cabinet I myself was not present.

8.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central is primarily concerned with the short notice.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am explaining the reason for the short notice. This matter came before the Cabinet on June 30 and at that stage Cabinet pursued certain alternative proposals; and Cabinet raised the question of whether insurance companies should not be encouraged to invest their earnings locally and whether the National Insurance Board should not invest some of its funds in local projects. It has taken a little time because legal opinion had to be obtained from the Solicitor General as to whether or not insurance funds should be used. Also, the opinion of the Supervisor of Insurance had to be sought as to whether it was an investment suitable for insurance companies, and always had to be done against the background of closing out all applications by July 29, and hon. members who have had experience in Government will know that sometimes these things are not done at enormous speed. I must say that I do think that to be able to settle the outstanding point between July 5 and July 19 is fairly fast going and I would like to thank my Ministry for the work done in those two weeks and settling these outstanding points. But the fact remains that it was only on Friday that a decision was taken that national insurance funds would be used and this is the reason why the notice has been so short. The closing date is July 29. The decision was taken on July 14 or 15 and this is the first day that Parliament has met since the decision was taken.

Members want to know where the money is to be obtained from. The chief sources of money in Barbados are commercial banks and insurance companies. Cabinet made a good enquiry into the matter and my Ministry has acted expeditiously. The findings only came into our hands today, and that is why I am throwing myself at the mercy of the members and I think the explanation I have given will satisfy members that Government is taking a reasonable attitude towards the question of foreign owned utilities and I am asking leave to deal with the Bill in its remaining stages if there is no objection. *(A Pause)* There seems to be no objection, Sir, and I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on this Resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, a good deal of what could be said on this matter has been said. It is the policy of Government to aim at local ownership with substantial Government shareholding in utilities Companies. Pursuant to this policy, we propose to apply for 300,000 shares of the Telephone Company's forthcoming issue. This will not give the Government a controlling interest, but the Telephone Company has agreed that a Government Director will be appointed. The investment has been investigated by the Supervisor of Insurance and he has advised all insurers in Barbados that the investment is one which they can make and that it conforms with his regulations of prescribed securities and assets. The company has paid its dividends each year on its ordinary share; its earnings exceed 6% of the average value of the shares in its capital stock account; in other words it satisfies the trustee regulations which we have in Barbados. Profits before tax have risen from 18% in 1967 to 22% in 1976, and the dividend rate has been 13.5% for a number of years. It is a good investment and desirable in national terms, and an investment which I recommend to hon. members. The passing of this Resolution will facilitate this investment.

But there is a certain urgency. The number of shares the Government intends to purchase will amount to 9.2% of the company. We are now investigating the investment of National Insurance funds, as an investment rather than as a matter of control, in the local utility. We have received a favourable opinion from the Solicitor General and I propose to place some limits on my discretion to allow the Board to make what investment it likes. There have not been any insecure investments in the past but I think it wise to ensure that into whose hands the Ministry of Finance may fall there will be no possibility of insecure investments of the pension funds of the people of Barbados in the future. So at the very least I propose to limit the discretion of the Minister of Finance in allowing National Insurance funds to be invested to a framework no wider than ordinary insurance companies, at the very least. But that will await legislation in the future. I can certainly say that investment in the utility under the control of a Public Utilities Board will be a permitted investment.

I do not want to be too long, Mr. Chairman, and it is fortunate that there is

unanimity at this step towards Barbados taking over perhaps the largest of the foreign business operating within our shores other than commercial banks, and I recommend this Resolution to hon. members.

8.50 p.m.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to stress that we on this side support the principle of Government buying shares into any profitable business in this country. We will go a step further and say that we support workers' participation in any of these adventures, and I would also like to enquire at this stage from the Hon. Prime Minister what steps he will take to facilitate workers' participation in the ownership of any enterprise Government considers worthwhile to purchase.

What I would like to get the reaction of the Prime Minister on is this. I vaguely recalled that the previous Government had an understanding with the Telephone Company that a number of shares would have been given to the Government in recognition of Government's assistance in obtaining some loan, if I remember, from a Canadian source for finance of the operations, and I would like to know if this is so, and if this is not so, if he will correct me on that particular matter, because if that is so I would like to know how many shares have been made available, if any, and these are new shares being purchased along with the others which were promised earlier, what position it would now put the Government in, would it not improve the position of the Government higher than 9.2% of the total share capital.

A lot can be said about the functioning of these organisations in Barbados, and there are some people who have spoken very strongly about Government taking over them. I think, without having to call names, there is one economist who has put forward a very strong case urging this Government to take over or nationalise these organisations, but I am well aware of the fact that large sums of money would have to be found for the nationalisation process, and therefore in the absence of a full nationalisation, Government would have to resort to some other method of ensuring Government participation and workers' participation in this country, and accepting that, I see no reason why there should be any criticism of this action which is only an action which if the Democratic Labour Party was in power we would gladly take, and I would like to assure the Prime Minister, subject to the few remarks he made and the information given, we

on this side support wholeheartedly the effort of the Government to obtain share capital or holding in the Barbados Telephone Company, and we look forward eagerly to other exercises whereby Government would be acquiring a hold on other profitable organisations in this country.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central indicated that we on this side would have no objection to the principle of this particular measure, and in saying so I would like to say that on this particular matter - at least I certainly see this and I hope that the first step as it were in a situation where we are seeking to change the process of ownership in areas of utilities which can be regarded as key areas in our society, and whereas I take the point that at this point in time from the point of view of the economic situation there might be certain difficulties in a total acquisition, certainly this should be one of our objectives, and as I have said on a previous occasion, and I recall it must have been either in February or March of this year, when we were debating the situation to do with either the Telephone Company or the Light and Power Company, I then took the position that at some point in time, certainly in the not too distant future, we should be moving towards the situation of a total ownership in utility companies like the Telephone Company and the Barbados Light and Power Company Limited, so I would see this as a first step in this particular development, and I would hope that the Prime Minister would be able to give some indication in this particular regard.

We see from the Addendum that this is to facilitate the purchase of 300,000 ordinary shares, and the Prime Minister did say that whereas it did not give the Government a majority shareholding, nevertheless it ensured a substantial shareholding, and I think it would be right for him to give us some indication as to the exact amount of shares, the percentage of the ownership which the Barbados Government would be acquiring in the Telephone Company, because I think this would give us some idea of the extent to which it would go.

In listening to the Prime Minister one thing struck me, and I think it is a matter which we have to examine very carefully, because certainly from the point of view of policy, not necessarily the policy of the Barbados Labour Party, but certainly from the Democratic Labour Party's point of view, when we move towards the further socialisation of the economy of this country, we have to look very carefully at this whole question of private profit as

against social good. This is a crucial issue which will be exercising our attention and it would seem as if one of the factors which seemed to have influenced the Prime Minister about acquiring shares is the feasibility of the return of 22% on the investment - it would seem as if that is the trend - and we have to look at this very carefully.

We have to be able to balance these two factors, whether in truth and in fact we should be pursuing profit in a private arrangement or whether we should be interested in extending a facility, and certainly this is a facility, to the improvement of the society, and obviously if it is going to be extended one would therefore have to look at the whole idea and the whole role of profit within this particular exercise, and I would like to submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is a matter to which we must pay some attention, and certainly from the Democratic Labour Party's point of view we would like to see a situation where some proper balance is brought about rather than more pursuance of an investment which has a high profit component.

This therefore means two things really. One, we hope to look at the service and at the cost of that service towards the consumer, and if we regard it as a service which citizens are entitled to, whether this service will be provided to them at cost as it were or whether the question of reducing the cost of this service or ensuring that the cost of this service does not escalate in the way that the cost of the telephone services has been escalating in Barbados, thereby making it more difficult for the masses of people within the society to have access to this particular service, as I said, this is the kind of problem that we have to address our minds to, particularly when we are thinking in terms of public ownership and the extent to which we will become publicly involved in an enterprise of this nature.

9.00 p.m.

I therefore hope that this acquisition of \$300,000 in shares is the first step in this direction which would enable the Government.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now 9 o'clock, which is the moment of interruption.

Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the matter under discussion is not controversial, but that we were only expressing our views. I ask that Your

Honour do now leave the Chair and the House resume Committee so that we can wind up this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will that meet with the satisfaction of the Acting Leader of the Opposition?

Dr. CADDLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: Having got that assurance, there is no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House resumed Committee, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I was just winding up when the moment of interruption came. As I was saying, I was hoping that this would be a basis on which we could see the Government moving to a point of complete ownership of this particular utility. That is something which I see could only be for the public good.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we have been very accommodating from this side, and I hope that when the opportunity arises they will be as accommodating to us as we have been to them. I merely want to raise the question relating to this note which comes under Item 2, Continuing Projects, and not new projects. So I take it that this is a continuing project already started on by the previous administration.

I am sorry that we do not have the details before us. I have not been able to research this matter, but I have a document which might be familiar to members on that side — the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party for the last general election. As you know, there is no better manifesto. It says that joint ventures have been undertaken with Maple Leaf Mills of Canada for the operation of a flour mill, and the Government has taken shares in the Barbados Telephone Company.

So, in fact, we have this policy of investing in the public utilities of this country, a policy which the previous administration saw the wisdom of and which it initiated. Therefore it is now a continuing project. I take it that the Minister will indicate to us why this project is a continuing project rather than new projects such as the Trinidad Shrimping Company and the Barbados National Fisheries Company.

I believe that there must be some explanation as to why this is a continuing project and not a new project as such although

this must be a substantial investment in that particular area. I will not say any more at this stage on this matter because I believe that there will be other occasions on which to discuss the Barbados Telephone Company in particular, and the general question of the investment of national resources in projects in this country. I do not know if the Minister can clarify these points.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I suppose that somebody who holds up the manifesto of the Democratic Labour Party of the last general election must be bold indeed, and I congratulate the member for St. Michael South for exposing himself in this reckless way, although I do not think that the manifesto of any Government so thoroughly rejected should be exposed to public gaze.

As far as the Telephone Company is concerned, there is a continuing project in so far as that in October, 1975, the Government guaranteed a loan of \$3.4 million and it was given 15,000 shares which is less than 1 per cent of the equity of the company. We are now seeking to buy 3000,000 shares and pay for them.

On the earlier occasion the Government did not actually buy the shares. They were given them for a few million dollars, and that was at risk. To that extent it is a continuing project, but if it is a question of being a continuing project of the Democratic Labour Party, I will ask members to take note of the fact that they never appointed a director. They never enunciated a forthright policy of local ownership of the utilities.

We are now saying that in our present economic circumstances the Government should not own 100 per cent of the Telephone Company. In the second place I do not think that it would be desirable to take away the existing shares of Barbadian shareholders. Thirdly, these utilities are useful investments in trustee funds, and I do not think that that is the situation in many countries.

I have heard one hon. member speak of the Pension Fund of the Barbados Workers Union. That was not said sarcastically; that was not said in any way other than seriously. It is time that some of the local pension funds should invest their money in enterprises that should be local but still remain foreign.

For example, I feel very strongly that Manufacturers Life Insurance Company — and I

will say openly — because this can never be Government policy. We cannot make them do it; but the Manufacturers Life Insurance Company manages the Electric Company's Pension Fund for it. We feel that in the circumstances that should be used by some of the Electric Company's own shares so as to give its workers a continuing interest in the welfare of the company by way of the Pension Fund. 9.10 p.m.

It is one way of motivating the workers, if they know that their own Pension Fund is a substantial shareholder in the Company. Barbados Shipping and Trading, I believe, has taken this course of affairs. These are areas where we believe that there is room for local institutional but non-Government investments; therefore, we will not be aiming at full ownership of these Companies. We will give somebody else a chance to earn these profits. I really believe that for shares that are traded in the open market, the Telephone Company's shares must be among the most profitable that you can possibly buy.

As far as the Government is concerned, I suppose I wear two hats. As one person in the Ministry told me: "We are getting the money for these shares from the Savings Bank at 7% and getting 13% from the Telephone Company." It is a good investment as well as giving the Government some grasp of control of the affairs of a vital area of open communications. Although I appreciate the sentiment behind the hon. member's suggesting a 100% ownership, we prefer to look at it as a 100% local ownership. That is how we prefer to look at it. As I say, later on in the year we will have an opportunity of a debate on an even larger scale than the area we have been able to cover this evening. I would like to thank all hon. members for their contribution in the matter and for their assistance.

I forgot to mention, hon. members, that the reason why it really is very urgent is due to the fact that this is not an issue of shares for which you can make application by writing a letter. As we are advised, the application to get the shares has to be accompanied by payment in full, and therefore we cannot really apply for the shares until we can write the cheque. It is not a case that we can write and wait to get the money later. We have to send the money with our application. I really thank hon. members for their assistance in this matter.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, in my contribution I raised

the question regarding the level of profit which seems to be forthcoming from investing in the Telephone Company. I think I did hear the Prime Minister refer to a 22%. If in truth and in fact this is the kind of dividend which the Telephone Company pays out, I am wondering if the Prime Minister does not regard this as an excessive profit, and from the point of view of Government involvement in purchasing shares in the Company, whether this should not be used as a means of reducing the dividend. It does appear to be excessive and certainly the cost to the consumer should be reduced.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The level of 22%, Sir, which was circulated by the Supervisor of Insurance in the Company is the free-tax profit. The level of dividend has been 13%, and the hon. member will, of course, take note that this level of dividend has been recognised by the Public Utilities Board as containing a sufficient element of generosity as to cause the Board to refuse a rate increase to the Telephone Company. I think the Board is doing its duty of trying to bring down profit levels.

Hon. members will also take note that it is an ordinary commercial matter. If the shareholding is diluted by this issue the amount of dividends now has to be spread over a wider number of shares, and I do not anticipate that the dividends will remain at that level for very much longer, nor could there be any justification when interest rates are falling and when money can be obtained by a prime

borrower such as the Telephone Company, especially with Government guarantee, as the last loan was guaranteed, at rates of interest far below what they were in the years of the 22% before tax profit. Now 22% is the before tax situation. The dividend is considerably less than that.

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

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

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

On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded in each case by the Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 26th July, 1977, at twelve noon.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.

9.15 p.m.