

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 11th October, 1977.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, (Speaker); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. F. G. SMITH, Q.C., S.C., B.A., (Leader of the Opposition); Dr. R. B. CADDLE; Mr. D. A. C. SIMMONS, LL.M.; Hon. B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, (Chairman of Committees); Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, B.A., M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Community Development); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc.

Prayers were read.

Prayers were taken by the Chaplain, Fr. F. A. Cayless.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD and Mr. B. M. TAITT entered the House and took their seats.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the Meeting of Tuesday, 4th October, 1977 are before the House (A Pause). If there is no objection, the Minutes stand confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the following document: The Hire

Purchase and Credit-sale Agreements (Control) (Amendment) Order, 1977. Also, Statement showing Net Customs and Excise Receipts for month ended 31st July, 1977.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Financial Statements of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the years ended 30th June, 1974, and 30th June, 1975.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

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

Resolution to approve the borrowing by the Natural Gas Corporation of the amount of \$2.1 million by the issue of Debenture Stock.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at the junction of Sobers Lane, Coleridge Street and White Park Road, for the purpose of road improvement.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Spooners Hill, St. Michael, for the re-siting of the Grace Hill Primary School.

Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity of speaking to the Leader of the Opposition on these Resolutions but wonder if we can deal with them in all stages today.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have no objection to dealing with them.

STATEMENT BY MINISTERS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker,

As the House may recall I announced that a Commission of Enquiry would be set up to investigate certain matters relating to the expenditure of public monies during the years

1961-1976. I can now inform the House that such a Commission has been set up with the following terms of reference:

- (a) To enquire into and report on the circumstances surrounding the acquisition of lands, assets or other property of, the expenditure of public moneys on, the guaranteeing or indemnification of liabilities or obligations of, and the procuring of goods and services from, enterprises of a public or private nature and in particular the enterprises set out, in a Schedule thereto, by Government or any public statutory body during the years 1961 to 1976;
- (b) To enquire into and report on the circumstances in which Government entered into the said enterprises set out in the Schedule;
- (c) To enquire into and report on the state and adequacy of existing laws, rules and financial and administrative procedures for ensuring parliamentary and administrative control over public expenditure, the incurring of liability on the Consolidated Fund by way of borrowing, loans, guarantees and indemnities and the procuring of goods and services, in relation to enterprises of a public or private nature;
- (d) To make recommendation as to the laws, rules and financial and administrative procedures which should be implemented to ensure proper parliamentary and administrative control over public expenditure and the incurring of liability on the Consolidated Fund by way of borrowing, loans, guarantees and indemnities and the procuring of goods and services, in relation to enterprises of a public or private nature.

SCHEDULE

1. The Bath Plantation Limited Enterprise.
2. The Carib West Airways Limited and Carib West Management Company Limited Enterprises.
3. The International Sea-Foods Limited Enterprise.

4. The "North Point" vessel purchase Enterprise.

5. The Golden Mile Limited Enterprise.

2. The sole Commissioner to execute the enquiry will be Sir Herbert Duffus, a distinguished West Indian jurist, retired Chief Justice of Jamaica, and the Government's case will be presented by Mr. Harley Moseley, Attorney-at-Law of James Street, Bridgetown, assisted by Mr. Hilary Nelson of the Crown Counsel's Department. The Commission will commence its sittings on 7th November next in the Senate Chamber and the sessions will be open to the public.

12.25 p.m.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the audited financial statements of the Barbados Marketing Corporation for the years ended 30th June, 1974 and 30th June, 1975, which were received in the Ministry in March this year show, among other things, that the Corporation sustained net trading losses of \$1,005,490 and \$1,143,240 during the respective periods. The accounts in respect of the year ended 30th June, 1976, have already been audited and are expected to be submitted to Parliament in the near future.

2. The Barbados Marketing Corporation has been bedevilled with problems from its inception. In its very first year of operation, that is, the year ended 30th June, 1964, the Corporation sustained a net loss of \$215,688. Under current liabilities it was noted that the Corporation was carrying overdraft facilities of \$275,809 — to be repaid in two (2) years. One of the reasons advanced for this undesirable state of affairs was that the structure of the finances placed an undue burden on the Corporation's operations — since 2/3 of the capital was provided by way of loan (i.e. \$1,000,000 to be repaid in 20 years @ 7% interest and 1/3 (i.e. \$456,850) by way of equity). The Corporation was from the outset technically insolvent with current assets, \$99,223 being significantly less than current liabilities of \$395,978. Resort was made to borrowing by way of overdraft facilities, but this served to impair the Corporation's ability to meet its working capital needs.

3. It is evident that prudent financial management was not exercised and that proper systems were not implemented at the outset. No attempt was apparently made to relate the scope of its activities to the then available resources.

The Corporation was allowed to drift along without proper executive control rather than following a pre-determined path. There was also an apparent lack of proper security and a poor public image militated against its effectiveness. The Corporation failed to appreciate the need to separate development from its commercial functions and was unable to generate any funds from its operations, with the result that continuing deficits became the norm. It seemed that loss had become institutionalised at the Barbados Marketing Corporation.

4. In the first ten years of its operations, the net loss increased from \$215,688 in respect of the year ended 30th June, 1964, to \$1,005,490 in respect of the year ended 30th June, 1974, bringing the accumulated deficit to \$4,045,517. The main factors contributing to these losses were financed charges, subsidy on abattoir, spoilage and developmental expenses. It should be noted that the auditors have stated at page 1 of the report for the year ended 30th June, 1975, that —

Because they did not obtain all of the information and explanations they required and because of inadequacies in the operation of internal control over purchases and sales they were unable to form an opinion concerning the results of operations for the year and accordingly were unable to express an opinion on the statement of losses and accumulated deficit covered by their audit report and are therefore not in a position to say that such additional information is fair and reasonable.

5. When my Government took over the Government in September, 1976, and portfolios were allocated to the various Ministers, responsibility for the Barbados Marketing Corporation was transferred from what is now the Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry & Tourism, to the Ministry of Agriculture where it rightfully belongs. At this stage, the state of affairs of the Barbados Marketing Corporation's finances were in a sorry mess and I was soon asked to seek the provision of funds to the extent of \$4.8 million to refinance it — this, despite the fact that the Corporation had been refinanced in August, 1975, to the tune of \$3.1 million. The refinancing exercise in 1975 was evidently a stop-gap measure which only solved the immediate cash flow problem leaving a solution to the long-standing woes of the Corporation unresolved.

6. My Government, in its election manifesto, has promised to recapitalise, restructure and

redirect the policies of the Barbados Marketing Corporation to ensure that it fulfils the basic objective of providing service to farmers by assuming the responsibility for marketing their produce. Of course, the Barbados Marketing Corporation will have to play another role — that of stabilising prices. As a corollary, the Barbados Marketing Corporation will also be a distributor of essential food items. A planned programme has been formulated to put the Corporation on a sound footing. The activities of the Corporation have been clearly set out as commercial and developmental — the former is expected to be a profitable operation while the latter will be co-ordinated by my Ministry in order to avoid duplication and/or unnecessary expenditure. (The Agricultural Development Corporation is also involved in developmental work). Any developmental expenses will be indemnified by Government. Management and staffing have also been re-organised in order to make them more effective and to reduce operating costs. It should be noted that the Corporation had been heavily overstaffed and steps to remedy this undesirable situation have been taken. The position is being kept under constant review. The Corporation has been restructured along the lines of a marketing agency with more emphasis on marketing in an effort to attain the objectives laid down in the Barbados Marketing Corporation Act Cap. 255. The Barbados Marketing Corporation is on the road to recovery — the signs are there. Recently the Corporation realised a profit of some \$44,000 in its handling of this year's onion crop — whereas total losses of \$109,398 were incurred in respect of the previous two years.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 44 is now ready.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Order No. 1, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the Day. To move the House into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the House do now go into Committee of Supply to consider the grant of money for the service of the Island.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to second that.

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO
ITEM 2 – SECONDARY SCHOOLS,
UNDER HEAD 115, MINISTRY
OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution seeks sums to provide canteen facilities at the Parkinson Secondary School.

The situation is that the new Governing Body did an investigation into the school and found that the canteen was in a terrible state of disrepair. The Ministry of Health is in danger of closing the school canteen unless immediate repairs are carried out, and this Resolution seeks supplementary funds to carry out those repairs.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO
ITEM 10 – FURNITURE, FIXTURES
AND FITTINGS, UNDER HEAD
15(12) – ARCHIVES

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is seeking sums to provide a filing cabinet for the Archives Department.

Actually, the note in the Non-Recurrent Estimates under Furniture, Fixtures and Fittings, Head 15(12) – Archives, as set out in the Approved Estimates must be amended to include the purchase of one metal cabinet, and this is the purpose of this Resolution, to make the necessary change.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977–78
No. 14

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The first, I believe, is Head 10(1), Sir.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, under Head 10(1), the sum of \$42,890 is required to provide salaries and furniture and equipment for the setting up of the Metrication Office. We are planning to have 1 Director, 1 Technical Officer (I), 1 Technical Officer (II), 2 technical Assistants, 1 Printing Assistant, 1 Secretary and 1 Typist/Office Assistant, the idea being that the office must be functioning so that we can change over to the metric system by the date set, which is May 1979. If there are any further questions I will gladly supply the information.

I beg to move that Head 10(1) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 11(5) – PRISONS

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this part of the Resolution asks for a grant of \$81,000, and this is to pay the duty allowances which have been agreed to be paid to other services than the Police. This refers to payment in this case of the Prisons Department.

You will recall that they had been omitted from the original Resolution since negotiations were still going on with the National Union of Public Workers. Those negotiations have been successfully completed and the NUPW has accepted the terms that were offered to the other uniform branches, and I now seek therefore to get the grant to honour that agreement.

I move that this Head stand part.

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

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

HEAD 11(6) – FIRE SERVICE

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, this refers to the Fire Service. Under the last

Resolution we had granted some money for the Fire Service which apparently was calculated using the wrong number, and therefore there is a residue of funds still due to the Fire Service in the amount of \$53,670 in order for the agreement with the Fire Service to be satisfied.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister, bearing in mind certain statements that were made in the local Press recently regarding the accommodation at the Fire Service, especially at Grantley Adams International Airport, would be in a position to tell us what is the real situation there. As I recall, it was suggested that Firemen on duty for long hours were sharing cots, and I saw conflicting statements purporting to emanate from the Chief Fire Officer. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to enlighten this House in that regard?

12.45 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer the hon. member's specific question at this moment in relation to the number of beds at the Seawell Fire Station. I have myself seen the report since I returned to the island on Sunday, and my department will be making a report on it. All that I can say is that the account in the newspaper does not seem to accord with the views of the Chief Fire Officer. While I sincerely welcome the Press ferreting out any information that is necessary, we will check with the Permanent Secretary in our Ministry and give the correct information without offending the Official Secrets Act; and that information will be given.

So far as the Fire Service is concerned we have started further construction at the main Fire Station; and this construction is going on still. We hope to accommodate Fire Women at the station, and the Cabinet has already agreed that in the Development Plan for the next five years provision will be included for an expansion of the facilities of the Fire Stations so that women will have the physical facilities appropriate when they join the Fire Service. This is in keeping with the Government's announced policy to cease discrimination against women. I will also say that we are looking at the location of Fire Stations, and the departmental officers are working on a long term plan for the upgrading of Fire Stations generally. As soon as it is possible, I will make the details available. I will try to answer the question raised by the hon. member. I will

write him privately, unless he wants a public answer.

The question that Head 11(6) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 11(7) – Police – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the present Estimates do not provide money for the purchase of radar equipment for the Police Department. The department has been testing Radar Speed Control equipment, and these tests have been so satisfactory that we are recommending to this House the purchase of this equipment. The results show that we are liable to save on police hours and police time, while increasing our efficiency in safeguarding the users of our roads.

I am using this opportunity to appeal to the public to show more care on the roads and co-operate with other members of the public in the use of our highways. The simple purpose of this Head is to get \$2,500 to purchase the radar set. We have undertaken to purchase further sets, and we will be checking the speeds at which people drive by radar control in the future.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to ask the Minister if there are any plans for training members of the Force in the use of these sets.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I should say to the hon. member that the Police are very fortunate in having one of the best electrical departments in Barbados, particularly for dealing with equipment of this nature. We have people specially trained in this field. This is equipment which we are now getting from Canada on loan, and obviously other people will also be trained.

The question that Head 11(7) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 15(1) – Ministry of Education and Culture – Direction and Policy Formulation was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in July 1976 when salaries were revised a duty allowance of \$600.00 was set as the figure to supplement Minister's salaries. This was overlooked when the last Estimates were prepared, and this supplementary is to provide

the sum of \$600.00 for the provision of the allowance to the secretary to the Minister of Education for the present financial year.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister said "Minister's salary." I wonder if he could explain.

Hon. L. R. TULL: As far as I know Ministers do not get this allowance. The note to the Resolution which is in the hands of the hon. member for Saint Michael South West states "secretary assigned to the Minister".

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I cannot go by what I see in the note when the Minister says something otherwise. I hope that he will take my question in the spirit in which it was asked.

The question that Head 15(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Head 15(7) – Hotel School was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, in January 1977, approval was given for the appointment of an additional cleaner to the staff of the Barbados Hotel School; and it was estimated that the provision in respect of the wages payable should be \$3,600 which would be required for this financial year. The Estimates for 1977–78 did not include this item. This Resolution is seeking provision for this amount.

I beg to move that Head 15(7) stand part.

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

Head 15(11) – Libraries was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, arising out of the salaries revision, provision was made for the payment of an approved responsibility allowance of \$540 to each of the four Library Assistants who are in charge of full-time Branch Libraries. Due to an error, the Chief Librarian did not include this sum in the draft of the estimates for this year. We are now seeking \$2,160 to meet this deficiency.

I beg to move that Head 15(11) stand part.

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

Head 18(1) – Ministry of Housing and Lands – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Hon. Leader of the House will be speaking on this Head. I see that he is coming.
12.55 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, Item 11A is to provide the sum of \$67,000 to remunerate the members of the Commission who are undertaking a Commission of Enquiry into the National Housing Corporation. Full details of the respective sums to be paid to the Chairman and members and the Secretary are set out in the circulated document.

I accordingly beg to move that Head 18 – Ministry of Housing and Lands (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, this is a Resolution for the sum of \$67,000 for the Housing Authority Commission under W. H. Hanschell, Esq., M.A. (Oxford), Q.C. Now I want to ask a few questions. This is the second commission set up by this Government. The first one they could be excused for because it was not something of their choice, and I think it was necessary, and that is the Cubana enquiry which cost this Government over \$65,000. For this one, according to the Addendum, the Chairman is going to get \$16,000, three other members are going to get \$12,000 each, but then the principal Crown Council is going to get an honorarium of \$5,000. There are other consequential amounts bringing it up to \$67,007.

I am not quarrelling with the amount of the remuneration, but I certainly think the Senior Crown Counsel is very generous to the Government. Old people's houses have not been repaired and recently with the rains a lot of old people are getting wet, and this \$67,000 at \$2,000 each could do a lot of repairs to old people's houses and help fire victims and people who need it. The Government has enough commissions to read on housing. Mr. Carlisle Burton, Mr. Payne and Mr. Harcourt Lewis formed a commission set up by the last Government, and the report is available to the Government to see what is happening in housing. This continuous appointment of commissions is only spending the taxpayers money, money that they claim they do not have. All this is money being given away, that is all it is, which could be better spent in providing amenities for the people of this country, but if the people want you to spend it so, that is their business. This sum of \$67,000 is going to these people for what is

going to be a perfectly useless enquiry, and I would bet that nobody goes to gaol, but you will have another big document to put in the Ministry of Housing and you will have satisfied your conscience that you had an enquiry into the Democratic Labour Party. If that is how you want to run this country, you are entitled to it. I am saying that this \$67,000 is a colossal waste of taxpayers' money and it is not going to prove one thing. You get another situation where the Prime Minister himself on television, when a lady asked about a house, sent her to the member for St. Philip North because she is from his constituency, and that is something I warned about in putting members of Parliament on Statutory Boards. You admitted that she should have no difficulty in getting a house because she was from St. Philip, the constituency of the Chairman of the Board; so if that is not political patronage and favouritism, I do not know what it is.

I know the member for St. Philip North and as far as humanly possible he will try to resist, but I warn you against something that you in your year of non-achievement spoke about. You know that you have not done anything yet, and you should hear the people outside. You can go on the air waves and tell people to go to the member for St. Philip North especially when they happen to be from his constituency. If that is how you are running the country, that is a matter for you. The Parliamentary Secretary is giving people in the Pine houses, so you will have an enquiry every time into what each is doing, because the Parliamentary Secretary is giving houses to party adherents. That is common knowledge. The hon. member would not get up and deny it because nobody would believe he is an idiot. If you are in charge of housing and people come to you, you will not tell me that you will give your opponents.

I want the Attorney General to tell the House the circumstances under which Mr. Reid, the Principal Crown Counsel, refused to continue the enquiry under the Chairman. The House is entitled to know that. What led to Mr. Reid's withdrawing which has resulted in a delay in the Housing Authority enquiry continuing? I would like to know the true reason why Mr. Reid refused to appear. The Government set up a commission and on it is a civil servant, Mr. Reid, who has refused to continue to serve under the Chairman, and you now have to get Mr. Carlisle Payne to continue.

I also want the Attorney General to tell me if Mr. Reid will get piece of this \$5,000 because he had to prepare the case for the first time, he

collected and collated the evidence as Principal Crown Counsel, and I feel that Mr. Reid having done the spade work is entitled to a piece of this \$5,000, never mind he and Mr. Hanschell may have fallen out.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, the hon. member said never mind Mr. Reid and Mr. Hanschell may have fallen out. Is the Leader of the Opposition giving a reason for the question he is asking?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I do not know the answer. All I am asking is that Mr. Reid who did a lot of spade work to start the enquiry be not left out of this money which is being given away. I want him to have a piece because he must have prepared the work. Apart from that it is the Government spending the taxpayers' money. If you have \$67,000 now, I wonder how much the Duffus Commission will cost? That will cost a good piece too because he will enquire from 1961 right up to now; so we will have some good money throwing about. You have the Government and you are the Minister of Finance, so you can spend it as you like, but people will deal with you in due course. Let him explain this. The Government has got to be consistent. The Judge who did the Commission of Enquiry into the Cubana incident, an enquiry of great importance to the external affairs and relations of this country was offered a paltry \$15,000 for his part of the enquiry, Mr. Justice Williams. Mr. Hanschell is doing a little housing enquiry and is getting \$16,000 for a start. The Judge doing the Cubana Enquiry sat more consistently, but Mr. Hanschell does not sit during the week, he is working at the Bar, but on Saturday mornings when he has nothing to do, he is going to bring along some people and sit in the Senate Chamber. If I were appearing for anybody he could not get me; he would have to accommodate me. Mr. Williams sat persistently and consecutively on the Cubana enquiry and the Government gave him a paltry \$15,000, but you can come and give Mr. Hanschell over \$16,000, and then the Judge paid tax on the amount the Government gave him, he had \$5,000 from the enquiry which I have heard is an excellent enquiry. He got \$5,000 after tax to carry home for an enquiry of this magnitude and which I was told was a good enquiry.

1.05 p.m.

And you are coming now to give a little Housing enquiry more than for the important Cubana enquiry where the Judge had to have

two technical advisers in the matter and sat for days on end. And you gave him \$15,000 which after tax deduction left him \$5,000. This cannot be right; you gave the Judge in the Cubana enquiry too little, and what he carried home was too small. If you go on like this you will get nobody to do this kind of work. What I am saying is you must be consistent; you cannot pay a high court judge \$15,000 for an important enquiry like Cubana and then give a Chairman \$16,000 for an enquiry into housing. This is a colossal waste of money which could be better spent in providing homes for poor people who during the last rainfall were getting wet. I am drawing to attention the inconsistency of the Government, and I also want to know why Mr. Reid left the Commission.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things which I would like to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, though I believe the hon. member for St. Philip North will deal with this matter in detail. First of all, the Leader of the Opposition asked what you need a Commission for. You want a Commission to be able to know who the criminals are.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: You know exactly what happened; what need is there for a Commission?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps I waxed a little too vehement a moment ago. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that I know who the criminals are; but I do not regard the argument about there having been investigations before as holding water at all. You are dealing with millions of dollars, a sum of money which was enough to have repaired all the old people's homes in Barbados, but water is still coming into the homes in 1977. These are the things we are dealing with, and this is why Government decided to have a Commission. In addition, the Commission will also make recommendation on future accounting procedures to prevent a recurrence of this sort of thing. There are some people who are already feeling the breeze from this Commission.

With respect to the question of remuneration and other arguments, I did not know that Mr. Reid was so disliked by the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Have I said that I disliked Mr. Reid? He is my personal friend. I only want to

know why he left Mr. Hanschell. Why do you like to twist things so?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the Leader of the Opposition was really interested in Mr. Reid, he would not come in here and ask me to say why Mr. Reid and Mr. Hanschell fell out. But whatever has happened, whatever the complaints are, I have not the slightest intention of reading them out; I believe it would be damaging to the position of a public officer to have his affairs unnecessarily dragged through the House of Assembly.

With respect to remunerations, a case has been put for Mr. Justice Williams to have got more for the Cubana enquiry. The Leader of the Opposition perhaps has forgotten that Mr. Justice Williams is a full-time salaried employee of Government. He has entirely ignored that fact in connection with the remuneration being given to Mr. Hanschell. English judges have been known to undertake Commissions of Enquiry without remuneration, and the thought of suggesting that somebody should be put above the law by giving them remuneration taxfree, I treat with contempt. All of us have to pay taxes and nobody is going to be given the privilege of tax-free remuneration. The Leader of the Opposition should bear in mind, too, the fact that if Mr. Justice Williams' earnings and salary are so high that out of \$15,000 he only takes home \$5,000, it is his good fortune; it shows he is working for good money. He is a full-time employee of the Government and the remuneration which would be offered to such persons should they find themselves on Commissions of Enquiry would be on a less generous scale than for persons in private business. And I personally would like to thank Mr. Hanschell for conducting what will probably be a long and tedious investigation into the Housing Authority. I think that to work for a total sum of \$16,000 on an enquiry likely to go on for such a long time speaks well for a sense of public duty, and I would like to repeat my appreciation of Mr. Hanschell for his services, and thank Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Walmsley and Mr. McConney for giving their services on this Commission for relatively small fees. You are dealing with millions of dollars of public money, and if these persons are willing to sit Saturday after Saturday to conduct this enquiry, the Government is well served by them. I reject entirely the arguments of the Leader of the Opposition.

1.15 p.m.

In due course, after the Commission has gone into the matter, the costs will be published and the Leader of the Opposition may be very disappointed when he sees how relevantly modest the entire exercise may turn out to be when some of the profits sought to be made by certain persons in respect of Government enterprises will be investigated.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am getting accustomed now to hear irresponsible statements made by the Leader of the Opposition, and I am satisfied that he is not interested in the responsibility of his office any more. He has categorised the Inquiry as useless, and that the sum of \$67,000 is a waste of money and in the end nobody is going to jail. It is not the function of any Inquiry to send anybody to jail, and the Leader of the Opposition, as a practitioner in law, knows fully well, or he ought to know, that the Commissioners can only make certain recommendations and, if necessary, point an accusing finger at certain persons. The matter rests with the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Judge, and nine persons on a Jury, who will decide whether a criminal offence has taken place and who should be sent to prison. Mr. Chairman, I will remind him that a former employee of the National Housing Corporation, who was investigated during the days of the past Government, was at last indicted, tried and acquitted. Whether the exercise was useless or not is a matter for him to say in the context of his Government having started the ball rolling, which resulted in ultimate prosecution.

Now, there has been a complaint by members of this Party and members of the D.L.P. that, within the last year, no money has been spent on repairs to pensioners' homes. Let us get this clear. I would have hoped that the Debate today would not descend into the details of the Commission of Inquiry, but, since the wicket has been rolled, I will have to bat on it. Between the 9th July, 1976, and the 2nd September, 1976, \$500,000 was allegedly spent on repairs to old aged pensioners' homes. In the same period of time, in less than six weeks, a separate and distinct sum of \$500,000 was dispensed with for the purpose of granting loans to persons who had applied to the National Housing Corporation for loans. The sum of \$1 million was got rid of in six weeks. The votes were busted. The financial year of the National Housing Corporation was not even half-way through, but through the irresponsible conduct of persons, not necessarily in the management of the National Housing Corporation, but due to other

external forces, \$1 million of the taxpayers' money went down the drain.

When I took over on the 8th November, I suggested to the Manager that we should do something for old aged pensioners' homes for Independence. He told me, "Mr. Simmons, we have no money." I asked for an investigation into the matter, and there is a list which has been supplied to the Commissioner of Inquiry showing persons to whom money was loaned and the persons on whose houses money was, allegedly, spent. At the time you only qualified for old aged pension if you were 68 years or over, but we have found cases where persons aged 34, aged 43, aged 45, who were not old aged pensioners and were not entitled to loans, were given as much as \$1,500 or \$1,600 out of the National Housing Corporation. We have found persons who were given completely new houses costing \$3,700 per house. The Commissioner will deal with these issues.

All I can say is that in respect of the system for giving loans, it was very weakly set up. It was thought that every candidate of the Democratic Labour Party was told to find out who from his constituency who had applied for a loan, and to make the necessary arrangements with the Housing Authority, including in some cases going on the premises of the National Housing Corporation, going through the files, finding out who was to get a loan, and then going into the constituency to Mrs. Jones or Mrs. Brown and saying: "Mrs. Jones, I will get you your loan to repair your house before the 2nd September." She would then run around telling her friends: "Do you see what a good man Mr. Barrow is? I have got money to repair my house." All of this will come before the Commission of Inquiry.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, here we are dealing with a matter relating to a Commission of Inquiry to enquire into certain activities of the National Housing Corporation. I am suggesting that the hon. member, who has just sat down, is abusing his privilege, because he has said that the Commission of Inquiry will be going into the matter. This matter is *sub judice*. He has made many allegations which will be the subject of an Inquiry. I was a successful candidate in the last election. At no time of my 25 years in the former Barbados Labour Party Government, or in the Government of the day when I had the honour to be the Prime Minister, did anybody invite me to give him a list of people in any of the two constituencies: The one you now have the honour to represent,

or the one I now represent. I do not even know where the office of the National Housing Corporation is now.

1.25 p.m.

I have at no time, and I have absolutely no recollection of the allegation being made, but the point of order I am making here is.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You said you were on a point of explanation, and the hon. member for St. Philip North gave way.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point I am making is that it is improper for the hon. member to get up here and make inflammatory speeches and allegations, which will be the subject of an investigation, because he is prejudicing the outcome of the Commission by making such statements before the House. I said that they are untrue and unfounded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Philip North knows the Rules of this House.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, before the member for St. John came in here during this debate he should have listened to his Leader of the Opposition who introduced the question of the Commission of Enquiry. If he did not ask the question and if he did not make certain statements I would not have had to reply. (*Aside*). I am not shutting up, I have already given evidence before the same Commission of Enquiry dealing with these same very areas and I am going to give further evidence.

Imagine that after 15 years in power the hon. member does not even know where the office of the National Housing Corporation is. That man never knew anything about what was going on in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is making a lot of cheap rhetoric for the Gallery.

Mr. SIMMONS: Objection, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The statement I made was that I do not know now where the office is. (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Order on the Government benches!

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am addressing you, Sir, not the Gallery. Now, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, as usual swiping

like 'Blind Elder', has accused the Parliamentary Secretary in the Ministry of Housing of giving houses to party adherents. You do not want me to go into what is going on before the Commission of Enquiry, so I am not going into the details or the ramifications of how houses are allocated.

Since November 8, 1976, there are a set of rules under which the Board of the National Housing Corporation functions, and there are sub-committees to that Board. One such sub-committee, Sir, is a sub-committee which allocates houses for rent, another one allocates houses for sale. The guidelines are quite clear, I am not going into all of them now, but the basic criteria are the age of an application, how long ago you applied, and other things. I can tell you of one case of a policeman who applied for a Public Officers Housing Loan in 1957 and up to now he has not got it, but he has gone home retired. Between 1957 and 1976 that man's application was never processed.

I have set up a system where the longer you have applied the greater chance your application has of being processed and of your being allocated a house. The principal thing is the size of your family. If you have six or seven or three or four, obviously you will get a house before somebody who is just a single person and who may just need a house as a 'pad', as some fellows want them. I make no bones about that, nobody who can afford to have his own house is going to pay \$15 to the National Housing Corporation and renting another place to put young women, not when you have people in this country with four and five children. That is not going on any more. If I have to suffer for what I think is right, then I will suffer, but I am not encouraging that when the need is there, when people have genuine cases to be satisfied.

Obviously, Sir, your income level is a criterion that is taken into consideration, so all these sub-committees and the Board are seized of these criteria when they are adjudicating upon applications for houses for rent or for sale or whatever facets of the Corporation's business are being discussed at the time, so that we are trying as far as possible to set up these objective standards to rule out questions of partisan consideration. I wish the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to know that I have incurred the wrath of some people about Barbados because a well known supporter of the Democratic Labour Party, no less a person than Roderick Alleyne who operates the newspaper stall here in the bus stand, who is the biggest

antagonist of the Barbados Labour Party in Bridgetown, has been allocated on merit a house in Wildey. We are trying to clean up the system, but we are trying to do it the right way to ensure that people who have genuine cases will get their cases genuinely looked into, and you can come in here and make snide remarks about the parliamentary representative for St. Michael South East. Talk about Roderick Alleyne, let me hear.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: One swallow does not make a summer.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, part of the reason for the delay in the continuity of the Commission of Enquiry has been that a research crew has been set up to assist Crown Counsel who is presenting the evidence and the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Housing and Lands, and there was a lot which needed to be done, but we feel that on the resumption of the Commission the whole matter will go smoothly. One of the other reasons for this assurance that the continuity hereafter will be smooth is that Mr. Carlisle Payne has already sat on the Enquiry into the Housing Authority and that he is familiar with some of the problems of the National Housing Corporation.

In short, it is my submission that the Commission of Enquiry into the National Housing Corporation cannot be useless in the light of only two instances that were put before this House today, and if we can plug loopholes so that in future no Government will waste the taxpayers' money as it was wasted last year.

The question that Head 18(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

1.35 p.m.

Supplementary Estimates 1977-78 No. 15 for the sum of \$31,000 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, this is a very short Supplementary. The Addendum indicates the circumstances for which this amount is being sought. Item 11 — Operating Expenses — is a provision for Government Hospitality, the sum voted under this item has proved inadequate. We have had a number of houses during the first half of the financial year which were not anticipated. For instance, we had a visit by Mr. Andrew Young, Mr. Phillip Bede, Under-Secretary of State from the State Department. Various visits indeed in connection with negotiations which are going on have been made to Barbados. For instance, again,

there was the visit of the Secretary General of the OAS and the President of the Inter American Development Bank. We had to extend this hospitality in a much greater measure than anticipated, and we are not seeking a supplementary provision in the amount of \$25,000.

The second item relates to Compensation. This is always a difficult item to budget for properly. I would have liked to give a breakdown of the vote, but I do not have the file on it. The balance left from the vote is only \$355.00. I understand that out of this there is an amount for compensation in respect of a claim against the Ministry of Communications and Works. That is something which the Leader of the Opposition will be familiar with.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, that arose in December last year when a lorry knocked down a man's house. Is the Prime Minister trying to attack my professional integrity? (*Asides*).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am glad that he knows the contents of my file better than I know them. I only see that there is a token provision of \$650.00. If there is a matter of professional integrity it must be a profession of which I am unaware. The hon. member cannot take any case against the Government. He has sufficient difficulties on his left.

I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister seems to think that abusing people is his passport. If you read the file you will see that I had nothing to do with that claim against the Ministry of Communications and Works. He must not suggest and insinuate these things in the absence of any information. If he has no respect for his professional integrity, I have some.

However, I am not quarrelling about the vote. What I want to know is if the amount under Item 11 of \$25,000 contains element of expenditure for the entertainment of Her Majesty the Queen; because if the House is going to be prorogued at the end of the month money will have to be spent without authorisation. Therefore I want the Prime Minister to assure us that the \$25,000 is not a way of hiding money with

which to entertain Her Majesty the Queen. That is what I want to know from this open Government.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, continuing on the same lines, it seems to me that this supplementary is one that could be avoided if the Government was not bent on trying to give the people of this country the impression that they are trying to do the impossible. The Hon. Prime Minister got up and told us all about the people who came down. These were not people coming here on an excursion. These were people involved in the business of international relations. If he had looked at the expenditure for the previous year he would have seen that it was \$71,000. Yet he came, and asked for an estimate of \$36,000. How would it be possible in an era of inflation to spend \$36,000 in 1977 when \$71,000 had been spent in 1976? It is part of their effort to give the people of this country the impression that they have the capacity to perform miracles.

I have heard them boast about the number of Resolutions and Bills which they have brought before the House. I would say that from the point of view of financial management the Minister of Finance should be embarrassed at having to bring down this number of supplementary Estimates.

1.45 p.m.

We are discussing a matter of finance; why doesn't the hon. member read the editorial and keep quiet? Mr. Chairman, the problem is that there is either inadequate planning or deliberate distortion. You say to the public that they spent \$70,000 and we are only going to spend \$36,000, and a few months later you come back and say these people dropped in and we were not really expecting them. When Mr. Ramphal comes to Barbados he pays his own hotel accommodation, he pays his own food. When Mr. Habib comes down he pays his hotel accommodation, unless they have changed the system. People do not cost that great expense to suggest that you need to have a supplementary because the people came down. I am saying that the \$36,000 was bad planning initially, but we are not going to oppose the additional few thousand dollars; we are saying it is bad planning initially and intended to give the people of this country the impression that they are able to spend less money, and if you go through all the supplementaries which come down here, you will see constantly the same pattern emerging.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to get into this debate. I am sure the Prime Minister answer hon. members with the

usual aplomb, but I just want to clarify some facts for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Michael South West. The Secretary-General of the Commonwealth made an official visit to Barbados and the protocol arrangements which I believe are correct and which have been followed by the former Ministry of External Affairs and by ourselves are that in such circumstances the host Government pays for his hotel bill. It is not paying unusual expenses, but reasonable expenses. The Secretary-General of the Organisation of American States at the conclusion of the conference in Grenada also indicated he wished to discuss with Barbados various matters and he came on an official visit to the present Government. Again the same arrangement existed. In the case of Mr. Habib, he was here at the request of Secretary-of-State Vance and he paid his own hotel bill, but we did host a luncheon for him at the cost to the Government of Barbados. In the case of Mr. Andrew Young he stayed at the U.S. Ambassador, but we certainly hosted a reception for him.

I should like to take the opportunity for the purpose of the record and for the purpose of Barbadian citizens in Toronto who have been misled by wild statements made by a defeated candidate who will be defeated again, who ran against the hon. member for St. George North, to correct what was said. He made wild statements at a meeting in Canada last Thursday night in which he said that at the reception given for Mr. Andrew Young there was only one black person invited and that was the Minister of External Affairs. I do not know whether he is colour blind, whether he is snow white or whether he was invited, but misrepresenting the position of this Minister of External Affairs is an unfortunate one, and if this is the manner in which he runs his politics, not only will he run from St. George to St. Michael South Central, but he will run from public life.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, I do not know if the hon. member objects to being called black. I thought he was proud of being black. I am shocked to hear it. I am sure his colleagues are also.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am so proud of being black that I have never had to wear a shirt jack to show I am liberated. I am so proud of being black and so totally confident in myself that I am here five years longer than the hon. member gave me despite the fact that the Democratic Labour Party ran a campaign against

me telling some people that I was white and others I was black.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, he says that the Democratic Labour Party ran a campaign against him telling some people he was black and some he was white. Will he now tell us exactly what he is?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I can assure the hon. member that I am not a woman; he seems to regret it. I have no problem with colour if other hon. members have. I think it is not right for people to misrepresent the position and I am glad I got the opportunity to correct this view, because I was in New York and I got telephone calls within a couple of minutes of that speech being made giving me the speech and his misrepresentations that were being made about such matters, and I was given the range of the attack on the hon. member for St. George South, the hon. member for St. Joseph, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and myself. Unfortunately we have to notice these things occasionally, but I wish that when people are speaking on issues of this nature that they would stick to the facts.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, so much heat has been raised over this that I would like to give a brief answer in due course to the Leader of the Opposition. The question raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West is easier to deal with. The hon. member has always enjoyed a degree of plausibility without profundity and therefore when he gets up and speaks he creates the impression that his arguments are well considered and merit some kind of attention.

Now I know why we voted \$36,000 in this matter, but upon hearing the hon. member I began to doubt myself; so I have taken the precaution of going back through the Estimates for several years and \$36,000 have been voted under this Head for many many years now. He speaks of \$71,000 being spend in 1974-75 and 1975-76. He could if he chose have looked back and seen that in 1974-75 a sum of \$115,000 was spend. He would therefore have discovered that all his strictures about it should be planned properly, it should look at the previous year and see how much you spent, should be directed to the hon. member for St. John because year after year the hon. member for St. John would spend \$70,000 or \$100,000 and still vote \$36,000.

The reason why we decided not to increase this is that we wanted to get a proper estimate of what Government hospitality comes to as a careful analysis over a period of years, because

this vote is regularly overspent, but it is overspent by widely differing amounts. Some years it is overspent by \$80,000, other years by only \$20,000 or \$30,000. It seems difficult that it is too small an amount; there is no doubt about it, but it is impossible to choose that as a proper analysis of the running of charges on the vote over a year. It is impossible to choose an amount other than \$3,000 a month which has been put down as a norm over a period of time. So far this year \$1,050 was spent on the Conference of Caribbean Hotels. I well remember that was the first charge on the vote, and the Minister in charge will deal with that. I remember wondering about it and it was explained to me that it was necessary. As a matter of fact I have read some of the material from it and I think the conference was a well held conference and did not cost the Government anything.

1.55 p.m.

The next amount spent was \$1,621.50 for a reception for participants in the 1977 CARIFTA Games. The Ministry of Education had another call on it for a cocktail party for \$11,027 held for Regional Workshop on In-Service teaching. There was an amount for the Queen's Birthday reception, and an amount for the CPA Conference. The Commanding Officer of the Barbados Regiment gave a cocktail party for the Director of Students of the National Defence College of Venezuela. There was a luncheon given by the Minister of External Affairs for the Secretary General of the OAS; a cocktail party for the delegates to the Caribbean Public Service Association Meeting; a cocktail party for Andrew Young, the cost of which was \$2,900. The Minister of Labour also gave a cocktail party for the Caribbean Public Service Association. The Barbados Hotel School catered for a seminar on human rights, and there has been a number of small amounts — about \$500 — for official entertainment at the VIP Lounge at the Airport, lunch for Cabinet, etc.

I really do not know if there is anything else to tell hon. members. The vote is running out. It may well be felt that a standard vote of \$36,000 a year, with the unusual expenditures caused by the visit of Mr. Andrew Young and the Public Service Association Meeting would have been inadequate, and I am not surprised that with these unusual expenditures the vote is at its last gasp at the present time.

As far as the Queen's visit is concerned, it really comes as a surprise to me. All I can say is that I do not consider this supplementary vote as having anything to do with the Queen's visit. If we spend at the present rate we would need

another \$30,000 just to maintain the present level of expenditure. The Queen's visit was not envisaged in terms of a special vote at all. If hon. members would agree to give me five minutes, I would ask the Cabinet Secretary if he has a special Resolution coming down on this matter.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, what I find rather strange under this system of open Government is for some things to be hidden in obscurity. Invitations for the Queen's visit have been sent out in respect of various functions. Every minute of the Queen's visit has been arranged; the Royal party is staying on the Royal Yacht. The Minister of Finance is telling us that the visit is going to cost so much less than the \$48,000 spent by the last Government but yet he is saying he does not know what the cost is going to be. My respectful submission is that there is nothing in the Estimates for Royal visits *per se*. It is part of the operating expenses under the Hospitality vote.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I appreciate the fact that my credibility stands a little higher perhaps than the former Minister of Finance, and in this particular instance, as he says, to the best of my knowledge this is a vote for Government hospitality. We do not intend to have a special vote for the Queen visit, and I suppose that the Reception at Government House would have to be paid for from this vote. I cannot see it coming from anywhere else.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister of Finance is saying he supposes this and he supposes that. He must tell us where the money is coming from. He must not come here and say he does not know, he supposes so. He must get down to the facts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am guilty of not taking this matter with the seriousness the Opposition would like. The Queen's visit, as far as can be envisaged, will cost about \$5,000 and will be paid for.
2.05 p.m.

We do not intend to have a special Resolution for the Royal Visit, and we do not intend to spend any large amount of money on it. It will be accommodated out of the ordinary votes to Government, the proper vote being one under this Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is now....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: We still have 7 minutes..... (*Asides.*) I am only saying that the

hon. member is telling us that we will have to ask Mr. Harold Hoyte how much the visit will cost.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Take your seat, please!

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member knows that when something has to be spent from a vote, you can never settle the account until all the bills are sent in. All he has to do is to put down a question and ask how much did something cost.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Right Hon. Gentleman knows that you cannot come to the House of Assembly and say: "We are going to spend some money, and then we are going to find out how much it will cost." He knows that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: 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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting now stands suspended until 2.45 p.m. today.

On resumption --

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. It is now Question Time.

QUESTION TIME

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 44 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South. As I understand, the hon. member is absent through illness, and I hope he will soon be with us. Let the answer be laid.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 44 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Question Time. It is now Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Item under Private Members' Business and, consequently, we will revert to Government Business.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

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

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1977-78
No. 16

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: This Supplementary provision of \$16,000 is required under Head 17(10), Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to purchase a piece of equipment known as an Endoscope for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Endoscope is an instrument which, I am made to understand, is most essential in tests for early detection of upper gastro-intestinal disease including some cancers. There is a waiting list for this instrument, and the instrument cannot be obtained anywhere in Barbados.

I beg to move that Head 17(10) stand part.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I beg to second that.
2.55 p.m.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be very long, because the Opposition could not oppose a Resolution like this. All I would like is an assurance from the Hon. Minister that the report to the effect that the doctors at the hospital and the waiting period for people in Casualty — I am telling you what I read, I do not pimp about there — that they were short of doctors some time ago by 50% or some figure, and I want an assurance that steps are being taken to see that people are treated as urgently as possible. This is from the report which you must have seen yourself, and I just want an assurance that everything is being done to accommodate those who have to use that service.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the entire House the assurance that everything is being done to make the situation better. At the same time I would like to say that as long as a situation continues in Barbados where people simply because they have not got the few dollars to put into the hand of a doctor come to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for primary care, there is going to be unhappiness in

the Casualty. The Casualty has not for years functioned as a true emergency department, and until the National Health Service comes into being when people will go to a doctor and not at the time of being seen by the doctor have to put their hands into their pockets and produce money, until that happens, people who just cannot afford to go to a doctor will continue to go the Casualty and we will have to continue to stretch our resources to the very bone to accommodate these people.

We do everything to make them as comfortable as possible, but there is going to be a long waiting time, there is going to be the kind of situation which you see reported in the Press from time to time. I am not fooling anybody that I can cure that overnight, because the real cure for that lies in the National Health Service. The reason why it could not have been cured before is because in former times the concept of a National Health Service never entered into the thinking of the previous administration. In the meanwhile, for the time being, we are doing everything in our power at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to accommodate those people who go there simply because they cannot afford to go anywhere else.

The question that Head 17(10) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of five money Resolutions in Committee of Supply, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On the separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Resolutions were read a first and second time and agreed to.

THE HOLIDAYS WITH PAY (AMENDMENT)
ACT, 1977

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this Bill seeks to amend the Holidays with Pay Act, Cap. 348, to make provisions for the increase in the minimum annual paid holidays for employees.

This is another step which this Party has set about to make sure that it provides for this country and its workers, the social reforms which we fought for since 1937. One can safely say, and it is a fact, that this Party gave birth to what is now considered the vibrant trade union, better known as the Barbados Workers' Union, in Barbados and thereby setting the pattern for

trade unionism in Barbados to succeed. This was by way of making sure that the workers had a just deal in the society, by making sure that workers — some of them — are getting a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. We have always been in the forefront making sure that those who serve this country in whatever capacity would have the best that we can provide for them.

In the Manifesto of our Party in the last election we set out to provide for the workers in this country four weeks' holiday after one year's service. Due to the fact that this Party is now embarking upon having a comprehensive labour code in this country — and we have sought the technical assistance from the British Government, I can say here that they have kindly consented to assist us with this bit of legislation by way of a labour code.

3.05 p.m.

It is in this light therefore, Mr. Speaker, that I have not brought to this House today what we have set out in our manifesto — providing four weeks as the minimum holiday for the workers of this country; but you must at all times realise that in a journey of 1,000 miles you must begin with the first step; and this is the first step in this country for providing every worker with a minimum of three weeks holiday at the end of a hard year's work.

I would like to say something, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the labour force in this country. One of the things that we must get straight is the attitude of workers. This must be said to our society. Within the past years there has been an attitude whereby people feel that they can take jobs which they are not qualified to do. I have a classic example. Only quite recently a lady came to me in search of a job for her son, a boy of 22 years. I asked the woman what could the boy do. She said, anything that a Combermere boy can do. I asked her if he had certificates. She said that they did not like him at all at school and he did not do very well. Here is an unfortunate case of feeling that he has to get a job that a Combermere boy can do.

I will make a statement. When I was 18 years old I went to the cane fields in Florida and harvested sugar cane. I want people to know that if they would decide to do what is there for them to do and which they can do best this country will be better off. I went to Florida as a labourer, but I went back there 30 years after as Minister of Labour, and I have sat

in the Chair of the Prime Minister of Barbados. I am proud of that.

I read in the Nation some time ago of my colleague setting about to tear down an administration that has already been torn down. I want to remind them of the ills that they have already created. I see people doing jobs because of political favour, and jobs which they are unable to do; and that is why we have this attitude to work in this society. We cannot be all doctors, lawyers, engineers and scientists. It is like the Rastafarians talking to me yesterday. When I offered them work they said they wanted special land. That is the attitude that you are having in the society today.

We have heard people shouting from the house tops about how many people are being dismissed. I will challenge any member on the other side to give me documentary evidence. If they can bring me documentary evidence of any political victimisation of workers, I will resign. I know of people who have abused the Prime Minister and who are still working. There is a Mr. Alleyne in the bus stand who has abused this party, but he has got a house through the Barbados Labour Party Government which he did not get three or four years ago. I am a politician although some of my colleagues may be administrators. I am a politician and I do not believe in feeding anybody to beat me. It is like giving a man a gun and telling him to pull the trigger. I hope that they get the message clear from me.

Only yesterday a woman came to me asking me to get her son into the Polytechnic. He is 15 years old. No provision was made by the last administration for that boy to go into the Polytechnic. Today you have a lot of young boys who want to learn various skills; but under the last administration there was no room for them in the inn; but in one year we have built a polytechnic, post office, the BMC, a ring road etc. We have done all of these things in one year.

I am going to say some very strong things. Nobody has been told of the 300 or 2000 workers taken on by the Transport Board. All that you hear is about 300 workers laid off in the Parks and Beaches Commission. We hear how Mr. Simpson gone from the CBC; but people do not hear about those who are taken on. I am dealing with the whole labour force. I am dealing with holidays with pay. I am appealing to the people of Barbados as a whole that they can only assist in building the nation by working hard.

My colleague, the Minister of Communications and Works has the courage to say what he said. He made it clear that people who are laid off were people who could not produce. I know of this. I see workers cooling out under a tree while agricultural workers are harvesting the canes in order to pay them.

3.15 p.m.

The whole problem is that everybody who comes to you about a job wants a cool job; like a youngster who came to me about a job. I asked him what I could do for him and he said he wanted something cool like being a gas attendant. I asked him why a gas attendant and he said that all he would have to do is to carry to work his transistor and if people came for gas they would get gas, and if they did not come they did not come. That is the attitude. As soon as it has to be cool, we will have to go to Alaska and live. For the past fifteen years this has been the problem with some people in this country.

I will say this about the school meal workers because you know I am going to talk about it, and I am going to attack you first on this. Thirty-two school meal workers got laid off and I believe firmly that the Prime Minister or whoever was responsible for the report tried to handle it too nicely. The supervisor's reports during the old regime on the 32 that were laid off were adverse reports. There were people who made threats on the premises of the school before the children that the children and their mothers wanted poisoning, and that Barrow's administration had put them there and they were not prepared to serve under this Government. Can you really tell me if this should have been the attitude of people? Therefore you send them home. I am prepared to take on the NUPW when they come too. I am not afraid of the challenge with the NUPW.

Within the next few weeks or months depending on the heavy work load which is now in the Attorney General's office and along with the technical aid by the British Government, I hope that I will be in a very strong position to introduce into this country a comprehensive labour code which was set out in the manifesto. I say this for the reason that we have not abolished the idea of any four weeks in the first year. We have a five year programme and I can assure this House that it is going to be done within the five years. The Employers Confederation and the Unions have seen drafts of this legislation before we introduced it into Parliament, and they are satisfied that we are on the right road. There are some business houses today which are a step ahead of the Government by giving their workers three weeks in the first year; there are some

workers who get four weeks in the first five years, but it is Government's intention to make sure that the workers get four weeks in the first year. There is only one regret I have and it is that when these workers get the four weeks holidays they would not be able to go out to the seaside and live in the resort houses promised them by the former administration fifteen years ago. I hope that the Minister of Finance will set that also rolling by setting up two or three houses somewhere along the seaside so that the same workers would be able to live in them. I do not know if the National Housing Corporation would be in a position after I have heard today how much money Duffus will get for the Commission of Enquiry, how much the next person will get and so on.

In the next few weeks my Ministry is going to be in control of housing welfare whereby the senior citizens whose contributions we sometimes do not respect are going to have their houses properly repaired, and when I say properly repaired I do not mean by putting a board here and something there. I am going to dress them up; I am going to give them somewhere to live and repair the houses in a manner that they can be happy to live in them — put some paint on them and try to put a little something around the back and give them a degree of privacy, because they are entitled to that from this society. What I am going to make sure about is that there are no corrupt practices as existed in the same housing welfare under the last administration, where over \$1 million was spent on other people's homes rather than on old people's homes. I heard the silly argument put up today by the Leader of the Opposition that the \$65,000 which we are now going to use could have been spent in repairing nearly all of the old people's homes, but they did not get all the old people's homes repaired in 1976 in the month of July on \$1 million, but we are to repair them with \$65,000. That is the sort of parliamentary stupidity you hear sometimes. You get this out of the mouths of parliamentary clowns and therefore you treat them with great contempt.

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

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Minister would have given us a little more substance on the Bill, but he seems to be more concerned with parliamentary clowning today. I am sorry too, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague and friend the hon. member for St. Lucy is not here for reasons which are well known, because I am

sure he would have wanted to make an input in this debate. You will recall that it was on the agitation of that hon. member that the qualifying period for holiday within the public sector was reduced from 250 days to 208 days, and you will recall that that same hon. member had introduced into Parliament a Resolution calling for three weeks' vacation with pay for persons after one year and four weeks for persons after five years, and I had hoped that since the Government benches had participated in the defeat of that Resolution that when they came today with their Bill they would have been coming with a much farther reaching social service for the workers of Barbados. I heard the Minister say he gave a categorical commitment that the workers of Barbados can look forward to four weeks with pay sometime during the next four years, and I like you to look forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, we are unlikely to oppose this Bill because the concept of giving greater holiday with pay is one with which the Democratic Labour Party has been identified, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, the last Minister responsible for Labour, Mr. Philip Greaves, in his speech to the Barbados Workers' Union I believe in 1976 made a commitment that given the opportunity it was his intention to bring in an amendment to the Act to give three weeks with pay after one year's work and four weeks with pay after five years. I think that the workers in this country will have cold comfort from what the Minister has said today, because in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, most of the persons in Barbados who work now get holidays in the vicinity of three weeks and there will be no change for these workers who have been working for five years, ten years or thirty years. This legislation make absolutely no change in their status, so although it might appear on face value that something fundamental is happening, and although we will have to wait for some time before the labour code is brought, the persons who would have been expecting some change will not be able, after we have passed this Bill, to say that the Government has brought something for them.

3.25 p.m.

The persons who have been expecting some change will not be able, if we pass this Bill, to say Government has done something for us. The majority of persons in this community are honest workers who give an honest day's work for a day's pay and it may very well be that they are included in the Minister's remarks. I am sure he will want to make a corrective statement, because I form the impression he thinks Barbadian workers are sloppy. It is unfortunate too, Mr. Speaker, that large numbers of persons who used

to work at places like the Marketing Corporation, M.C.W., School Meals Service, C.B.C. and a whole host of Government agencies will not be able to benefit from this Act, because in many cases they have been given permanent holiday without pay; they have been asked to go home. And I heard the Minister indicate that they have been sent home for good reason, and I believe he promised to resign if documentary evidence could be supplied to the contrary. There are a number of persons who used to work for Government and Government organisations who can give the Minister a personal account of the victimization they have suffered. I know of one such person in my constituency who related a story which could only be described as victimization, if the story is true. I have had no reason to doubt this person in the past, and I have no reason to doubt him now; and the story which was told to me is a story of bare, undiluted victimization. The person was in fact told: "So you live down by that man Taitt; let him get a job for you." The stories of victimization will emerge; and what I believe is beginning to happen is that members of the other side are beginning to get the message from the ordinary man in the street; they are beginning to feel the pressure which is coming upward from all the people who believed what they said a year ago and now find that the days are getting darker in spite of daylight saving time; who find that life is getting grimmer and who see no hope, especially in the area of employment. Never before in the history of politics, never before has any Government, has any combination, promised so much and delivered so little. In due course the unemployed in this country are going to speak, and I believe that they know that the people of Barbados have already in such a short time made their decision. (*Asides*) It is immaterial whether I become a Minister. As you know there are some of us willing to make a contribution whether we are Ministers or not.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill does not call for a long speech. I just wish to repeat that what is happening is that Government is discovering that it is easier to make promises from the other side when you do not have the experience of dealing with unemployment. Take the question of early retirement: it is ironic that the Barbados Government is formulating a position on early retirement and have decided to send home persons of age 60, and people are expecting to be sent home at age 60. Yet I believe there is someone about age 66 who was recently hired at the Transport Board. I hope Government will be sending home all persons who reach the age of 60, and not just some of them. But it is ironic that while this Government is contemplating sending home people at 60 there is another

country considerably more prosperous, the United States of America, where a Bill is now going through Congress to remove mandatory retirement at age 60. We have different systems of Government, it is true; they are a developed country, they are richer; we are a developing country. But I put it to you that no amount of sending home 60-year olds will provide the massive employment they promised. (*Asides*). I hear some asides from the Minister of Communications and Works. There is a programme which comes over CBC or Rediffusion; I believe the title is "Without Shame". I believe the Minister should listen to it. They have promised the people employment, but they have not given the people employment; they cannot find the avenues to create the employment they promised. The hon. member for Christ Church East should enlighten his colleagues on how difficult it is to find new sources of investment to provide the kind of employment which is required if we are to get out of quagmire which the Great Combination has put this country in. So far the only employment they have provided is small quantities of retired persons and persons who apparently could get employment under the terms and circumstances which the Barbados Labour Party Government has introduced into this country. (*Asides*) I hear them talking about Roderick Alleyne and giving a job to Roderick Alleyne.

3.35 p.m.

Imagine two Ministers, already today, can be jumping up and down saying that they have done something for Roderick Alleyne! Somebody ought to tell the Ministers, either individually or collectively, that they are not Ministers of the Barbados Labour Party and that they are Ministers of the Barbados Government, and that they have a responsibility to all of the people of this country. To stand up and tell me: "Look how good we are; we gave a house to Roderick Alleyne." means nothing to me.

Mr. Speaker, if you look only at the appointments that have been made in this country; if you look at the emergence of the few identifiable members of the elite in the Barbados Labour Party, you must know that the Democratic Labour Party must have given jobs in massive numbers to persons who were members of the Barbados Labour Party. There is nothing big in anybody's heart to be able to say that he employed somebody from the other side, or that he gave a house to somebody from the other side. That is nothing for anyone to be crowing about. It is their duty to provide houses for people on merit. It is their duty to provide jobs for people on merit.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I suspect.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the hon. member rise?

Mr. JOHNSON: On a point of order, Sir. I submit that the hon. member for St. Michael South West is irrelevant. This debate is about a Labour Bill, and he is talking about the National Housing Corporation. I do not see how those two things are at all related.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of order!

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe if I had been talking about the.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. member continue to address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, they should not be crowing at the fact that they have managed to provide a single example of having extended normal governmental service to a person merely because that person is an identifiable member of another political party. Mr. Speaker, I make bold to say that nothing would destroy this country like how it would be destroyed if they continue this divisive policy of choosing persons on the basis of their party identification. When we were in the Government, so far as I know and so far as I am aware, we gave persons employment on the basis of merit. So far as I know, there were large numbers of persons who were identified as members of the Barbados Labour Party, members of the hierarchy of the Barbados Labour Party, who held positions of trust in the Government of the Democratic Labour Party. I am very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to hear them come in here time after time, week after week, sitting after sitting, talking about what they have done for some member of the Democratic Labour Party.

Mr. Speaker, they have run into difficulty with the administration of the Government. That is not what I say, but that is what the ordinary people are saying on the street corner. That is what we hear in every rum shop. I believe they are hearing it, too. They will not admit it if they have difficulty, if they cannot run the Government, why do they not take the advice of one of their own and return it to the people who know how to run it?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grateful to the hon. member for introducing, in the course of his speech, the issues that he has attempted to introduce. Unlike the hon. member, I am not going to indulge in descriptive analysis, nor am I going to indulge in

repetition of opinions which cannot bear factual analysis. The economy of this country has improved considerably over the course of the last year. Every index for measuring economic performance justifies the statement I have just made. In terms of agriculture in this country, the physical volume of production has increased in the last year. When last did the hon. member produce, under the Democratic Labour Party regime, 117,000 tons of cane? In the tourism sector.....

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minister does not give way.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Sugar, Sir. Sit down. In the tourism sector in 1975 there was a minus 4% in the number of visitors coming to Barbados. In 1976 there was a 1.2% increase, and the average rate of increase this year is running at 15%. Let us go now to construction, another key sector in the economy of Barbados. The volume of building materials and cement has increased considerably this year over the last three years. When last did the hon. member hear advertisements over the radio or see them in the newspaper for carpenters and masons or for workers in the construction industry? It is the key productive sector in the economy that this Government has got moving again. What is more is that in each of those industries more people have been employed than in the last two years under the Democratic Labour Party regime.

I will now go in the hon. member's ex-Ministry. The hon. member could never prove or demonstrate that there has been in his period of time such an upsurge in confidence in manufacturing in Barbados. From January 3, 1977, to now we have granted 24 incentive applications. The hon. member has never granted that amount in a whole year as yet. We expect between January 1 and the end of the year, some 16 factories to go into production, so that when the hon. member repeats statements that he hears, when the media in this country indulge in pure repetition instead of doing analytical journalism and looking at the key sectors of the economy and doing a detailed financial analysis of the performance, anything can happen. Until they proceed correctly, the hon. member will not be enlightened because he will be totally incapable of doing it himself.

Despite the fact that it is very popular to misrepresent the economic strategy of this Government, fortunately for us, we have people on this side who can lay bare the facts for

examination. I challenge the hon. member, if he wants a public debate outside, then start the public meetings and let us have a debate. (*Asides.*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order!

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: For the information of the hon. member, between January to August, 1976, our exports were \$99,464,000. In a comparable period in this year our exports were \$112 million. Let us deal also with the situation in the garment industry. I challenge the hon. member, like I challenged the Manufacturers Association and the media previously, to demonstrate that there is any reduction in the number of people employed in the garment industry today as it was in the last year at this period of time. What has happened is that the efficient manufacturers have taken on those workers whom the inefficient have laid off. We have got more employment in the garment industry in Barbados. We have done a very detailed analysis of the imports of garments into Barbados, and we have shown to the manufacturers something the hon. member's Ministry never did in its history before. It has never in its time done an elaborate analysis of every item of garments imported in Barbados and the source from whence they came.

3.45 p.m.

That sort of sophisticated approach did not enter into the hon. member's method of operation, and having shown that to the garment manufacturers, having pointed out that \$12 million in imported garments and asking them what can they do to fill this gap, \$6 million coming from a CARICOM source and \$6 million coming from outside, a clear void left there, a clear breach left there to be filled by the garment manufacturers. Some of them thank God, were very grateful to us for doing research that their Association could not do, that they came back in to us and we sat down and worked out strategies and schemes to help fill that void; and what is more, some of them in fact are helping to fill that void.

All of this propaganda, all of this talk is not based upon facts. That is the unfortunate thing in this community, that we are really unsophisticated, that we operate in a situation in which rumour-mongering, wild opinions, wild statements and things of that kind are the order of the day, because we do not have in this community a sufficient number of independent analysts who would go through the facts and show how they arrive at their opinions. Let the hon. member contradict any of the factual bases I have based my statements upon. He has

provided none, he has only been engaging in the rumour-mongering like the Press.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the opportunity was afforded to the Leader of the House to give the public of Barbados some sort of assurance that the economy of this country is not in the doldrums that they have been experiencing. Even although this is a Bill dealing with holiday with pay and increasing it, I am glad that he saw the wisdom of at least attempting to convince such as will listen to him and who possess that analytical approach which he says is sadly lacking to help carry their gospel to them.

I do not think there can be any doubt that one of the problems facing this country is unemployment, and I have seen a document put out by the Ministry of Labour in June this year which states that unemployment increased about 3.6% over June last year. I can tell you where I saw it, I have a copy. I was home when my papers came from Canada. (*Asides*). Yes, it was handed in as part of the CPA meeting in Canada. I am sorry I do not have it here because I would read it to you. It was prepared by the Ministry of Labour; if you want to know about it ask the Presiding Officer in the Other Place.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. Will the hon. member make the document available to the House? The unemployment statistics are collected by the Ministry of Planning, and they show that at the end of June, contrary to the hon. member's statement, what did he say? Unemployment increased from when? Contrary to that, over the previous year employment increased from June to June. There was a small increase in overall unemployment of the order of .6% with males and females because of the school leavers at the particular time. If the hon. member would care to make the document available to the House I would be glad to see it.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I have no objection. As you know, the papers were to be sent down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader is not quoting from a document, so he cannot be asked as such to make it a document of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, if I had the document — it is among papers to be sent down — but they were all handed to the High Commission to be sent down and I was surprised when I saw it, 13. something to 16.

something. Those are the figures, and I was rather surprised myself. He had better find out who prepared it for the President of the Senate, because there it was, and I was a bit amazed, so do not let us get into these statistics now, the fact remains that in this country the young people who were promised employment are not getting the employment which they expected and therefore it is the Government's bounden duty to try to work out ways and means to meet this pressing need. It is no sense glossing over it and reciting statistics; that does not help. It is no consolation to a boy who has left school, a school leaver or a person who is out of employment, that 13.6 instead of 12.4 is the figure, that is no use, and therefore I think a Government if it is conscious of its responsibility must understand it is no sense giving three weeks with pay when you have 52 weeks holiday anyhow. This is the whole point, and I know we all as citizens of this country must be concerned about the need to provide employment for these people.

There is another area which I would like the Minister in all his comprehensive speech to consider; the area of employment which is very depressed. This is the question of domestic servants. The time has long come in this country when minimum wage legislation should be passed to enable domestics in this country to get a proper weekly wage, and not \$20, \$30 and \$35 a week where some of them have three children. The time has long come when it is no sense giving them three or four weeks when they are hand to mouth, and therefore that is an area to which he must devote some attention. Of course there will be a howl from some people who still think that servants are chattels and are not entitled at least to this type of social benefit. Therefore the Bill in itself, although the Union in many of its contracts has already got three weeks, the Bill in itself is one which the Opposition should support.

It is no sense crowing and boasting that unemployment has gone down. Last Saturday morning I passed up Broad Street and saw thousands of them in front of the Bank of Nova Scotia, and I see them every day, driving through the country, sitting down. This is a fact of Barbados, whether on Broad Street on Saturday or not, unemployment among young people is a problem which we have to face.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. If the hon. member is going to use Saturday morning as an analogy for saying that thousands of people are on Broad Street, I think the

member is not aware of the fact that people only work 40 hours, five days, from Monday to Friday. People only come to town on Saturday to spend what money they have. You are being misled by that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister to go at 12 o'clock midday at the Empire or Globe cinemas and see the number of people going in there at 12 o'clock to see midday matinee during the week and he will see what the position is.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. I would like to inform the hon. member that we have inherited that and we are trying to correct it because I spoke about that in the Opposition and I said at that time that I did not see why cinemas should be opened Thursday half day for young people to be going in there, but you see a lot of bus conductors and bus drivers also among them.

You said that on Saturday morning you saw this amount of young people on Broad Street but that is because they are not working on Saturdays and there is no school, so the young girls and boys are on Broad Street. That is all it is.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult if you get a Minister of Labour who is operating with blinkers and does not appreciate that one of the basic problems facing Barbados is unemployment among young people, and unemployment generally, and that it is no sense offering statistical figures but to settle down and try to solve. If he does not appreciate that by saying it is not Saturday morning or Monday morning, but Thursday midday, that is not the problem. The problem is that in Barbados today there are too many people who want work and cannot get work.

I will counsel the Government that the sooner they sit down and stop all these Commissions and these other areas which are only red herrings across the trail, to tackle the problems facing the country and use every penny they can get in that direction, at least the country will move on. I do not want any excuse, it is blatant and it is patent to anybody who lives in Barbados that the problem facing us is that of the young people who want jobs. 3.55 p.m.

I see the member for St. Michael South East keeping very quiet. I know that after last Wednesday and his speech he has to keep quiet because he was at the receiving end. Although

he is Parliamentary Secretary, he should not get into this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the Leader of the Opposition addressing the Chair?

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Yes, Sir. We can say that up to now they have not done a thing. Up to now there have been non-consequential promises. I hope that the Government will take a very serious view and not go on with this idea of not realising where this country is heading, and the need for employment, the need for young people to be gainfully employed. All this setting up of a Sports Council and such things will not solved the problem. I say that unemployment in this country has increased over unemployment in June last year.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, any legislation that is brought before this Hon. House and which deals with the improvement of the lot of workers, especially those in the lower categories, has my support. This legislation, while it is not a comprehensive Bill, still does something for the average worker; but, Sir, I too would like to make a brief comment on what I would call the redundancy which is taking place in this island.

In the district where I reside, only a few weeks ago a woman who was employed by the Ministry of Communications and Works intimated to me that she was laid off. Now, I want to draw to the attention of this House the sad plight of this woman who has eight children and lives in a wooden house approximately 16 x 8. You can see what would be the condition of that poor woman. I am saying that we can be a penny wise and a pound foolish in laying off such people because you will expect, Mr. Speaker, that that woman will have to apply to the very Government for National Assistance for herself and her eight children; and I have no doubt, Sir, that a proper case will be made out, and no National Assistance Officer would be able to turn down her application.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member is getting a bit irrelevant.

Mr. WEEKES: If that is so, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to stick to the Bill; but I will say that in doing something to assist the workers you have to still consider the plight of the people who are unemployed. The two things go hand in hand; and while I agree with your ruling, Sir, I must continue to let this House know what is happening. I feel that if there is redundancy in

certain areas, while we are trying to improve conditions for others we have got to consider both at the same time.

I can only make the suggestion, I can only appeal to the Government that in cases where people are laid off — in some cases they have not committed any offence — these cases should be investigated fully because as far as I can see it will create chaos to this island by the laying off of people in that category which I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill in some measure does something for the improvement of the lot of certain workers and I will say that all of these workers, especially domestic servants and registered agricultural labourers, will appreciate what is being done for them here today; but as I have said I consider it my duty as a representative of the people to let this Hon. House know that there are certain cases which should be given careful consideration. The whole situation should be analysed before arriving at any conclusion.

4.05 p.m.

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I would say that if people are not pulling their weight and the Government has found out that they are not, it is a matter for the Government to decide and not for me as a member of the Opposition. On the other hand, I am appealing again to the Government to use commonsense and sound judgment in trying to improve conditions at the various Ministries. I do hope that the Government will accept my criticism in good faith and that they will look into the matter and do everything possible before dismissing or laying off workers.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, knowing the hon. member for St. Michael South Central as well as I do, I knew that during the course of the day he would have fallen into a trap; it was deliberately set for him and his colleagues because I never thought that he would have been so stupid as to walk blindly into it. However he has done so and it gives me an opportunity to set the records straight once and for all on this question of an article or an editorial which appeared in the Advocate-News. Now I do not have to make any apologies for what I said last Monday at a Church in Carrington Village.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this one for holiday with pay?

Mr. BRADSHAW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I said on that occasion that there was unemployment in this country and I hinted at some of the reasons which brought about unemployment, and as the Hon. Minister of Labour introduced today a Bill to make it now compulsory to have a minimum of three weeks' holiday with pay, I believe that we must understand what the true position is today, and it is time that the country understands the true position in relation to the unemployment situation.

Now it amazes me how members on that side could come in here today and make the insinuation that the Parliamentary Secretary, referring to me, was assaulted as I saw in the press and that I would sit down and not come back. I do not have to read what is reported in the Advocate or in any newspaper because on 1st April, 1976, the Cabinet of the Democratic Labour Party Government took a decision to invite Vicent Lawrence from Jamaica to Barbados to advise them on the problems which were then confronting the youth of this country. Vincent Lawrence came to Barbados and interviewed sociologists, educationalists, economists, unions and a whole lot of people in Barbados before he made his report to the former Government of the D.L.P., but that report, Mr. Speaker, was never read by members of that Government, and therefore it does not surprise me when you hear members on that side get up today talking about an article on what I said last Monday.

Now let us get this straight once and for all. The former Government invited an expert to advise them on the problem of unemployment in this country. He made a report and I have got in my possession that report, and this is what he said in the report:

"The urgency of establishing a proper and adequate youth training centre at different strategic points over Barbados is more than obvious. One fact that is outstanding is that more than 50% of the 15-19 age group is unemployed and also that 80% of those unemployed is inadequately trained and educated. This situation is obviously one which must be profoundly demoralising to the young people, and unless something is done in a fairly short space of time, the situation will be most untenable."

In this report, Mr. Speaker, it was made abundantly clear that of the children between 15 and 19 years who received their education under the former Government, 50% was unemployed and what was worse is that 80% of the 50% was untrained, unskilled and

unqualified. It means therefore that those people did not have the necessary skills, and any Government that took over, bearing in mind the plight of the young people, bearing in mind its responsibility to the country would have to embark on a training programme. I would state here that it does not matter how the economy improves, what sort of industries you set up in a country like Barbados, until you have got these people between 15 and 19 trained and qualified they will not be able to fit into proper jobs, and that is the basis on which I made my statement, and I repeat it on the floor of this Honourable House today because the members on the other side must be told that if we have unemployment of untrained people to the tune of 80% presently in Barbados, they had the Government in 1961 and people within the age of 15 and 19 received their education under the Democratic Labour Party; so what I am saying is that if anything, criticism must be levelled fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the former administration and not on this administration. That is what they must understand. What we are trying to do in this Government, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that we rectify that situation. It is indeed serious and the Hon. Minister of Community Services has made it abundantly clear that his intention is to set up training centres throughout the length and breadth of this country so that the young people of this country who are untrained will be able to take the opportunity to qualify themselves. I will repeat on the floor of this House that if the young people are untrained and unskilled they are going to find themselves in a position where they cannot get proper employment.

Mr. SPEAKER: So they would not get holiday with pay.

Mr. BRADSHAW: They would not be able to qualify and we want everybody to qualify. That is what the hon. member wants for the people of this country. What we must understand is that the former Government has put lots of people out of work and they have made lots of them unable to qualify for holiday with pay, and I will prove it because when the Democratic Labour Party came into power, in the 70s they employed boys and girls with one or two or three "O" level certificates, they drafted them into the teaching profession, but it was the same Government that in 1975 sent down a letter asking those whom they had drafted into the teaching service on those qualifications to get out.

4.15 p.m.

What we are doing, Mr. Speaker, we are giving these people, and other unqualified people, the opportunity to qualify themselves and qualify for the three weeks holiday with pay. The position is simple. We have got to bear in mind that last year immediately before the general elections I was privileged to read a report by the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, who promised this country two thousand jobs by 1978; and that was when there was a serious unemployment situation. So you see that absolutely nothing was done.

Mr. Speaker, there were some children turned out of school last year; and the Leader of the Opposition, then Minister of Education, allowed these children to be turned out. And I have got here some reports on children which I will read: A child that came second in class was superannuated; that was last year, June-July term; that was one of the many children thrown out of school. There was a child who came third out of 36, and Mr. Speaker, you will agree that third out of 36 cannot be considered as not learning; but yet that child was thrown out of school. These children were deprived of an opportunity to qualify themselves, and these are the people now unemployed. We have got to face up to the situation and let this country know what the facts are. Mr. Speaker, I must mention some of these things because it irks me when people get up and say certain things. There was a boy in form 3C; in English language he got 73 marks and came second; 84 for Social Studies, 2nd; 61 in Maths, 10th; 65 in General Science, 2nd; 76 in Agricultural Science, 9th; he came 3rd in the final position in class, but he was superannuated. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was then Minister of Education. Every time they get up and distort things I will be forced to go to my files and produce information.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Hon. Minister of Labour for introducing this Bill which means that people will be able to qualify for three weeks vacation annually with pay, and I do hope that the time will soon come when we will be able to implement what we promised in our Manifesto, four weeks with pay. I am sure that with the Great Combination nothing is impossible.

Dr. R. B. CADDLE: Unemployment in Barbados has for a long time had definite ethnic overtones. If you look at clubs in Barbados, the only section where you find unemployment is

among black people. There are many reasons why this is so; but if you look back over the years you will observe that in the years preceding the riots the problem of unemployment gloomed very large in Barbados and the unemployment situation was very bad at that stage due to the fact that large numbers of Barbadians had come back from places overseas such as Cuba and Panama. Trinidad and Guyana had also brought on restrictions with the result that these outlets which had aided the country were suddenly closed. It is interesting to recall that the Commission of Enquiry into the riots said that the country had 35,000 more people than the economy could support. Prior to that time emigration was the outlet for relieving unemployment; but the closing of these opportunities caused the problem of unemployment to become greater. It is very easy to get up and talk about unemployment but that does not help the young people who need employment.

It has been said in the past that the creation of one new job requires an outlay of \$20,000. When you multiply that by the number of unemployed in this country the amount of money required would be staggering. You would have to look for hundreds of millions of dollars to create jobs for all the people. And there is no point in talking about training people if at the end of the training there are no jobs for them. There is no point in talking in terms of sending home people at the upper end to bring in young people at the lower end, for as a result of improvement in health care, people are living longer and better and at 60 years are looking forward to another three years or so of work expectancy.

4.25 p.m.

There are a number of people who will have to carry the burden of supporting others. One only has to look at the figures available in Barbados to realise that you have a number of people in the over 60 group. Sir, it becomes necessary for us, if we are really going to do something worthwhile to solve the problem, to put politics aside and get down seriously to the question of how Barbados should solve this unemployment problem for black people. It is a problem for black people. There may be historical reasons and very many other reasons why this is so. One has to bear in mind the fact that it does not make a fellow feel comfortable to know that he is sitting down with a person of another ethnic group in a classroom; he is excellent in his examinations, but the other person can leave school and get a job merely because he is from a different ethnic group. Jobs

are just handed to some of those people. These are some of the things which young people are looking at far more seriously than people like myself are looking at them. There will be no satisfaction to them to hear that political parties get in the House of Assembly making charges as to whose responsibility it is to do certain things for them. In view of the social and economic conditions in this country which permit these problems to exist, it is no use our getting in here and making charges...

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this not holiday with pay for black, grey, blue and everybody?

Dr. CADDLE: During the opening remarks the Minister of Labour dwelt for some time on the question of unemployment, and I am replying to that aspect of things for the benefit of members of this Honourable Chamber. I am not criticizing the Bill which gives four weeks' holiday. I should like to wind up by saying that, as long as we continue in this manner, it will only be a matter of time before the young people become fed up, and what happened in 1937 may happen again in the 1970s.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on this Bill that I feel it is necessary for me to rise and say something. The hon. member for St. Michael South West introduced a number of irrelevancies into this Bill which I thought would not have come out. The Leader of the Opposition also spoke on the Bill and they mentioned the promise made by this new Government, the expectations of the people, and what we have failed to do. Their Government published in their Manifesto, before they came into power for 15 years, a number of things, and for very good reasons they have failed to do these things and they have failed to perform satisfactorily even at the end of 15 years. For example, every worker in the country had been promised to be shod within five years. A Shoe Factory, a Flour Factory and a number of things were to have been established. I remember it was shortly after the 1971 elections when the hon. member for St. John promised full employment in the country before 1975.

Mr. TAITT: 1976.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 1976. I thank you for your correction. The fact that I have been corrected by the hon. member for St. Michael South West proves that he is aware of these things, and I have good reason for saying what I have said. After 15 years of D.L.P. rule unemployment was at its peak, the economy in the doldrums, and nothing was being done to

move the country forward. It is in these circumstances that the Barbados Labour Party was charged with the responsibility of running this country. One year in the life of any business is but a short time to set up a work bench.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall that I said they had 15 years in which to do a number of things. They spoke about school meals and secondary education, but up to now the school meals are not free and education is not free to all in this country. It is only recently under the new Government that concessions were made, to people who are sending their children to private secondary schools in this Island, by way of tax rebates. We have done for these people what the DLP Government could not have done for them in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about what the M.C.W. is doing and so on.

Mr. SPEAKER: And very little about holiday with pay.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Thanks, Sir. I am sure you will agree with me that the position of any Government is to defend itself. I speak with the confidence that since the charges were made against the Government and my Ministry with respect to the question of the laying off of workers, and since you will agree with me that it was suggested that the people would have been entitled to holiday with pay, and those who were sent home would not be qualified for holiday with pay, then it is the duty of the Government to defend itself against the charges that were made.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the last Government did not see its way, because of its lack of ability, to plan and to do the things which the Deputy Prime Minister has suggested in his very able and far-reaching speech here this evening. This Government has created a claim for the industrial take off and the moving forward which that Government failed to do. That Government never saw a moving forward in the building industry, which is certainly a good pointer. Barbados depends upon the building industry as Trinidad and Tobago depends on its oil. The building industry was in the doldrums for some time, and nothing was done to push it forward. I can assure you that employment in the building industry today is very great, and it is difficult to get certain people to work for you.

4.35 p.m.

We feel, Sir, that all workers are entitled to four weeks' holiday with pay, and as the Minister

responsible for labour has pointed out, by the time the labour code is brought down we will have sufficient information on which to work, but we need the time in which to do it and we will not be moving from that.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of explanation, if the Minister will give way. Mr. Speaker, all he will have to do is change "3" in the Bill to "4"; that will take care of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of elucidation.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I want to point you, with your indulgence, the position with respect to workers in my community who will be entitled to holiday with pay and who are referred to as people who were sent home and will not be entitled to holiday with pay. I offer no apologies whatever for the fact that a number of people who the taxpayers were saddled with by the old administration and doing nothing whatsoever were sent home for their failure to produce. There are some of them who do not feel they should do any work but they want to be paid.

I was looking around just now to see if he was here today, but there is a gentleman, St. Clair Blackman, who frequents this place, who for years was a watchman of the Democratic Labour Party's Headquarters and drew his pay from M.C.W. and when he failed to perform and he was sent home he was given instructions by a Government Minister, a person at the Personnel Department, to put back his name on the pay-roll, not to put him back to work. We are saddled with people like this. When the St. George Secondary School was being built, Mr. Speaker, over 400 people were sent away over a six month period from M.C.W. and nobody ever said a word about it, because it was so cleverly and smartly done, but we have nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to complain about, the workers who were sent home were workers who were not working. They were not sent home for any political reason at all. I myself never looked at the list of the workers who were being sent home, these were people who were recommended as people who did not qualify to stay on because the Ministry was seriously overstaffed.

More than 1,200 people — to be exact, 1,246 people — were brought into MCW between the beginning of 1976 and August, 1976 when in truth and in fact their employment figure never at any stage went beyond 2,100, and that was the peak of their employment period, but what do you find? You will never hear this, it is for the Government to say, 304 people were brought

into employment at Highways and Transport since this Government took over the administration of this country, but you will never hear that.

Mr. Speaker, the record has to be put clear, and I would like to compliment the hon. member for St. Michael North Central for the very sensible address which he made to this Hon. Chamber. I think the time has come when we have to stop playing politics over the question of employment. You have played it, the Opposition had said they were going to have full employment by 1976, but what do we find? There is no full employment.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister is not giving way.

Mr. TAITT: A point of order then, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, you are out of order.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, the question of unemployment is a question which this Government has found itself with and is taking every step to deal with, and I have no doubt whatever in my mind that given the time and the goodwill of this country this Government will satisfy the criteria as set by the electorate in this country, and will certainly fulfil all the promises which it has made.

Mr. SPEAKER: Everybody will get four weeks holiday with pay.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish on rising that I could say, like the Leader of the Opposition, I shall not be long, but unfortunately I will have to spend a little time as this debate has been very wide ranging, and while I do not intend to pursue irrelevancies I must refer to some of the points which have been raised.

The first thing is that this Bill has a very close intimate connection with employment in this country and therefore it is necessary to talk of employment when considering the terms of the Bill. To the uninitiated a Bill which seeks to increase the amount of vacation for workers appears at first sight like a Bill which will increase employment. However, I should tell the House, in disposing of the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, that all the advice the Government has received in my Ministry and in the Ministry of Labour has been

that modern experience shows that increasing vacations for workers leads to a reduction in employment and not an increase, and if the hon. member wants any further justification.....

Mr. TAITT: I did not say that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not think there is anything in what I said that reflects on the argument of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, but if he wants the argument that we do not consider it possible at the present time to implement the full period set out in our Manifesto but to leave it for an occasion when employment in Barbados is very abundant, he has the answer in that. Industrialists ask what is the cost to them of the labour input into their business.
4.45 p.m.

Having to give long vacations increases the labour input; and therefore industrialists are inclined to lay off one or two of the staff or not to take on new staff if it knows that it will lead to increased costs. Nevertheless, three weeks vacation is no widespread in this country and in some areas four weeks, that we have decided to bring down legislation for a minimum of three weeks vacation; and we have set out the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why the intention was reconsidered.

In regard to the employment policies of Government, it would be no use Government trying to hide from itself that there is disquiet and also some public perturbation and all of these things have been occasioned by the general situation of employment in the country, the particular situation of laying offs and what appears to be unemployment in the country, the particular situation of laying offs and what appears to be unemployment in the public sector and in sectors associated with the public sector.

Much of this public perturbation has gone on in the context of the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party. It has been quoted in respect of holidays with pay in the Press and also by the Opposition. It has been said that we promised to provide immediately 3,600 jobs. I think that it is time that the voice of accuracy should be heard in the way suggested by the Leader of the House. The Barbados Labour Party did not promise anyone 3,600 jobs immediately. The Barbados Labour Party promised to institute programmes immediately which would generate jobs. Anyone would understand that a scheme like the St. Andrew Development Scheme is not a programme which would generate jobs immediately. No one could expect that we would have been able to start the St. Andrew

Development Scheme on 4th September or 5th September; but it will be started, just as the plans for housing, for agro-industries, the plan for a National Sporting Council and for Parks and Beaches Development.

Plans for the Transport Board are also being proceeded with. You hear about lay offs. No one has heard that since we came into power the Transport Board has taken on 304 new staff. How is it that that has not been in the Press or in the voices of the Opposition? At the National Housing Corporation approximately 200 new staff has been taken on. These things do not get into the Press because the Press is only interested in something bad from the Opposition and something bad about the Opposition. They turn to them for bad news.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the House is interested in holidays with pay.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Yes, Sir. The employment situation prevents us from going the whole hog with holiday pay. In the last 15 years the employment situation in Barbados has got worse. When the Democratic Labour Party came into power unemployment was running at between 8 to 9% of the labour force. If anyone says that emigration was high, it is also true that the actual number of people who had work was the same as it is now.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the Prime Minister is intentionally misleading the House. The basis on which the figures were put forward 15 years ago were entirely different from today.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not misleading the House intentionally or otherwise. The method of discovering the amount of employment in this country, on the basis of what constitutes employment has remained the same; but the way of finding it out is different. The rules of arithmetic have not changed because you use a calculator today when you used to use an abacus or a pen and a piece of paper when the hon. member was at school.

In 1960 the labour force was defined in terms of people offering themselves for jobs at certain ages. I myself think that if you are keeping children in school up to the age of 16, you must remove the 15 year olds from the unemployment list. I will not regard that as reducing unemployment. It is reducing the labour force. This is a concept which the hon. member should have tried to grasp before he talked about misleading the House.

I believe that the figure for employment might have fallen off by the end of 1961 because the harbour was no longer being built. Unemployment also fell very low in 1970, although not as low as in 1960; but from 1972 or thereabouts unemployment in this country increased. This is indeed a serious fact of life with which the present Government as well as previous Government has to deal; and to this extent I welcome the words of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central when he said to put politics aside. By 1976, far from there being full employment, it got worse; and it was getting worse before the oil crisis. The peak year for construction in this country was 1970. The employment situation had nothing to do with the oil crisis. The former Government did not find some substitute to maintain the level of economic activity. There was a slide under the Democratic Labour Party from 1970 to 1976, nothing to do with the oil crisis. Opportunities for employment were based on a building boom, and there was no substitute for that boom when buildings erected, primarily hotels, were no longer needed in that quantity.
4.55 p.m.

From 1970 there was an economic decline. It is very fashionable to say that the oil crisis of 1973 created a lot more unemployment in Barbados. I am yet to see that the oil crisis had the same effect on the economic conditions in Barbados in 1973 as the collapse of the building boom had in 1970. I made that statement quite advisedly. I am one who has said in international forums that I have never believed that the oil crisis had the same effect on the economies of the developing countries other than the five countries of South Asia as it had on the development of other countries. I have always believed that the real sufferers from the oil crisis were the economies of Western Europe, countries with a greater dependence on oil perhaps than Barbados. I have seen an analysis from the OECD which indicated that at the time when Western European countries were then encountering serious stagflation that the ten main primary exporters among developing countries were all experiencing very considerable prosperity led by countries such as Brazil, including also one or two Central American and small African countries, and indeed including at that time, I believe, one or two of the Islands of the Caribbean although at a much lower level; but that was only an aside.

It is not my purpose to talk about international politics. Certainly it is not my purpose to make Barbadian people believe that we are so buffeted by the outside world that we

cannot do something to right ourselves even in the face of circumstances such as the oil crisis gave rise to.

Now, Sir, to come more narrowly on to employment, very unfortunately Mr. Speaker, the then Government considered that the chief remedy for unemployment when unemployment went into double digits and when unemployment as it had in 1975 reached the peak, never before or after seen, of 22%, — I was given the wrong figures at the time of the last election of 28%, but 22% was the accurate figure — was to take on a couple of hundred people at Parks and Beaches, take on a lot of extra people at the Ministry of Communications and Works and so on. Now these palliatives have always proved in every case not only useless but worse than useless because they tend to withdraw resources that could be used for productive employment and put them into wasteful crash programmes. They have a waste on emergency public works, but I will tell hon. members how very limited that waste is, and if the hon. member for St. Michael South West really wants to know what a waste was put on the economy, he can listen now.

In the circumstances of the great depression of 1929–1931–1932, there was undoubtedly a place for large scale public works and the injection of Government money into the labour market place not to alleviate unemployment alone, but to create demand, to put money into the pockets of unemployed workers so that they could spend money on goods and perhaps allow factories to take on new staff to satisfy the demand for those goods. The creation of demand was improved in Western Europe and more so in the United States where there was no such thing as unemployment pay. It was improved in the United States for President Roosevelt to take on people to weed the roadsides and put up pavements. It was important because by that alone he was contributing to recovery. Now this is a pointer that perhaps had those hon. members opposite been aware of, they might have paused before jumping with both feet into doubling the size of MCW and so on in those days, and not one of the figures had been used to count persons who were paid by the Government on the national recovery administration programme. The NRA before it was declared unconstitutional used to employ people, but let me state here that although the NRA had employed people for the sake of giving them work, these people were still counted among the unemployed. That is one of the reasons why you wonder how the United States came to recover from the depression although there were so many unemployed people on the official figures. Unemployed people were

still regarded as unemployed even after they had gone to work in this type of activity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to take on people at Parks and Beaches to pick up stones in baskets for three or four weeks at Delamere Land was exactly the type of NRA activity to which Roosevelt resorted in 1932 and it is obvious that they were not employed in any meaningful sense.

In fact, if you want an opinion, it would have been better for Mr. Carmichael to give them the money openly to sit down with a hoe than to go in Delamere Land because really and truly they would have to put the stones somewhere and somebody would have to come and move them a second time. That is not employment in any real sense and you have to get this out of our heads; it is not employment where at MCW a gang consisting of nine people is doing a job alongside the road that can be done by a staff of four. You see, you begin to fall into the area of Communist economics. That may seem paradoxical except perhaps to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central whom I am sure understands what I mean. Employment is organised in Communist countries on a different basis altogether. It is obligatory to work and if 1,500 school leavers leave school, they are by law obliged to work and the Labour Control Officer or whatever he is checks up around the area and sends 300 of them to this factory, 100 to the next factory and so on, but such a system is only possible where you have total control of wages, where in a given factory the workers cannot decide their necessary conditions of life or what they want of life. The Government decides for them what is going to be essential and they cannot collectively bargain for wages. There is complete control of wages and of prices, and full employment is achieved at the expense of productivity. People talk about socialist forms, but they do not realise that there is no general wage increase in Russia every year. There are people in Russia working for the same wages as in 1930 because there is control of the level of wages and general control of the level of prices, and they do not bear any relationship to the market force such as we understand them.

5.05 p.m.

In a mixed economy where the trade union can bargain with the private sector it is impossible to say we have \$5 million to spend on Parks and Beaches, we employed 500 people last year, so let us employ 1,000 this year. We cannot say that in Barbados and therefore a great disservice is being done to the country by

what appears to be just giving people a job, put on here, put on there, take on a few more over there. It appears easy, but it is destructive in the end if Government is to find real employment for its people. And we are suffering in Barbados from this. When you get down to it, the Government's deficit last year of several million dollars can be explained in large measure in terms of wastage in this direction. But as stated by the Ministry of Industry: it has been proved that if you build a factory in Barbados or maintain adequate levels of available factory space, the factories do not long remain unoccupied. An example of this is the cluster of factories at the Harbour. If more money had gone towards the factory building programme to create, say, another 50,000 square feet of factory space, that space might have been occupied, because when the Chairman of the IDC goes around he can say that there is factory space available.

As regards the School Meals Service a number of School Meals personnel have been retired on pension and others have taken their place. Over all there is no change in the situation. I see the "Advocate" had an Editorial which they suggested there were fewer people working in the School Meals Programme than before.

Mr. SPEAKER: And they will get holiday with pay.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And they will get holiday with pay. It is time that people understand that we are trying to grapple with this problem of unemployment. I see the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is back in his seat. He is wrong if he thinks that unemployment is a disease of black people only; it is a disease throughout the society. If we had only white people in Barbados there would be the problem. If he went to Rockley he would find lots of people who are not black hanging around. I do not believe that racial overtones will help this situation.

It has been asked what the Government is doing. I do not want to anticipate anything we might hear this month or next month; but it should be noted that we have been in power only one year and to reverse what has been running on the wrong tracks for several years will take a little time, but the change has started. Already you have heard of a 20% increase in agricultural output and tourism. Government is presently negotiating for a loan for \$10 or \$11 million for a factory building programme. The hon. member for St. Michael

South Central, the Leader of the Opposition, talked about an increase in unemployment. He spoke of a slight increase from June to to June but a considerable increase from April to June. But a considerable increase from April to June occurred because April is the height of the crop season and the closing of the tourist season. Obviously in the middle of the year, at the end of June, unemployment will be higher.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister knows that when unemployment figures are prepared, adjustments are made for seasonal unemployment; so unless he explains this he is misleading the Chamber.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The only person who is misleading is the hon. member himself. We do not make adjustments for seasonal employment; we make our comparison from year to year; April to April, June to June, and so on. In this way we can find out whether more people were employed, say, in June 1977 than in June 1976. Or we can compare the month of December, when they were 3,000 more jobs than the previous year. But what has happened is that the employment situation has shown a steady improvement since we were in power. There has been improvement in employment for men, but for women it has declined. Therefore, we are placing a lot of importance on the factory building programme because our type of factories give a lot of employment to women, and so this \$10 million for factory building is targeted mainly towards female employment.

Another area of unemployment very popular with the Chamber of Commerce is white collar unemployment. No doubt this is unacceptably high in Barbados.
5.15 p.m.

It is necessary to have people who are conversant with algebraic formulae to work with these machines. As a result of the shortage of such persons in Barbados, some 200 to 300 additional jobs had to be postponed until we can build up a reserve in certain areas. There are a lot of modern areas where you can get these bottlenecks and, instead of forcing people to work in the Parks and Beaches section, or as casual labourers, we are trying to take young people and have them trained in certain skills. Hong Kong has done it. Taiwan has done it. Cuba has done it, and South Korea is now showing us that it can be done. These are the areas we are thinking about and doing something about.

Sir, we are looking at several things. We are giving consideration to legislation regarding certain tax haven proposals, which will be looked after by the External Trade Ministry. Very soon we will have to bring a Bill to this House dealing with International Business Companies. We have looked at what has taken place in the Bahamas and we have certain things in view. We have also looked at the question of banking. Dr. Blackman told me that the Bahamas now employ more people in that section than are employed in the tourist industry, and they have about 1¼ million tourists every year. We are hoping to improve the lot of the white-collar employee with the expansion of International Business Companies.

Sir, there are a number of areas which, in due course, as they develop, will be indicated to the House and to the public. With all of these things in mind, nobody should be disappointed when a Bill for improving holidays with pay is discussed in terms of a few people being laid off at the School Meals Department. Those people have been given pensions and gratuities and sent home. I believe Mrs. Hinds has already got her pension, and the hon. member for St. John will know who she is. She is the first of these School Meals employees to go home on retirement. We have to keep ourselves above these trivialities and put our shoulders to the wheel in this matter. We have to understand the interactions: the interaction in the negotiations in union affairs, and the interaction of Government spending, and we do ourselves no service if we discuss them in terms of petty trivialities and bitter political campaigning.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I believe all the points in this debate have been canvassed, but I want to make a point. I do not think that any amount of short-term political debating will hide the fact that this particular Bill is a significant measure of social legislation in the field of labour laws. It seeks to give three weeks' holiday to every Barbadian who is employed in this country after one year's service, and to this extent it is a considerable improvement to the existing position as it operates in the law. The Minister has gone further and stated in no uncertain terms that he will guarantee within the five-year period our undertaking to give four weeks' holiday after three years of work. I have not heard the hon. member for St. Michael South West talk about the former Minister of Labour, who talked about four weeks' holiday after five years of work.

We have done a survey on existing conditions, and the only reason why we cannot

go immediately to that part of the legislation is that further consideration of the labour and the labour code will have to be given to the matter. Hon. members have taken the opportunity to speak at length on the unemployment position in this country. Obviously every Barbadian must be concerned about that. I do not think that anyone who has listened to the reply of the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister in particular should be under any illusions about the serious attempt on the part of the Government to bring down the number of people unemployed.

Sir, we have increased the number of jobs provided during the year that we have been in power, but that has been overtaken by the number of persons coming into the work force, so that if you provided 3,500 jobs and you have 4,000 children coming out of school, then you would still be faced with a difficulty. I have the statistics from June to June which the Prime Minister referred to, but this does not take away anything from the fact that we have created additional jobs, both in the public and private sectors, during the year we have been in power.

I want to remind the Leader of the Opposition of the fact that before the last election he had a survey made which established that there were 5,500 young people between the ages of 14 and 19 who were not employed. That is the problem that we have inherited after 15 years under his Government's regime. They had promised the people full employment by 1977 or 1978, as the former Minister of Finance has said he would do. He has passed on to us a legacy of 5,500 people unemployed in the age group of 14 to 19 at the time of the last election. I believe that Barbadians are not stupid. They would not expect that problem to be put right overnight, unless we started with a useless short-term crash programme where people were given an opportunity only to carry a hoe in their hands and get money. That is the type of employment that was given in this country years ago. If the DLP Government had done certain things during their 15 years' regime, it might not have been necessary to change the Government.

Sir, employing a number of people just before an election does not solve anything. It is merely a short-term political solution, and it does not solve the problem of unemployment. Everybody knows what took place at the Parks and Beaches just before a by election in Bridgetown. A lot of people were given jobs merely on political grounds.

5.25 p.m.

You can cite the case of several people taken on in Communications and Works without work available for them to do. We have inherited this, it is not a legacy of which we can be proud. I would like to speak, for instance, of the case at the District "A" Police Station in which 20% of the work has been done and 80% of the money spent. The original estimate was \$1.2 million, \$800,000 have been spent and only 20% of the work done. We must get out of the habit as politicians of encouraging people on low productivity on the basis of the fact that we will get a vote for it.

A lot of people do not know this, but the Minister of Communications is a very forthright man. He has a lot of guts and courage which Barbados will one of these days come to recognise as very valuable in dealing with structural employment and the long term problems in this country. I would like to remind the Leader of the Opposition that he is in the evening of his days in the political field. It will not be long now, according to my information, before he hands over the mantle of Leader of the Opposition, since he is not running in the next election, he is no longer fighting for political office, therefore he should get to the stage where he can speak out frankly on issues like these so that people will recognise that it is in their own interest that we have increased productivity in this country.

We are beginning to price ourselves out of our own financial resources, and that is a dangerous thing. Only a few days ago I was reading an article in the Sunday Times which says, for instance, that the Japanese worker was producing five times more than the worker in Britain, which means that the British economy was on the decline. That cannot be good enough, and I think if you take the statistics in Barbados you will find that if you are going to give people more leisure time, as we are seeking to do here, then I think it is but reasonable for the people in their own interest to realise that their work time must be properly spent, that efficiency must eventually improve so that there can be a greater distribution of wealth among people.

I want finally to make one last statement which came up in this debate, the question of political victimisation. I take that charge very seriously, because I think it is a charge that is being bandied about by a party whose record in this field is one that nobody should envy. When you think of political victimisation, I myself could state one such instance in relation to the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and myself. I have had the fortune of reading the

file. When I came up to be appointed Queen's Counsel it was recommended on one day by the then Attorney General writing a letter to the Chief Justice and saying that I was suitably qualified. That same day he wrote a letter to his political master, the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, saying that although he had given the recommendation he was of the view that there were enough Queen's Counsel and that there should not be any more. The Prime Minister wrote back and said "loose away this file" he agrees with that and he knows that during his absence the Hon. Cameron Tudor had allowed the hon. member for Christ Church South Central to proceed to Queen's Counsel, and had he been in the island he would never have approved it. The hon. member for St. John, when it comes to victimisation, is a classic example. I have a tape which I will never get rid of, of a meeting in the market square where he said that I should never get a job as a lawyer in this country, simply because of my politics.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well, you will get holiday with pay.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: That is the sort of thing that that Party carried on. I had to send members of my constituency group to go and get Democratic Labour Party cards sometimes to get jobs, or to get houses, or to get into school meals. When it comes to political victimisation, they took the Constitution of Barbados and treated it as though it was the private preserve of the hon. member for St. John, and they were a series of mice sitting down there and saying not one word. Certainly if I hear of any allegation I take it up with the Ministers concerned and try to investigate, if there is anything to investigate. This is so. One must have a look at these facts.

When the hon. member for St. Michael South West was in charge of the IDC — I am sorry he is not in his seat — we had to send a Labour Party girl to the member who was then running for the constituency in the Pine, Senator John Connell, and that is the only way she could get the job. The same girl turned around and lives in the Pine Housing Area, and I would not say what she told me. Patronage was introduced into this country by the Democratic Labour Party because they were afraid of their job positions. This is a fact, and right in the Civil Service you have this happening. We have gone into the Civil Service and we are trying to run the country, we are not bothering about that sort of thing, no political party like ours would be so stupid as to believe that everybody is going to belong to the Barbados Labour Party, we know that there are many people who would hop from party to party

also simply because there has been a change of Government, and that same thing happened in 1961, it has always been happening, and it will continue to happen.

Now, I want to deal with one call he made for domestics. I am glad to hear that he is joining the chorus of people seeking a better deal for domestics, but the Labour Party has a record in relation to domestics that it can be proud of. In the early nineties, you will recall this, Sir, it was Mr. M. E. Cox who put on the Statute Book of this island Cap. 344 protecting domestics at that time. In 1969-70 I heard campaigns against him, one by the Democratic Labour Party, for putting that statute on the Statute Book of Barbados and giving protection to domestic labour, saying that you should not keep a domestic working in your house for longer than eight hours a day, and also stipulating that you had to give her a certain rest period. That is part of the labour legislation in this country and we will improve on it regardless of whether the hon. member thinks now he is going to jump on the domestic servants' bandwagon.

The history of labour legislation shows that almost all the significant bits of social labour legislation originated during the period of Grantley Adams and before, the concept particularly of the Labour Movement when you had a bifurcation between Sir Grantley and Mr. Frank Walcott; a most unfortunate incident that happened in the Labour Movement in this country. There was a time when Frank Walcott was attacked by the Democratic Labour Party because he held the views that Sir Grantley had, and the quarrel between himself and Sir Grantley had not come then. That is a fact, so the Barbados Labour Party has a history in labour and social legislation of which it can be proud, and thank God the young people coming up are getting a chance to look at the historical facts themselves, and they are no longer going to be fooled by the attempt to rewrite history between 1961 and 1976 as occurred in this country before.

5.35 p.m.

I hope, Sir, that I have clarified the point about the domestics. The Minister of Labour himself has pointed out that he is looking at the whole question of a Labour Code. The people can rest assured. Give us the time, but we need your help and we need your co-operation and we need the hard work of every Barbadian. It is not a problem only for the Government, but a problem for each one of us to push our country forward. I think that we need an understanding on these issues.

For the first time this year there is a significant growth being forecast for the economy in the overall picture. There is much more economic activity taking place in the country. There are some problems, but there are problems which can be beaten, problems which can be solved. We are appealing to all Barbadians to stop talking, stop gossiping, stop wasting time and get down to working for themselves and for their country. There are those of us like Ministers who work 12-16 hours a day. We take home work and do it at night. We spend a lot of time working and trying to get programmes going. We would like to see co-operation being shown in return from the private and public sectors of this country.

None of us like to talk of somebody being unemployed. Only this morning a chap with a degree from the University of the West Indies phoned me about trying to find a job for him. He has a degree in mathematics, and he wants a job. These are problems that we have, and we will have to look at these problems. We probably need a proper vocational guidance scheme, and this is something that the Minister of Education is looking at. I think that we can rest assured that this Government has as much, if not more than the other Government, the interest of the people at heart; and I do not think that anyone will be fooled by the pious and lordly statements made by the member for St. Michael South West on these issues at all, nor the slick political statements to get back in favour.

Any Government has short term problems, and it is easy to look at that; but look at the long term trend of this economy. I suppose that the hon. member has to do his job on behalf of the Opposition. He has to say something; but we hope that the things that he says will not distort the facts as they exist, Sir.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I would like in the light of the speeches made on both sides of the House to take this opportunity of thanking my colleagues for putting the case so well, and particularly the Minister for external trade, and also my colleague on the other side of the House, the member for St. Philip South. The speeches of the others on that side were of course too lacking in depth and content to merit much reply.

I did make mention about the attitude of people and I am proposing to my colleagues that I am trying to change the titles of a number of jobs in Barbados. A young man who is called a watchman is annoyed; but if you call him a security guard he is happy. A lady referred to as

a maid is a bit concerned if she has to go for a visa. She would prefer to be called a housekeeper; and a gardener would rather see on his passport "landscape artist". I am serious about this. In the U.S.A. you would see a man whom in Barbados you would call the janitor of a building, but they call him a maintenance superintendent.

As I said earlier, all of us cannot be engineers etc. We have got to examine the titles of these jobs and I am starting with it in my Ministry and will be bringing proposals to Cabinet in the not distant future. As regards Housing and Welfare which also falls under the Ministry of Labour, I will be coming back to Parliament in a few weeks with a supplementary to allay the fears of my colleagues on the other side and people in Barbados whereby the houses of old age pensioners will be repaired, and properly repaired on this occasion.

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

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Dr. CHELTENHAM Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: 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. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE the Bill was read a third time and passed.
5.45 p.m.

THE FINAL APPROPRIATION (1975-76) Act, 1977

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Finance, and is to

move the second reading of a Bill to grant an additional sum of money out of the Consolidated Fund and appropriate the same for the services of the Island for the financial year ended 31st March, 1976.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Bill stands in the name of the Hon. Minister of Finance and in his absence I am asking leave to deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is necessary to comply with the constitutional provisions of Barbados dealing with the appropriation of finance, and as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition says, this money has already been approved in separate Resolutions, and this is the Final Appropriation Bill.

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

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

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

On motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

The Preamble was called and passed.

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

On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
(AMENDMENT) (NO. 3) ORDER, 1977

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 4 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, and it is to move the passing of the Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1977.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking leave to deal with this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted the Hon. Minister.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Resolution is to approve the Civil Establishment (General) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1977, and it is to effect certain regradings in a number of public offices. The individual details and the particulars relating to the offices are set out in the Addendum to the Resolution, and various Ministries will be involved in this regrading. I am sure that Hon. members whose departments are affected be in a position to deal with any questions from the other side. As is well known this regrading exercise is a continuous exercise that goes on between the Chief Establishment Officer and various recommendations and contentions which are put forward by various departments.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are several matters in this Resolution I would like to speak about. Under the Head Governor-General, during the time of the Democratic Labour Party Government there were two Secretaries who used to be on a par, that is, the Prime Minister's Secretary and the Governor-General's Secretary, and the basis of the argument for that was that the Secretary of the Prime Minister who has several portfolios and who is a very busy man carries or is expected to carry a greater workload than the Governor-General's Secretary for the simple reason that he is only a figurehead in the constitutional sense, and therefore his Private Secretary has not got the volume of work which the Prime Minister's Secretary and Minister responsible for Finance has got to carry, and this regrading now is the first attempt made by this Government to change that parity which existed

between the Prime Minister's Secretary and the Secretary of the Governor-General. I for the love of me cannot see how it can be justified to me unless the Prime Minister is not doing any work at all that his Secretary is less important in this community than the Governor-General's Secretary.

5.55 p.m.

Therefore, unless the Governor-General's Secretary is reaching the age of retirement and therefore an attempt is being made to increase her final emoluments, that's something else. But I do not think others on that side who know about Ministerial Government can say that the Governor-General's Secretary has a greater work load than the Prime Minister's Secretary. I would like to know why deviate from that principle, and how it is justified when one hears that the Prime Minister's Secretary works sixteen hours a day. I have been a Minister and I know what Secretaries have to do; and I want the Prime Minister to give this House an explanation why the Governor-General's Secretary has been picked out and given this differential. Even with re-organization of staff I do not think the Governor-General's Secretary would carry any greater workload than the Prime Minister's Secretary. If the Prime Minister is saying that his secretary has not got as much work as the Governor-General's Secretary, I would be surprised at this, as I know something of the duties of Prime Ministers in developing countries.

Dealing with the Ministry of the Attorney General, I sometimes hear that I did not do any work when I was Attorney General. The present Attorney General now has a staff of twenty six when I had only eight. But I would ask the Attorney General at this point in time to look into the regrading of magistrates in this country. The magistrates are doing a remarkable job — they are the hub of the maintenance of law and order in this country and deserve much better than they are getting. At no time that I was a member of the Cabinet did I have any responsibility for the Courts, Magistrates or the Registry of this country; so it is no point talking about when I was Attorney General. I was never Minister of Legal Affairs, and a check will show that at no time did I have any responsibility for the Judiciary or the Magistracy. But the present Attorney General has some idea of the work load of the Legal Department, and I am asking him to treat the matter of the regrading of magistrates and the reorganisation of the magistracy as a matter of urgency.

I would also like to say on the question of the Attorney General's Office that it is true the Constitution of Barbados does not give the Attorney General any right over criminal prosecutions except for certain offences. But I would like to tell the Attorney General that the public is very upset about the matter of the withdrawal of the Truss case. I know that under the Constitution the Attorney General has no control over the Director of Public Prosecutions, but I would like to hear an explanation on this matter.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is going on to an exercise on the conduct of the Director of Public Prosecutions, he must give proper notice. The Director of Public Prosecutions has got certain duties under the Constitution of this country and I would not interfere with this discretion. If the Leader of the Opposition wants the matter discussed he must put it upon notice.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said the Attorney General had no control over the Director of Public Prosecutions, but I am talking about a particular case at District B which was withdrawn.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that if the hon. member is bringing into discussion the conduct of the Director of Public Prosecutions, he must give proper notice.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I am saying that a case brought against Truss at District B was withdrawn; and I have said that the public has expressed some concern about it withdrawal.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is making an attack by innuendo on the Director of Public Prosecutions. If the hon. member does not want to clash with me.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Constitution gives certain powers to the Director of Public Prosecutions. All I have said is that the case was withdrawn at District B on the 4th October.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Director of Public Prosecutions is not part of the Attorney General's department. I am making this point because I think it is important for the future and it seems the hon. member is making allegations of misconduct and that there was something improper in the proceedings.
6.05 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Chair may be permitted to rule on the point, if you take your seat, the conduct of the Director of Public Prosecutions is irrelevant to this particular Head and, in those circumstances, my ruling is that no reference to the conduct of the Director of Public Prosecutions can be dealt with under this particular Head of the Civil Establishment (Amendment) Order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Is not the Attorney-General responsible for Legal Affairs in this country?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cannot ask the Chair that question. My ruling is that the conduct of the Director of Public Prosecutions is irrelevant to this particular Head.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: With all due respect to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I agree with that. I will not call his name at all. I am dealing with legal affairs and justice in this country, and the Attorney-General.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Why are you jumping up?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members take their seats! The Hon. Prime Minister is on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. A serious allegation is being made about interference with the courts of justice. To the best of my knowledge the Director of Public Prosecutions has absolutely nothing to do with it, and I respectfully submit that you should not allow the hon. member even to preface his remarks by talking about the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Comptroller of Customs withdrew a case following the enunciated policy of the Ministry of Finance. If he wants to argue about that, let him keep off the poor Director of Public Prosecutions.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: As I understand the Right Honourable Prime Minister, the Comptroller of Customs filed a case; he was called to the Prime Minister's Office, and there the Prime Minister enunciated the principles which should guide prosecutions in such a case and the Comptroller withdrew the case. Once I have got that established, I do not need to go any further. I do not want to find out anything any

more. I am very happy to hear the Prime Minister admit it. After a case was filed in a court in this country, he then tells the Comptroller of Customs what is the policy of Government on matters of this nature, and the case was subsequently withdrawn. As a result of that, what I am saying now, Mr. Deputy Speaker.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. We are discussing the Ministry of the Attorney-General. This is the Head he is speaking on. If the hon. member is speaking on another Head he must indicate it. (*Asides.*) Deal with it when you are dealing with Customs, and I will deal with you in replying to my particular Head.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are beginning to wonder where justice begins and where justice ends, and whether there is equality before the law. They want to know when you are going to run foul of the law, if you have to be connected with a member of the governing party, or to people of influence in this country. I, as a lawyer and one of the leading lawyers in this country, am concerned about it. I, as a lawyer and one of the leading Queen's Counsels in this country, am concerned with the question of justice. (*Asides.*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I want that to be quite clear. If this method of people not facing the music is going to be based on enunciating decisions of Ministries on whom you know, then there is going to be a sad day for this country. We will be on the border of corruption, and the whole basis of equality before the law will be destroyed in this country. I want to issue a warning about that, and I am glad that the Prime Minister has had the courage to get up and admit that the withdrawal of the case at District "B" was after he had laid down the policy to the Comptroller of Customs, a civil servant who is under him as Minister of Personnel and Minister for Establishment and, therefore, inferentially, had to act on his instructions in keeping with the policy of the Government. (*Asides.*) I am not finish with this. I will deal with it properly under another Head. I am now dealing with justice and what the man in the street is saying: "He got off because he knows somebody." What about the man today who gets five years for stealing a breadfruit? A man who has no money has to steal to feed his family, and he has to face the music and get six or seven years, but a man who is making profits by bringing in, illegally, one-armed bandits in this country is walking free as if he is to get the Order of Jerusalem! The

time has to come when we, as citizens in this country, have to start facing facts. I heard the Attorney-General saying that if he hears this or that he is going to investigate! Investigate that, and tell the public if you think it is fair and right and fair and just! You are always saying you are investigating..... (*Asides.*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I do not mind how much the hon. member may froth at his mouth. If the hon. member was dealing with any Department under my control and making allegations of corruption, I would have been on my feet against him to find out who is corrupt and who is not corrupt — particularly his Government. It was very unparliamentary language, but he is not referring to me otherwise I would deal with him right there, Sir. I would submit, in this instance, if the hon. member is going to continue, in this vein, to speak about the state of justice in this country and impliedly means that it has anything to do with the Attorney-General's Chambers, then this debate is going to be a very acrimonious debate, indeed, therefore I am asking you to ask the hon. member to restrain his language. He is making allegations of people being corrupt and interfering with the courts of justice in a debate of this nature as against hon. members. If he is given the scope that he is being given, I hope he can take the music when I read out files as to the interference that occurred in their regime.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am nothing to do with that. Let him bring files to show where I, as Attorney-General, interfered with the course of justice! I dare him to bring the files to show where F. G. Smith, as Attorney-General of this country, interfered with justice. I am not asking for any mercy. I dare you to bring the files. If you want time, you can bring them tomorrow.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition must address the Chair, and I will not tolerate any addresses and cross-talk to the other side of the House.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I just want the Hon. Attorney-General to know that I do not have anything to hide in this country. Go and get the files. You cannot frighten me or blackmail me.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: When members of his Party were stealing the Housing Authority's

money, he never had the guts to prosecute anybody, or to ask the DPP to do so. Why did you not investigate the matter?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please! Will all members who propose to take further part in the debate please keep their language within certain bounds.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: What I am saying now is that the Attorney-General gets hot.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will you please come back to the course of the debate.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that you allow the Leader of the Opposition to speak at length and at will. I am not in it because you are an LL.M., the hon. member here is an M.A., and he is a P.C., a Parliamentary Clown. (*Asides.*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you allowing that? A parliamentary nonentity, a nitwit, can get up, look at me and call me a Parliamentary Clown, and that is supposed to be not insolence, or supposed to be all right. If that is how the debate is to be conducted, then.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I happen to be on my feet last.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members take their seats! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, please continue, and please keep your language.....

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Are you asking him to withdraw that and let me withdraw what I said?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Withdraw what? I never referred to you. I said he.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: He said, "He is an LL.M....."

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: And he is a Parliamentary Clown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Anyhow, I would not bother with that. I have aired the point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You cannot bother with me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. James, please, take his seat!

Hon. F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I know I have the Q.C., and I do not have any P.C. behind my name.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Concentrate, please, on the debate.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: If you have P.C. behind yours, I do not have it. You can get that point clear. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am passing on, and I know the Attorney-General has nothing to do with the DPP's Department except to come in here and ask for money for it.

6.15 p.m.

If you look in the Estimates you will find that the Director of Public Prosecutions is under the Ministry of Legal Affairs for departmental administration; but in terms of the Constitution anybody who knows anything about the Constitution knows that he has nothing to do with criminal justice in this country, and that is quite clear, so he need not get hot under the collar because that is obvious, and any strictures I am making on the withdrawal of the case cannot be directed to him. As a matter of fact, it is not directed even to the D.P.P. because the Prime Minister has explained to this House and to the public, I hope, the circumstances under which the case was withdrawn, and I am passing on because we now know how it was done.

As I say, I again make a plea for the Magistrates of this country, and I ask the Attorney General to concentrate on improving that branch of the Service in the Judiciary where a great work load is being done in this country.

Under the Probation Department there can be no doubt that the Department is doing a very good job in this country and deserves a thorough and ongoing look at it. I think they have done a commendable job in maintaining the rate of delinquency among young people at a very good level, and I have always found them in my dealings with them as humane, as understanding, and as willing to redeem and rehabilitate such young people as have fallen foul of the law.

The Registration Department. Instead of getting hot under the collar, try and do something about the Registration Department. Nobody can quarrel with the upgrading of the post of Registrar but the Department itself in

terms of working conditions is chaotic. Only last week the Judges could not find cases lodged and Solicitors having their receipts but having to run over to the court and try to get a document which has not been filed. It is not because of slackness on the part of the clerks, it is more that there are so many documents being filed, they are cheek by jowl, and therefore it makes it difficult for administration. (*Aside*). We are not in power any more. Do not tell me we were in power and did not do it, I am not interested in power any more, I am interested in improving my country, I am finished with power. Is that an argument for maintaining the Registry? Those days have passed. You all had me chased off to Jamaica since August, this is October and I am still in the House. Nobody has given a ticket to me to go to Jamaica but they had me gone since August.

Be that as it may, what I would like to ask the Attorney General is this. I see MCW's truck near to my Chambers as if the Government is working on the old telephone building. These are things you should let the public know. What is he doing with that building? Has Government bought it? Has Government leased it? Is Government turning it into offices? Is it an extension of the Registry? What is going to happen with the old Waterworks building which is a historic building in this country? Has the Government abandoned plans for bringing that into a useful occupation either as an extension of the Registry or not? These are questions I want answered, I am not accusing him of any criminal law, he was never an outstanding criminal lawyer anyhow. He was a good lawyer but not outstanding. He is a very good civil and commercial lawyer, but he knows that when it comes to criminal law he could get the odd one but he was not any giant. These are questions I would listen to him any day on. Do not get hot on this, I am pulling your legs. I would like the Minister to tell me whether the new building at the corner of James Street is an extension of the Registry. What is the purpose for which it is being renovated and fixed up? What are the plans for the old Waterworks building?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we come now to the Customs Department. Having got the explanation from the Prime Minister that as a result of instructions given, this matter was withdrawn, that is the answer. I know who did it, but when the Attorney General is jumping up trying to stop what is a legitimate answer, I am not going to be short-circuited, and as I say, the answer is given. We will have to decide later

on whether that is the correct procedure to terminate cases and so on, whether it would not have been another thing on Customs, and the Prime Minister will have to say this. I read a Press Release which says that all the customs duty had been collected on illegally imported one-arm bandits as well as semi legal, as well as properly imported. I cannot see how a Government can sit back and just allow things to come into the island semi legally or even illegally, just to be satisfied with the mere collection of the duty that is due on them.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is running ahead of his thoughts. He has failed to recognise that it was during his regime as a member of the Government that the machines came in illegally and no customs duty was paid, and there is nothing to prevent the Government now from collecting all the back duty if necessary.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am sure I heard the hon. member say that machines were imported illegally during the past regime. I believe he is misleading the House, Sir. In the first place those machines that came in were deemed to have been imported, as far as I know, legally and the Attorney General's Chambers argued that they were imported legally, as far as I know, but so far as when I as the then Minister of Trade imposed licensing on machines, so far as I know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not a single gambling machine was imported into this country by way of a licence.

Hon F. G. SMITH: Mr. Deputy Speaker, what I would like to say here is that even if I accept the point made by the member for St. Philip North, even if I accept that some came in during the DLP's time, the mere lodging of the case against the man in your time shows that all were not brought in legally. Unless the Government is prepared to tell me how many machines were involved in the case at Boarded Hall, because even assuming he is right that in the DLP's time machines came in illegally on which this Government is now collecting duty, he certainly will have to admit that some came in illegally in your time on which you are also collecting duty. You made a point, but the case caught you, because that is a clear case that some came in illegally.

The Ministry of External Affairs. I remember hearing that the Ministry of External Affairs — and this was one of the constant rows of the then Opposition — was costing and spending too much money, and there was a pledge made by the then Opposition that they

would take steps to keep the money for the Ministry of External Affairs down. I am not quarrelling with the Minister's right to extend or to form new relationships with Eastern Europe, the Far East of anywhere, but will the Minister of External Affairs agree that his promise to cut down on the increasing cost of External Affairs cannot be met for his policy and the Government's policy envisage the creation of new diplomatic relations?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, probably I have the wrong thing circulated, but nowhere is the Ministry of External Affairs stated in this Order that I have here. I see the Ministry of Caribbean Affairs, External Trade, Industry and Tourism.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: At the bottom of page 3.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not the copy I have, Sir. I am sorry, the one which was circulated to me has not got anything on External Affairs.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is on the bottom of page 3 reference to the Ministry of External Affairs.
6.25 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Not on the copy that I have.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I take it that I can continue just to ask the Minister of External Affairs whether his new forage into the establishment of external relationships does not of necessity mean an increase in the cost of the budget for the External Affairs Ministry in this country. Will he not agree that all the promises of keeping the budget within a certain limit cannot be met if an extension of the diplomatic relations is to be maintained at the same time. They made a lot of promises and then you find that these promises are not.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I believe that it is out of order for any hon. member to mislead the House. The hon. member is talking about the Ministry of External Affairs. There is no provision for any increase in expenditure for the Ministry of External Affairs in this paper. He really should read carefully what is before him before he speaks. I do not think that he meant to mislead the House. I think that he just does not understand what he is reading Sir.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I was reading from two and a half to three years old, and I am 53 now. The Prime Minister must understand that if there are three literate people in Barbados, Sleepy Smith is one. So do not talk about if I can read or not. I am not saying that this particular Head in itself creates any money. I am asking the Minister of External Affairs as a general foreign policy — as part of the foreign policy of the Government — whether he does not think that the extending of diplomatic relations to China and other areas will not lead to an obvious increase in the Foreign Ministry budget. (Aside) Well all right. I am just asking.

I am not saying that this creates any extra; but it is obvious to anybody that this will result from the appointment on a permanent basis the post of an executive officer; but I am dealing now with the whole foreign policy of the Government.

Now the Ministry of Communications and Works. You have here the temporary post of Surveyor and Workshop Manager. I know that the Minister has been experiencing quite a bit of difficulty in getting a mechanical engineer. We have been trying to get one for years and years, without much success. I do not know, but I think that it is a sad commentary that with the University of the West Indies, we over the years cannot find a Barbadian who can come and staff that particular workshop. The same thing applies to the Electrical Department of Government. I am sure that the Minister suffers the same thing that my colleague, the member for St. Michael North Central suffered in finding Barbadians qualified in either mechanical or electrical engineering.

I would suggest that the Government look carefully and see whether the salaries themselves may not be a deterrent to somebody coming because certainly not a long grade salary from \$13,212 to \$16,872 — I think that as engineers go — you will agree that after tax that is not a princely sum even for a young engineer; and I will ask the Minister to get his colleagues to see that this salary is not the type of salary that is going to attract any kind of young, enterprising engineer.

Under Ministry of Health, the Mental Hospital, I do not want to comment on any matter which is pending, except to say that I will ask the Minister to have a look. I have read of an incident which took place there and which may or may not be before the Courts; so I will not deal with that at this

point because that is a matter which I will avoid discussing.

Now, the Civil Aviation Department. It has been drawn to my attention that your Minister of Agriculture behaved himself very badly at Seawell on the 22nd of July this year. He brought in some banana plants with Mr. Webster from Guadeloupe. He did not have the necessary documents and he was told so by the officer who was there looking after the.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order. You are making a reference to a member except in his official or public capacity.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: That is a Civil Servant. That is not a member of the House. If that is so, you cannot say anything about Ministers at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No reference may be made in debate to the character or conduct of any person except in his public or official capacity.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: A Minister is not acting in a public capacity?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: In my view you were dealing with his conduct in a private capacity, as a person.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: No Sir. He was on Government business coming in from Guadeloupe. And I understand.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But you should not say that.

Hon. F. G. SMITH: I said that he was coming in from an official visit to Guadeloupe. He brought in some banana plants and he did not have the necessary documentation; and Mr. Webster was told so; and I heard that the Minister went up there and behaved disgracefully. I was told that not only by persons who were there, but people whom I have every reason to believe.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I regard it as tasteless, if you are making a complaint about a Minister's behaviour, to raise it for the first time in the House of Assembly, rather than writing to the Prime Minister, we cannot control matters of taste; but I submit that no hon. member can reflect on another hon. member by saying that he heard that he went somewhere and behaved disgracefully. He must say what happened at a

particular occasion — banana plants, the officer asked for X and so and so said such and such if he wishes and let the House draw what inference it wishes to draw; but you cannot by hearsay say that a member of the House behaved disgracefully.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the Leader of the Opposition making a reference to the Minister in his official capacity? I will draw your attention to Standing Order 28(10)B. That Standing Order says that notice ought to have been given to the Speaker. In my ruling, unless such notice has been given you cannot deal with that matter.

Hon. H. deB FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not unusual that people who have paid in public for the misuse of their mouth to use the guise of parliamentary privilege to make scurrilous attacks on the characters of other people. It is not unusual for such people to be such cowards that they never remain for the reply to me made in their presence. Whom the cat fits, let them draw the string.

I am making a speech. In this instance we have had some definite statements made by the Leader of the Opposition who has not got the courage of his convictions to remain in his seat to hear the reply to some of these things. He has brought all kinds of allegations against the character of Ministers which you have ruled out of order — the Director of Public Prosecutions, the Prime Minister, everybody, in circumstances where he seeks merely to hide behind privilege in this Assembly, and will not have the courage to repeat outside what he has said, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand the Minister to be casting aspersions on the character of the Leader of the Opposition. (*Asides*) That I submit is contrary to the rules. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. TAITT: I submit that the Minister is out of order, Sir.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not recognise any character in the sense in which it is understood. I may recognise him as a character; but in this instance you would think that a man who has been Attorney General in this country should know something about the.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I just heard the learned Attorney General refer to the Leader of the Opposition of whom he was

speaking as saying that he did not recognise him as having any character. Is that what he said?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not my understanding of what the hon. member said.
6.35 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, I do not want to trespass on the Prime Minister's reply except to make two points. In the first place the prosecution of any person in this country other than in a few limited cases, cases which were introduced into this law by the Democratic Labour Party in the Constitutional debate, does not rest with the Attorney General of this country. It rests with the Director of Public Prosecutions. In the second place, the Director of Public Prosecutions has the right to take over the conduct of any case whether it is started by a public officer, the Comptroller of Customs or anybody else, and therefore I respectfully submit that any attack on the Comptroller of Customs must of necessity affect the Director of Public Prosecutions himself. In the third case it is a recognised fact that every day in this country cases are withdrawn not because the police may not believe they can get a conviction, but policy decisions are taken on matters such as this having regard to the policy involved, and the nature of the offences concerned. In the fourth place clear policy statements about a period in which people would have a grace period were given prior to the case cited by the hon. member, and if he did his homework he would have known that, but he comes in here swiping and unprepared and not even earning his salary as Leader of the Opposition in the way in which he makes statements from day to day. This is part of the problem with him. I have heard him say in his seat that he will not pay money again for libel and he is going to use this House of Assembly to attack people from time to time in circumstances where he knows his criticism are totally unjustified, and in these circumstances he should remain in here, or I would challenge him to debate this issue outside where he can face the full rigours of the law. Anytime he gets up here and he is scurrilous, I reserve my right to reply to that sort of speech being made in this Assembly about anybody's character, because I consider it a scandalous remark to insinuate in this debate that the course of justice in Barbados was being interfered with.

He challenged me to investigate certain instances. I will throw back a challenge to him. When he was Attorney General, when he knew of

the stealing that went on at the Housing Authority, why didn't he as a member of the Cabinet get up and exercise his position as Attorney General and ask the Director of Public Prosecutions to look into those instances. Why did he allow corruption to run riot under the Democratic Labour Party and the misspending of public funds and did nothing about it and call himself an Attorney General? His only excuse to us was that he did not have the power, but all of a sudden he has become Mr. Clean. Why doesn't he consider people who bought land from the National Housing Corporation when they held Cabinet office and investigate and see whose names appear in instances such as this instead of coming in here and raking up muck, and does not have the guts to sit in and take the reply being made to him?

On the few substantive points he has made, if I may give him a reply, the position in the Attorney General's Chambers is that we have asked for the provision of three additional staff and the upgrading of two staff. The Chief Parliamentary Counsel has been upgraded to the same level as the Solicitor General and the Director of Public Prosecutions, and one of the Parliamentary Counsels will be upgraded to the level of Deputy Solicitor General and he will be put in charge of law reform and law revision.

Now I was asked by hon. members in another debate in this House a couple of months ago to look at the question of law reform seriously. I said then that a request had gone in to the Minister in charge of Establishments for additional staff. Some of the additional staff is now being provided and we hope to bring down to this House soon some information concerning the establishment of a permanent law reform commission who will look at the question of law reform and law revision in a serious manner. This staff will be assigned to that division.

In so far as the regrading of magistrates is concerned, I am looking at the whole question of the judiciary and the law courts and a developmental programme for the courts over the next two years. I want to take in the Registration Department in this instance. The Registration Department has not been plagued with problems since 9th September, 1976. It had been plagued with problems under the member's last administration; several of these problems were drawn to his attention as Attorney General, he did nothing about them, but he is giving people the appearance that in a couple of months of Government we could have made better provision than has been made in the Registration Office. The Registrar has tried in limited physical space

to reassign officers, to remove furniture and see if the staff could work much better than they were working.

The position with the James Street building is not that it is being bought for the use of the law courts just yet. We are putting up a plan; the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of the Attorney General and the Judges are considering a plan for the rebuilding of parts of the law courts. It will have to be a long term developmental plan; it is not going to be achieved in a year. We hope that we can use the basis of the synagogue and that surrounding area, what area is not being used by other institutions which are in that area, for expansion for the Registry and for the courts themselves. We are hoping that we will get accepted by Cabinet provisions for a new District "A" Magistrates Court with adequate facilities and with arrangements for a Family Court, but these are plans that the last Government in fifteen years never thought were worthy for consideration for capital development, the development of capital structures or anything of the sort, and I do not undertake as I said before to get this accomplished with the economy as it is and the competing needs on the Ministry of Finance within a year. The Courts will have to understand that there must be a proper developmental programme for them which will go over a period of five and possibly ten years, and at the end of that period I trust we will have proper facilities not only for the people who work in the Courts, but for those who go to the Courts themselves.

As regards External Affairs, the officer being asked for here is already doing the job and has been doing this job for several years since the Venezuelan Mission was established by the last Government. It is now being placed on a permanent basis. There is no extra money being asked for this post other than what the last Government had in the External Affairs budget.

I do not intend to discuss in this Resolution the policy of the Government on Foreign Affairs. The hon. member is incapable of understanding foreign policy or Foreign Affairs. He can only discuss it in terms that he hears about somebody having a house, or Maurice King having to come back here, or something of the sort. Policy he does not understand. When he is prepared to come in here and raise policy matters for me, I will give him a proper answer on the policy which the Government is pursuing. In the meantime I will proceed to make statements in Parliament for the benefit of hon. members and so that the public can be kept informed, but I am not going to waste time answering the hon.

member who does not understand anything about the Ministry he is supposed to be shadowing, refuses to read one document on it, would not be prepared, and comes in here wasting people's time on the sort of attack, he is making on the character of people.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If no other hon. member wishes to speak, I propose to wind up.

Well, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it seems that the pencils of nastiness were sharpened for this particular Civil Establishment Order — such a simple Order correcting a few anomalies, giving a few people in temporary jobs permanency. This is a well-known principle sought by the public service unions and the Barbados Workers Union, and in the middle of all this we have to hear about some banana plants at the airport and about corruption in respect of Abraham Truss' case at Boarded Hall Police Court, and even the Telephone Company's building was dealt with in such a way as to suggest that there is something sinister about the Government's activities.
6.45 p.m.

For the benefit of those who heard what was said about the Telephone Company building, I would say that under the previous regime it was made possible for the Government to buy property without specifically coming to the House of Assembly. This is how the property at Heywoods, the house at the Pine, and all those other places were bought, without any chance of debate in the House of Assembly. I believe that the previous Government bought a Telephone Company building without its being canvassed in here. I was under the impression that an announcement about this building had been made; if it was not, I am happy to make it now. The Telephone Company building has been bought not by the Government but by the Government Savings Bank. The Government Savings Bank has an independent existence to buy property on its own and it has bought this building as the first headquarters of the new financial institution. The Sugar Industry Agricultural Bank should have moved there this week, and if it has not yet done so it soon will, and other financial institutions will soon move there. I think I am visiting the building tomorrow afternoon to see the alterations being made; if there is any member of the House who would like to go and have a look at the building I will be glad if he would ring my Secretary tomorrow morning and she would make arrangements.

As regards the behaviour of the Minister of Agriculture at the Airport, I have heard nothing

which disposes me to treat criticism other than with contempt.

On the question of the Truss matter; when I introduced the Bill relating to the legalization or regularization of gaming machines in this country, I said in the House that a veil would be drawn over the past; and I indicated to the hon. member for St. Michael South West that things had been done in the past which were wrong but we were going to draw a curtain, accept the Customs duties for all the machines which were in Barbados, and proceed to the future with a slate wiped clean. This is something Governments have to do sometimes. In some countries they have wiped the slate clean and let all the criminals out of prison. In Britain, I observe that they have just wiped the slate clean for all bankrupts of more than eight years standing — shades of Neville Maxwell. Perhaps in a few years time we will wipe the slate clean for all bankrupts in Barbados too and cancel their debts.

Now the situation was that there was a number of people who had brought in gambling machines with no pretence at legality whatsoever. They had brought them in marked personal effects or whatever, and they got them through the Customs by some means or other. These machines had paid no Customs duties. These machines were tracked down, the Comptroller of Customs did some detective work and subsequent — I must say — to the Truss matter, all the outstanding Customs amounts were paid. In the meantime the Truss machines were supported by documentation, because unlike other people who made no effort even to appear to bring in their machines legally, Mr. Truss apparently bought a number of machines — and I am just going by the statement of facts which were alleged, I cannot say whether they are true or not — Mr. Truss bought a number of machines at a distressed price as a speculation in Montreal or somewhere, where they had been moved hurriedly to avoid seizure by the Police. I do not even know the facts — I do not even know Mr. Truss particularly well — not this Mr. Truss — and I sincerely hope that nobody will allege that it is any matter of party favour being shown in this matter. I can definitely say this because the Comptroller of Customs accepted it; the machines were bought for US\$100 each. When they came here they were presented for duty at the rate of US\$100 plus the freight plus the insurance, and I think that they paid duty on that basis. Now when the machines were raided the Comptroller of Customs at that stage had been in possession of a receipt showing that seven gambling machines had been bought or sold within Barbados by a Mr. Crichlow — hon. members opposite may be

familiar with him — at a higher price; and the Comptroller of Customs decided to assess the machines at the higher price, and at first spoke of re-assessing the 31 machines which Mr. Truss had brought in and which he said he had sold but had not been paid for. There was this confusion over the true value of the machines and Mr. Truss was charged with an offence under the Customs Act. In the fullness of time all the other machines except these 31 were paid for. It was indicated to the Comptroller that the principle of amnesty should extend to everybody. If it could be extended to persons who had brought in the machines under personal effects and had never presented them at Customs at all, so much the more was it felt that somebody who had brought in the machines legally, with documentation etc., should have amnesty extended to them. The Comptroller of Customs collected some \$13,000 or \$16,000 — some amount of money, I don't know exactly. This sum of money was collected in respect of the machines and the matter ended there, as far as the entire gambling machine population of this Island was concerned. I do not believe any member would feel that, if racketeer Clarke and the others who were involved in painting the personal effects stencils on their machines, or involved in hiding the machines, could get off scot-free, somebody who was doing a job as a speculation should be punished. It has been suggested that there was some kind of secret intervention or improper activity of some sort. The Comptroller of Customs went to court and said that he had no further evidence to offer in this matter. This is something that happens every day in the magistrate's courts in Bridgetown. The Police sometimes bring a case in the magistrate's courts against somebody for dangerous driving; but the man involved make things right with the man whose car was struck and the Police offer no further evidence. Any barrister who is in the House could confirm what I have said. These are common form things. I am not speaking ill of anybody, but just to recite a series of facts; what about the case like Heddy and Elliott who were committed for trial on a charge of stealing paint from Berger Paints and then on the day in question no evidence whatsoever was offered? You can ask Joy Edwards about it; I believe he has a lot of information on this matter. How is it that the Leader of the Opposition did not worry about who put in a word to stop the prosecution in that matter?

6.55 p.m.

These are things that happen in the courts all the time, nearly all are perfectly proper, and some are not proper. Two people have a fight; one puts the other in court; the fellow gives him \$100, and goes and he says: "I offer no

evidence." This is another commonplace, Sir. You will be familiar with that. As long as you are not compounding a felony, it is absolutely permissible. To suggest that there is something wrong in the Comptroller of Customs having a dispute with somebody over the value of gambling machines and over their description, and the Comptroller of Customs settling the dispute — as I say, I, certainly, do not know the terms under which the matter was settled. I only know that many thousands of dollars were paid — by acceptance of the duty — (*Asides.*) I have no idea. I only know that the money is in the revenue settling the dispute, and now there is some complaint.

I would just say this, Mr. Deputy Speaker. The machines do not belong to Truss any more; he sold them; so Truss was losing nothing by the seizure of the machines, and there is little possibility that, if he had been convicted, a fine would have reached \$500. I do not even believe that the maximum penalty is a \$1,000. I know that a sum of money, high in the thousands, was paid by way of customs duty on those machines. I believe that the Comptroller of Customs should be congratulated for getting in some revenue for the Crown in all the circumstances and, indeed, Mr. Truss congratulated in his public spiritedness in coming back here from Canada and paying the money, settling the outstanding customs dues in accordance with whatever attitude the Comptroller had. Anyway, Sir, the public pick up these small things. We have had to close our eyes to so many things relating to the gambling machines — things we know and we have not said anything about. I see the hon. member for St. Michael South West indicating that I should say something. Do you want me to say something?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Mr. Earl Glasgow, the Private Secretary to the Prime Minister, was given \$40,000 by a gambling machine proprietor in the days of the illegal machines. I say that, categorically, and that is a matter which we decided to overlook. If buckets of nastiness are going to be put — not on any members of our Party, but in our direction — let me say that there is a lot that could be uncovered, and none of it involves anybody in the Barbados Labour Party that I know of. Mr. Glasgow bought lorries out of it, and there was a falling out. It was one of those lorries for which he was convicted and disqualified from driving. I say, categorically, that I know who supplied him with the money, where, and in what instalments. All of that we have ignored, and now we have to come in here and hear the Leader of the Opposition talk about corruption in respect of all of this! The hon. member for St. Michael South West should be

glad that he was kept in the dark in this entire matter. He should really be glad, in all the circumstances.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, 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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now suspended until eight o'clock.

On resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE WATERWORKS (GENERAL) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS, 1977

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution seeks to make certain amendments to the existing Waterworks (General) (Amendment) Act by the deletion of certain figures and the institution of others. We delete the words "\$24" appearing under Regulation 2 of the Waterworks (General) Regulations, 1953, and substituting the figure "\$40".

3. Regulation 6 of the principal regulations is amended —

(a) by deleting the words "\$1" appearing in the last line of paragraph (a) thereof and substituting thereof the words "\$1.35"; and

(b) by deleting the words, "\$1.25" appearing in the last line of paragraph (b) thereof and substituting therefor the words, "\$1.60".

This is a part of the Budgetary measures, and I do not think there will be any need for discussions on this. If members need to be enlightened on any matter, I will be happy and willing to give any information they may want.

I beg to move the passing of this Resolution.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COM-
PULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND
AT FUSTIC VILLAGE, ST. LUCY,
FOR PURPOSES OF ROAD
WORKS

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is to carry through the procedures of compulsory acquisition of a parcel of land at Fustic Village, St. Lucy. I have a copy of the plan available, if hon. members want to see it. It is for the purpose of giving a road to the Church and the Market under the Highways and Transport Act.

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

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

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

8.05 p.m.

THE MISCELLANEOUS CONTROLS
(AMENDMENT) ACT, 1977

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, under the present Miscellaneous Controls Act sections dealing with price control, the only power for anybody to collect documents in order to investigate the prices and charges lies with the Chairman of the Prices Commission. On taking office I realised that if we must do an effective job in keeping prices within reasonable limits from time to time it becomes necessary to ask the Price Control Inspectors to make investigations into certain prices. At the present moment the Price Control Inspectors have no such power to demand documents, their only power under section 11 is if authorised by the Minister. The section reads as follows:—

“11(1). Any person authorised by the Minister in writing for the purpose or any member of the Police Force may at any reasonable time enter upon and inspect any premises to which regulations made under section 3(1) relate with a view to securing compliance therewith and for controlling the prices charged for such goods and services as may be prescribed by those regulations.”

This power is only in respect of goods under price control, therefore goods which are not under price control technically we cannot demand any documents in order to investigate charges, etc. In order to have this facility, the amendment would put that power in the Minister so that he may delegate these powers to anyone,

the Price Control Inspectors particularly, to enter into premises and ask for these documents in order to make a careful analysis of prices which are being charged. That is the main reason for the amendment to the Act, and we amend sections 7 and 8 which would give that power.

One of the problems which are envisaged is that if the Chairman should be away sick and there is urgent need to investigate anything, at the moment investigations can only be carried on by the Chairman of the Prices Commission, and it is for that reason that we seek to amend this Bill so as to make provision in case there is any urgent need for investigation of prices.

With that I move that this Bill be read a second time.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak very long on this, or indeed to oppose it. When we set up the Prices Commission our concept was that the examination and the investigation of matters surrounding price control and the general running of businesses ought to be done by, if you will, an independent agency, and so the power was given to the Chairman of the Prices Commission, such that the police power would not be seen to be residing in the Government per se but rather in the Chairman of the Prices Commission. If, however, this particular Minister or this Government feels that the way in which they should operate is to give the power to the Minister, then we are not prepared to oppose that, we merely point out in passing that on the occasion when they were sitting on this side of the House they seemed to have had a different concept of concentrating power in the hand of the Minister. There are many statements on record in which they raised questions about concentrating too much power in the hand of a Minister.

I would merely like to ask the Minister, or make the observation in passing, that it would seem that with these amendments to the Miscellaneous Controls Act that effectively the Prices Commission has no real reason for them. Unless he has a new perspective for use of the Prices Commission, I can think of no reason for the Prices Commission's existence unless the Minister intends after assuming this power to delegate the power back to the Chairman of the Prices Commission. It is a moot point. I cannot think of any reason why we would wish to do that, but I am sure the Minister can tell us that. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, anything which the

Minister can do to start to do something about the increasing prices in this country is something which we welcome and therefore we will support it.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I am at slight issue with the hon. member about the question of increasing prices in this country. So far up to this year there have only been 31 price increases as compared with well over 161 last year, and in the price increases this year none of them has exceeded anything more than 10% of what it was, so therefore, talking about price increases, there are more decreases in prices this year than there has ever been in the last four or five years. If the hon. member was reading the newspapers or checking the supermarkets he would see that prices of essential commodities have fallen tremendously in this year.

On the question of concentrating power in the hands of the Minister, as far as I am concerned if it goes towards efficiency I would say yes, and this is what we are doing as a point of efficiency and cost. In the first place, under the present Act the Price Control Officers of the Ministry were working for the Prices Commission. At the moment, Mr. Chairman, what is the use of having a Prices Commission set up which will tell the Price Control Officer to do this work and report back to it, when on a simple Order the Inspector himself can collect the document, the economist in the Ministry can analyse the figures and determine whether or not prices charged are too great? We are at the moment carrying out an analysis into the use of the Prices Commission as was constituted and when that analysis is finished I will certainly come to Parliament and tell you exactly what we see.

We have had cases in which we have had to call the Chief Price Control Officer and say, as in the case of salt fish — people do not realise that Canadian cod comes in at a price. There are things called rounders, there are things called hake, there are several names where the prices are far below the price of Canadian cod but all were being sold at \$2.30 or \$2.40 per pound. When we discovered this and collected the documents, that is why the price dropped to \$1.68. Further than that I can say at the moment now the price can be dropped even cheaper, and it took two mornings for someone in the Prices Commission to collect the documents and analyse the prices. If we have to wait on the Chairman of the Price Control Division to delegate power to somebody to do the work that can be done in an hour's time by the Minister, what is wrong with

concentrating the power in the hands of the Minister?

8.15 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. The Minister said that it only took two mornings and he was able to accomplish this without having to change. What then is the point of the amendment?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: If I was outside and they asked me for my documents I would ask where is your authority. I do not intend to do anything which the law does not give me authority to do. If that operated under their administration, it will not operate under this one.

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

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative. Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the chair.

On separate motions of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive of the Bill were called and passed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO AMEND THE AIRPORTS ACT

The eighth order of the day was called — A Bill to amend the Airports Act, Cap. 185.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of the amendment to the Airports Act is to amend Cap. 285A and it re-defines "Authorised Officer" as being a person who has been authorised by the Airport Manager under Schedule A to the Civil Establishments (General) (Amendment) Order, 1977. Secondly it allows the Airport Manager to employ Security Guards who will have the powers of authorised officers. It also empowers the Airport Manager to confer upon a Security Guard the power to search vehicles that are entering or leaving a restricted or prohibited area or place in the airport.

There are similar powers as those which obtain at the Harbour; and in view of the increase in the traffic at the Airport, it is necessary to have similar powers there and specifically to empower Security Guards who are primarily responsible for security at the Airport.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I am not rising to question the object of the amendment; but I am sure that the Hon. Minister will remember the Editorial in the daily press about Security Guards at the Airport. I hope that we can have some information on this particular issue. What is the real situation? One of the things that can happen to a Security Guard who is doing his duty is to find that he is reprimanded by a superior officer or complained about the general public for what people consider to be a breach of Barbadian custom. Secondly, the officer may have just been obstreperous and might have brought the country into disrepute, for reasons which are uncertain. I would appreciate some enlightenment on this issue so that one would not form a wrong impression of the issue as it was reported. I am talking about the reported incident when Lady Worrell, armed with a rightful pass, went to carry out her lawful business and was prevented from so doing. I do not think that the country will lose any money, but I think that there should be some word from the Minister.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the Minister if all the Security Guards are Island Constables.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am unable to give the hon. member for St. Michael South West a specific answer to the question that he has raised because it was only this morning that I asked for a report of what

occurred in respect of the question raised by the hon. member.

8.25 p.m.

One of the things we must remember at the Airport is that the Ministry of Finance is responsible for Customs, the Ministry of Defence and Security is responsible for the security guards, and we are responsible for the issuing of passes. There are two separate authorities since the Cubana incident in which Defence and Security is now responsible totally for all security there. We have a system under which there are restricted and prohibited areas and a pass only permits specific people to go into restricted and permitted areas. As soon as the facts are available I will communicate to the House and the hon. member specifically who has raised it what were the findings on this matter. I know that a letter has been sent to this Chamber informing hon. members that all members of Parliament, Judges and other people are entitled to passes and a request has been made in order to prevent confusion that hon. members avail themselves with the facility of having their pictures taken at the Airport, because the type of passes that we have now are passes upon which is affixed a picture of the person entitled to the pass. Some people are under the impression that passes which were in existence previously are still valid; this is strictly not so and I will urge all hon. members to take advantage of the invitation and to get the relevant pass which is current.

Now in respect of island constables, it is the intention of the Ministry of the Attorney General to bring in a Bill to specifically confer the powers of island constables and indeed the powers of arrest in the Police Act upon security guards who are employed by the Department of Defence and Security. In addition that Bill will go further and have regulatory provisions and empowering provisions in relation to security guards who are employed by contractual firms of people. At the present moment most of the security guards are sworn in as island constables, but we think that in the case of the airport, now that Defence and Security has taken over control of that, we should specifically amend the Act and the Regulations to ensure that once you are a security guard, irrespective of whether you are sworn in or not, you will have the powers of arrest; but generally speaking to answer the question of the hon. member for St. Philip South, the security guards are sworn in as island constables; that practice originated to get around the gap in the law whereby they would

only have the normal powers of arrest of an individual if they were sworn in as island constables, but as I said, a review of the policy and the legal provisions is being undertaken as a matter of urgency by the Attorney General's Office, and we hope that new provisions will be introduced in the next Parliamentary programme, that is, before the end of this year, so as to clarify and clear up this area of the law.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Minister for the information which he has given.

The question that the Bill be now read a second time 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 on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, very briefly I would like to raise a matter with the Minister very seriously. He indicated in the second reading that there were three jurisdictions at the airport. As I recall it, in most modern airports, the Airport Manager has total control and responsibility at his airport and I would like to recommend to the Ministers responsible for the three jurisdictions that they give very serious consideration to making the Airport Manager a true Airport Manager in the sense of that word as it is recognised at modern airports, otherwise the situation can arise and perhaps will arise where precisely because of the three jurisdictions and because of the difficulties which may arise because the powers at the airport are trisected which might do some harm to Barbados as a whole. I wonder if the Minister would not wish to have the Airport Manager being truly an Airport Manager in total control of the entire airport, that is to say, he will not be himself the Security Chief, he will not be himself the Chief Customs Guard..... (Asides) You don't know anything about this, man. I don't know why he does not keep quiet when he hears people discussing serious matters. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking about the hon. member for St. Michael South East. When he hears people discussing serious matters that require some technical input, he keeps getting involved. I am sure the Minister

appreciates what I am saying, and I will continue to speak to you and hope that the Chairman will not be diverted by the nonsense which comes from the back.

I am satisfied that according to what the Minister has said there is room for misunderstanding at the airport unless the functions are very well co-ordinated. This is how it is at all modern airports, and I have no reason to doubt that Grantley Adams Airport is considered a modern airport.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, the fact that two other authorities exercise jurisdiction at the airport does not in any way detract from the fact that the General Manager of the Airport is responsible for and is in charge of the airport. It is true that in other countries airport authorities have their own police force, but in Barbados even in the proposals in relation to the Port Authority I do not think that it is contemplated that the Port Authority would have its own police force within the jurisdiction of the Port of Bridgetown.

8.35 p.m.

Similarly, it is not inconsistent with the authority of the Airport Manager to have the Police in operation at the airport.

With respect to Customs, at any airport the Customs have a zone of exclusive jurisdiction, so that even in the airport which the hon. member referred to there is a Customs zone in which the airport authority cannot interfere with the jurisdiction of Customs and Excise. At the airport here the only distinction is that the department of Defence and Security performs a function which the airport police in other countries would perform, and the authority of the manager of the airport is only delegated to that extent. But since we are operating under one umbrella government, the fact that a law enforcement agency is under another Ministry should not interfere with the concept that the airport manager is the boss of the airport. I agree that unless there is a measure of cooperation there can be occasions in which there is an overlapping. But obviously what has taken place at the airport is that only in the last six months has this been set up, since the Cubana enquiry, and we do not want to create a special security force and train them. We feel it is part of the functions of the general security. The officers who are there have not been in the service for a long period of time, and the airport security in Barbados is a new thing instituted only since the Cubana disaster.

The question that Clause 2 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE; 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. B. ST. JOHN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

BILL TO INCORPORATE CARIBBEAN METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

The tenth Order was called – A Bill to incorporate the Caribbean Meteorological Organization.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, in 1973 the various Governments which came together and are now known as CARICOM met in St. Kitts and agreed to set up a Caribbean Meteorological Organization. Part of the agreement was such that each section of the organisation that is set up in individual countries should have juridical rights and privileges which go with such international organizations. There is a section of the Meteorological organisation in Barbados, and it is now time when this should be changed to a foundation. Under the present legislation there would be difficulty in naming the organization as a charitable organization and transferring the various assets from the present Council to the organization. In order to overcome any difficulties and to set the situation straight in respect of the legal rights and liabilities of the organisation in Barbados, it is necessary that this Bill be introduced in Parliament. With that I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time. If there is any further information needed I will be glad to supply it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: 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. H. deB. FORDE, Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. ODLE in the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.
8.45 p.m.

Clauses 6 to 8 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report the passing of one Bill in Committee.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

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

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass and be cited as the Caribbean Meteorological Organisation (Incorporation) Act, 1977.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, earlier today three Resolutions were circulated. The Resolutions are very short, and I do not think they will be controversial. The hon. members have copies.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there is no objection, please proceed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE BORROWING BY THE NATURAL GAS CORPORATION OF THE AMOUNT OF \$2.1 MILLION BY THE ISSUE OF DEBENTURE STOCK AT AN INTEREST RATE NOT EXCEEDING 7¼ PER CENTUM PER ANNUM

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Resolution is to seek Parliamentary concurrence in accordance with Section 18 of the

Natural Gas Corporation Act for the approval of the Corporation to borrow \$2.1 million to carry out its development programme. The Natural Gas Corporation proposes to erect a new headquarters as part of its expansion programme at Wildey, St. Michael. The conditions under which they operate now in Bay Street are very intolerable, and there is no scope for expansion.

In addition the Corporation is replacing the existing natural gas line running between the Belle in St. Michael and Spring Vale in St. Andrew with a new pipeline. This has become necessary because of the worn out condition of the existing pipeline, and one of the objects also of doing this is to ensure that gas, which is piped from Woodburn in St. Philip and which is not needed at the present moment, can be stored in Spring Vale well.

I take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the House that a number of people, who were entitled to royalty, have been paid, and I am assured that some 35 so far have been paid, some 100 odd have to be paid, and the cheques are being processed and sent out. I gave the House the assurance previously that we would try and speed up this procedure, and I think we promised to have things finalised by the end of November. I think we are well on the way to meeting this promise.

Since the last occasion that we spoke on this matter in here, the Drilling Programme has restarted. One well has been completed, and I am sure hon. members will be pleased to hear that the signs are that this well is not a dry well. It has not actually gone into production because they are doing the cementing of it now, and until it is pumped the exact amount of oil and associated gas in the well cannot be determined. The tests have proven conclusively that it will not be a dry well.

Accordingly, I beg to move that the House concur in this Resolution.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. Minister has given this House such good news, perhaps, he will be in a position to state approximately how many people are entitled to royalty.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has already given the House that information.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, at this time we would like to welcome the bringing of this measure to the House because we feel that the Natural Gas Corporation has not been given the type of assistance as rapidly as it should have been given in the past. I recall, as Minister, making a selection for the land at Wildey and putting into operation the process where some definite decision could have been made regarding the siting of the Natural Gas building in that area. However, it goes much further than that because people all over this Island are now interested in getting some gas because they have reason to believe that, from the information given in previous times, gas is available. They would like to know that this gas is made available to them. I hope that the Natural Gas Corporation will be able to raise this money quickly and, having raised the money, they will be able to put into operation their capital plans.

I would like to enquire of the Minister what plans, regardless of how minimal, they have for the present site when the Natural Gas Corporation has been removed from the site in Bay Street. I know this question may take him by surprise, but I do accept that Government would have something in mind as to what they will do with the site on Bay Street. I do not know if they will use it as a window, or for some more productive purpose. I hope, in his reply, he will be able to indicate the lines along which the Ministry is thinking in putting to use the site when it is vacated by the Natural Gas Corporation.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, I agree with the hon. member that there is a tremendous amount of interest in the utilisation of natural gas by the members of the public. I want to assure the hon. member that only last week Cabinet took a decision to have the UNDP expert, who is in Barbados, now that he has completed his review of the Natural Gas Corporation, to enlarge his powers to have a survey of the gas industry generally in Barbados, and to make recommendations in particular on standards in conjunction with the Barbados National Standards and, further, to make Regulations with respect to safety and to ensure that consumers who buy gas other than natural gas will have a means of checking whether their cylinders have in the correct quantity of gas as well as the correct quality of gas.

8.55 p.m.

We are awaiting the report of this expert. He is very skilled in this whole area, and one of the first things he has pointed out to us in Barbados is that there is no Gas Act regulating the gas

industry of Barbados. You have a Natural Gas Corporation Act which deals only with natural gas, whereas for electricity and other things you have an Electricity Act and then you have an electricity department, a Government Electrical Department which ensures that the undertakers comply with certain standards. The Electric Company does not set the standards in Barbados, it is the Government Electrical Department that sets the standards, so you have your safety standards and you have the mechanism for ensuring that somebody is empowered to enforce it.

One of his first points is that we are playing with fire, so to speak, in Barbados with the gas industry because we have no department, nor is the Natural Gas Corporation empowered to perform similar functions in relation to all gas, so that a whole new set of legislation will have to come down in relation to the gas industry.

Now, in respect of the old building, there are a number of views on this. The land at Bay Street is obviously charged in the Natural Gas Corporation's books as an asset and there are some people who have some grandiose ideas as to the value of the land, but nevertheless I think that generally speaking, when we consider the amount of pressure that there is upon the one beach with facilities in that area, between the Hilton, the Holiday Inn and the Pebble, when we consider the competing number of interests between the water sports people, the water polo people, the people who go to the Pot, the people who want to go to the restaurant, when we consider all these, there is a view from the Parks and Beaches Commission and in the Ministry of Tourism that this is a golden opportunity for the Government to provide a comparable area with facilities for the public in which a number of activities can take place so that we can have a proper regulation of the various competing interests in Carlisle Bay. So it looks to me that the current of opinion is very strong.

I notice that the hon. member spoke about non-productive purposes, but the basic position is that that is a productive purpose also, because we really do have the whole of the St. Michael South, the whole of that area, the whole of Brittons Hill, and Pelican Beach, as it is called, is really very crowded now. You even have surfers who want to compete, you have yachting, and the area is really very narrow. We need to create facilities there for the use of the public.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: There is another urgent matter which was sent back from the Senate, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I believe this is the moment of interruption and I must enquire if the matter is controversial. ((VOICES): No, it is not.) You may proceed.

THE REGISTRATION OFFICE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1977

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that the House do now concur in the amendments suggested by the Hon. the Senate, namely, to amend the Schedule, line 6 thereof, and that the word "(1)" be deleted and the word "(2)" be substituted therefor.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT SPOONERS HILL FOR THE RESITING OF GRACE HILL PRIMARY SCHOOL

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: This is a rather urgent Resolution. This matter has been under negotiation for a fairly long period of time and it is vitally necessary that this land be acquired for the resiting of the Grace Hill Primary School which is a well known school in Spooners Hill. This school occupies the Moravian premises, and this area of land is the former residence of Dr. Carlisle Clarke.

I commend this Resolution to the House, and I beg to move that this Resolution be agreed to.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT THE JUNCTION OF SOBERS LANE

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members are very familiar with this area. There is a car park there, and this is to acquire

the piece of land on the other side which I believe is now the premises of W. I. Griffith and it is necessary to carry out the road improvement at that corner which is a very dangerous corner.

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

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

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

9.05 p.m.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN AUTHORITY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPORT IN BARBADOS

The 12th Order of the Day was called – A Bill to provide for the establishment of an authority to facilitate the development of Sport in Barbados.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, after hearing from the Clerk at the Table, I would not even expect a debate on this Bill. I am sure that members on the Other Side are not capable of debating this Bill in the light that they have not got any experience in playing any kind of games to an outstanding standard. This Bill seeks to repeal the Barbados National Stadium Corporation Act (Cap. 39) and provide for the establishment of an authority to facilitate the development of sport in Barbados.

This is just another step in the right direction as far as the Ministry of Community services is concerned. For a long time we have watched with a degree of annoyance sporting activities in Barbados in some areas which have not reached the standards which we should hope for. We have people today with the technical know how, such as coaches in football, cricket, hockey, swimming, lawn tennis, rugby and volley ball; and we feel that this will be a step in the right direction in introducing into this country a National Sports Council.

Sir, years ago, under the last administration there was a National Sports Council set up comprised of some 17 persons but it was a complete failure in the light that it acted in an advisory capacity. On this occasion we propose to set up a National Sports Council comprised of 11 persons with powers to guide and dictate to the other associations in Barbados, and moreso in the light of spending monies provided by Government grants and monies provided for the various

sporting bodies. The entire staff of the Sports Department will now be under the control of the National Sports Council; and we want to assure all those persons working with the Sports Council who are now Civil Servants that their pensionable rights and all of the things which they were entitled in the Civil Service will be protected.

There is one thing that I want to draw to the attention of the House and that is the conduct of people at sporting venues. In particular I am a bit disappointed on certain occasions at the behaviour of some of the participants. There is a tendency today – and this appears to be a global tendency – but I do not think that Barbados should be caught up in this, that you must disagree with the decision of the judges who are there in control of the game. Because of that attitude spectators become very annoying and threats are made to the people who are judges and umpires at these games. It is in this area that I would like to appeal to all of the sporting organisations in this country to assist the National Sporting Council with better sporting facilities, and also to assist in maintaining conduct of which we in Barbados can be justly proud.

I know that you have drawn to our attention, Sir, that it is the moment of interruption. Since there are a number of clauses in this Bill, and since I do not believe that this Bill will have any opposition from the other side I would like now to move that the Bill be read a second time. If there are any questions which my colleagues on the other side would like to ask, I am quite willing to give the necessary answers.

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee on the Bill.

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

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

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

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill were called and agreed to.

Clauses 3 was called.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on Clause 3. I did not speak on the Bill primarily because of time constraints; but I want to ask the Minister if it is intended that the Council will be a full time Council or if its members will operate in a full time capacity. The Minister has indicated that those who are presently appointed by Government will go over to the new Council. We now have a Chief Sports Officer.

Is it intended that the Chairman and the Council itself will be a full time body not only to deal with the organisation of games, but, as the Bill suggests, to deal with the organisation of sport generally?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, this will be a board like any other statutory board and the Chairman and Deputy Chairman and the other nine members will be paid per meeting. We might well change the title of Chief Sports Officer, but I have not yet made up my mind whether it should be Chief Sports Officer or Director of National Sports.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to know that this is the kind of thing that we were thinking of. Sports is something that is national and I feel that there will be a non partisan approach to this matter. We should think of the general concept of Sport being national rather than being attached to a particular department.

The question that Clause 3 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.
9.15 p.m.

Clauses 1 – 19 inclusive were called and passed.

The Schedule was called and passed.

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On separate motions of Hon. L. S. CRAIG seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, there is an outstanding matter of which notice was given last week dealing with an amendment to the note to Item 2 under Head 105 – Cabinet, which will require us to go into Committee.

I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair and the House go into Committee.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO HEAD 105 – CABINET

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, at the Government Printing Office one of the rooms needs some fans in the ceiling, but the ceiling of the room is of clayblocks and will not hold up the fans and therefore we have to buy pedestal fans instead, and it is necessary to amend the note to make this possible.

I beg to move that the note be amended as circulated.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to hon. members that although we appreciate that in bringing this Resolution to have the note changed the Government is trying to be as strictly legal as possible, they should pay some attention to the cost of bringing this particular Resolution. A ceiling fan is a fan and a pedestal fan is a fan, and I believe that even his worst enemy would interpret this as a fan. I hope that in future we would not have a situation like this; the cost is too much.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, the Accounting Officer in the Auditor General's Department said that no fan is going to be paid for except a ceiling fan. That is all it is. You cannot tell the Accounting Officer to go and buy pedestal fans if he has to pay for them himself.

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

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS seconded by Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one

Resolution in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

On motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolution was agreed to.
9.25 p.m.

**A BILL TO AMEND FISHERIES
REGULATION ACT**

The eleventh Order was called — A Bill to amend the Fisheries Regulation Act.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, this is a short Bill to promote marine resources of Barbados. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

The question that the Bill be read a second time was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER left the Chair, and Mr. ODLE took the Chair.

Clauses 1 to 5 were called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, 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. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these are all the Items that we can proceed with today. I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday October 18, 1977 at 2.30 p.m.

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

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

THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

FIRST SESSION OF 1971 - 76

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 18th October, 1977.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 2.45 p.m. o'clock.

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Mr. R. St. C. WEEKES, J.P.; Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. C. L. Bolden, LL.B., (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. L. E. SANDIFORD, M.A.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Communications and Works); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); 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.; Mr. B. M. TAITT, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. L. L. SISNETT and Dr. R. L. CHELTENHAM, M.Sc.

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The minutes of our last meeting are not yet ready for confirmation, and the matter is being looked into with all speed.

I have received copies of the Accounts and Statements for the month of August, 1977, as prepared by the Accountant General.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to amend the note

to Item 5 — Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, under Head 115 — Ministry of Education and Culture, of the Capital Estimates 1977-78, and I am asking for leave to deal with it in all of its stages at this meeting.

REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Joint Committee appointed for the purpose of discussing the recommendations of the Debates Committee concerning the Clerk of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I will, in due course, be giving notice of the Resolution dealing with the recommendations of the Joint Committee, and I think it is only fair to Hon. Members to indicate that we are going to proceed with the Resolution today.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the suspension of Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

Hon. Miss B. A. Miller entered the Chamber and took her seat.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Leader of the House is seeking permission to suspend a number of Standing Orders, and he has really given this House no reasons why those Standing Orders should be suspended. I think it is only a matter of courtesy to the House in session that the reasons for the suspension of those Standing Orders should be given. As we understand it, the matters before this Chamber are not very many matters, and we feel, at this stage, in the

absence of any reasons advanced as to why these Standing Orders should be suspended, we would have to wait to see what are the reasons of state, or other reasons for the suspension of these Standing Orders. I think, at least, this House should be given some explanation for the suspension of these Standing Orders, bearing in mind that the Order Paper is a very slender Order Paper today.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I have been in here, not only in this session, but previously, and I have seen the former Leaders of the House from the other side operate in exactly the same fashion as I have operated today. As a matter of fact, previous to a noise being built by us when we were on the other side, they never operated how I have operated today. It has become the custom that, before Standing Orders are being asked to be suspended, out of courtesy inform the other side. I did so to the hon. member. As a matter of fact, I prefaced my remarks by asking who was acting as the Leader of the Opposition today, and all I got was a smile from all three of them on that side. I, specifically, said that I was asking for the suspension of the Standing Orders because we wanted to proceed with a Report of a Joint Committee set up by this House, and in addition to that — I did not say this to them because I did not know it at the time — we now have an additional reason, and it is that the hon. member for St. George South has given notice of a Resolution and has asked for permission to deal with it in all of its stages today. It is an amendment to the note in the Capital Estimates to permit the Polytechnic to proceed. Those are the two reasons. I have done absolutely nothing that is not in accordance with the customs of the House.
2.55 p.m.

I notice the hon. member did state that I must give my reasons on the floor of the House. That has never been the custom.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker,.....

Mr. SPEAKER: On what has the hon. member for St. Michael South risen?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am rising on the motion before the House, the suspension of the Standing Orders.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have already spoken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I heard the Hon. Leader of this House say that he came over and

he asked who was the Acting Leader of the Opposition, and that he specifically told us apparently that he wanted to discuss, and then he went on to describe a report.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that he came over here and said he is going to be suspending Standing Orders, and then mumbled something about some report. I did not hear the Hon. Leader of the House say anything about any report of the joint parliamentary committee or any other committee, and I wish as a member of this House to state that given what has been said so far by the Hon. Leader I object to the suspension of the Standing Orders, because I have to agree with my colleague that the matters which have been circulated for discussion in this Hon. House do not in my opinion require the suspension of Standing Orders. There is one amending Bill which I can give you the assurance, Mr. Speaker, will not be the cause of any long debate on this side, and I heard the hon. member for St. George South say that he is going to be seeking to deal with an amendment to a note in the Estimates for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, and I have never read or heard of any note to the Estimates taking any four to six hours to debate, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to understand why we should have to suspend these Standing Orders.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, now here it is that we were just given this report. It is a matter of paramount importance ...

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member for St. Philip South is not attempting to discuss the report.

Mr. WEEKES: No, Sir. Therefore, the point I am trying to make is that we should be given some time to study the report.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am warning the hon. member for St. Philip South. The report is not before the House at the moment for discussion and you cannot.....

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, as you will know, Sir, I have at all times obeyed your ruling, but the point I would like to make, hearing that certain Standing Orders have been suspended today, and taking into consideration two matters which I do not think will take more than approximately half hour or less to deal with, I am just wondering why these Standing Orders should be suspended.

I listened attentively to the Leader of the House when he intimated to us about the

suspension of these Standing Orders, and he did mention something about the time, and I did hear something about 9 o'clock. Well, Sir, I too would like to state that I am not fully aware why these Standing Orders should be suspended today, especially when it is considered that the two matters which will be dealt with here today in my opinion are non-controversial and will not in any way waste the time of this House, because the two matters have the wholehearted support of the members of the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader made a motion for the suspension of these several Standing Orders.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the House longer, but there are certain things I do not like to see. First of all, when the House starts at 2.30 it is almost *ipso facto* necessary to suspend the Standing Orders, because 2.30 is lunch time according to Standing Orders, and if you do not suspend the Standing Orders, as soon as notices are given you may find yourself having automatically to adjourn for lunch. This is a mechanical matter which perhaps has not excited the minds of hon. members opposite. It is only a small matter, but an hon. member who has been in the House, like the hon. member for St. Philip South, for 16 years going into 17 should know that.

The second point is this. Two Ministers in giving notices have said that they want to deal with matters in all their stages today, and it seems to me to be hypocrisy to get up and say that you do not know the reason for suspending the Standing Orders. At one stage in fact I thought the hon. member for St. Michael South West was going to question the integrity of the Leader of the House when he said that he had spoken and told him of a joint report and he had reached a point in his speech ...

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: What is the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER: He has risen on a point of order.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I never said that I heard anything of any joint report. I said "report".

Mr. SPEAKER: That is no point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He was going to question it, and then he said he heard something mumbled about a Standing Order. I actually had asked the Leader of the House if he wanted me to speak, because let there be no doubt about it, if the Leader of the House gets up from here, goes over there and says something, when he comes back over here what he tells me I believe, and I will not believe the hon. member for St. Michael South West under any circumstances if what he says contradicts the Leader of the House.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe the Prime Minister under any circumstances either.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is a rule in this House which states that the persistent breaking of the rules results in a certain disciplinary action. I am not today prepared to sit down and have hon. members on this side interfered with in the making of their speeches or insulted by the rag-tag and bob-tail — I cannot say that, Sir, — of an Opposition. I cannot say that, I withdraw that. I am not prepared to have the hon. member for St. Michael South West jumping up and down like a Jack-in-the-box every minute shouting "point of order" as if they are the only words that he knows in politics.
3.05 p.m.

It is clear in my respectful submission that today's suspension of the Standing Orders is a convenience for transacting the important business before the House, whether it takes a half hour or six hours. I support this motion for the suspension of the Standing Orders.

The question that the Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the day's sitting was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

Ayes: Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. B. MILLER, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLEYNE, Mr. ODLE, Dr. CHELTENHAM and Mr. WARD — 13.

Noes: Mr. SANDIFORD, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. TAITT — 3.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION RE CLERK OF PARLIAMENT

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to

adopt the Report of the Joint Committee of Parliament appointed for the purpose of discussing the recommendations of the Debates Committee concerning the Clerk of Parliament which was laid in Parliament earlier today, and further to resolve that the Clerk of Parliament be removed from the office of the Clerk of Parliament by the Debates Committee pursuant to the provisions of the Parliament Debates and Establishment Act, Cap, 10, Section 4(4) for misbehaviour by him while in that office. I do not believe that hon. members have had a copy of this Resolution as yet. They have had copies of the Report, and I think that it is proposed that we will deal with this a little later on.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that Government Business be now taken.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Your Honour do now leave the Chair to consider the Resolution.

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

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

RESOLUTION TO AMEND NOTE RE SAMUEL JACKMAN PRESCOD POLYTECHNIC

A Resolution to amend the Note to Item 5, Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, under Head 115, Ministry of Education and Culture of the Capital Estimates 1977-78.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, last October the Government decided to re-admit a number of 14 year old children who had been super-annuated under the last Government. It is part of our policy to keep children to the age of 16 in school and to provide education for them that is less oriented. It is the policy of the present Ministry of Education to assist the children of this age group who do not show academic talent to remove them from the strait jacket of traditional education as has been

thrown around them by the last regime for all of its 15 years.

To this end we are seeking to extend and expand the type of work oriented to assist these children to be more useful to themselves and to the community. This Resolution is seeking to amend a note to the Capital Estimates for the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic, and to insert the new words "and erection of additional facilities."

What we are seeking to do is to construct an annexe to the Bay Primary School which will be under the control of the administration and the staff of the polytechnic; and we will be using the students of the Polytechnic to construct the workshop at the Bay Primary. I am sure that hon. members will appreciate that that is an appreciable departure from the policy that existed before. We are going to use 38 students from the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic to work on the construction of this annexe, and they will be working together with a few skilled artisans who will help them to move away from the theory of the Polytechnic to the practical course that will be a lasting monument to what they did for the Polytechnic.

3.15 p.m.

This is going to be a continual feature of the Ministry of Education to get the students of the Polytechnic involved in useful and constructive work of some use to the community instead of playing around in the workshops and taking in only a lot of theoretical knowledge.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to second that and reserve the right to speak.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I thought that this matter would be relatively non-controversial, but the Minister in introducing the matter obviously inserted some provocative statements, and I thought myself that he would have left the political claptrap for the platform. I really do not know why in this particular Resolution he should introduce a lot of irrelevant and provocative matter which is not fitting for this Honourable Chamber.

The first point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: a big point is being made that the students of the Polytechnic will be involved in doing some practical work and that this will get them away from the theory in which they are

supposed to have been strait-jacketed under past educational arrangements, but I would like to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the first occasion on which the students of the Polytechnic have been involved in practical work on community projects. These students working with artisans or under the control of their teachers have done work on practical projects before, so this is nothing new, and to come and put it in some type of tinsel as though this is something new thought up by the new educational thinkers, I think, does not do credit to the Minister. He himself in his research could have found out that this has been done before.

The second point that is being made is some suggestion that some students were superannuated by the Democratic Labour Party last year, and one would get the impression that the fact that students leave at the end of a particular period is something introduced by some wicked previous educational administration. Mr. Chairman, students have left educational institutions at the age of fourteen for a long time in the history of this country. More students were asked to leave educational institutions at the age of fourteen under the previous Barbados Labour Party administration than under any other administration in this country; so to come and say now that it was the Democratic Labour Party administration which asked some students to leave last year is really distorting the record, because more children were asked to leave at the age of fourteen down to 1960 and 1961 by the then Barbados Labour Party administration than ever. The record is that with the school building programme of the Democratic Labour Party initiated in the Sixties and continued in the Seventies more children were able to stay on after fourteen than ever in the history of this country, and that was the purpose behind the school building programme. So to come and put matters in that type of light is really for the political platform, but in here we are supposed to use argument and logic. I know that the Minister is capable of better than this; he really does not have to threat this House in this way on this matter. I know that he is genuinely interested in carrying out educational development in this country, so there is no need to distort the record.

The final point is that any additional facilities that are provided for education in this country I welcome and we welcome from this side, because educational development and educational advancement have been part and parcel of the programme of the Democratic Labour Party while in power, and we will support genuine measures for genuine educational advance in this country, and the provision of an annexe at

the Bay Primary School I particularly welcome; it is in a good area and I welcome the foresight of the Minister in putting this particular annexe at this particular spot; it will improve educational facilities for the good voters of St. Michael South who will know the right party to vote for. Just as we went into St. George and put down a lovely school up there, you know the educational facilities will enhance opportunities and I personally welcome this, and my party welcomes this particular development.

I do not wish to speak for long on this matter. There will be other occasions. We do not wish to hold it up on a simple Addendum like this, but I merely wanted to get the record straight. In terms of superannuation and readmitting fourteen year olds to school, no party in this country has done as much for retaining children in school than the Democratic Labour Party through its massive school building programme started in 1961 and continuing afterwards. This is a fact which no one can deny, and secondly the question of the students of the Polytechnic working on practical projects, whether in the field of construction, electrical installation or whatever, is something which has been done before, and I am glad that this is being continued. While we are at it, I would like to call upon the Minister to go into his files and look for those reports on technical education produced some time in 1975 or late 1974 for the development of vocational and technical education in this country, including the strengthening of the Ministry's staff to improve facilities and the provision of technical education and let us know when he proposes to carry out the implementation of these very sound recommendations which were made, but which the previous administration in the change of Government did not have time to implement.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just quickly reply to the two points raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South, it is a fact that there is today no child between the ages of 14 and 16 who wants to be in school who is not in school. I want the hon. member to understand that. He has made the point that in the previous Barbados Labour Party administration there were a number of children who at the age of fourteen were superannuated, and after the fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party administration the best the hon. member can do is compare them after fifteen years with what obtained before.

3.25 p.m.

And after fifteen years of Democratic Labour Party administration, the best the hon. member can do is to compare them, after fifteen

years, with what obtained before. I am saying that within a year the Barbados Labour Party Government has made it possible for every single child in this country of the age of 14 who wants to be in school to remain in school. You can knock that as much as you like, but it is a fact. And I have said in this Chamber before, the Democratic Labour Party seemed to think that providing education meant building schools. While the Democratic Labour Party was turning fourteen year olds out of school, and according to the hon. member building schools they were at the same time handing back schools belonging to the Church; and these were buildings that could have been used to keep more children in school. So I am amazed that the hon. member should get up — he was Minister of Education in the last regime, and he may feel affronted by the criticism but he will have to take the criticism. And I must say at this point that the type of gratuitous insults he hands out to the people in St. George will be reflected when the chickens come home to roost. He is saying that when we build an annexe over in the constituency he represents, the sensible people in St. Michael will know how to vote. But the sensible people in St. George North, your constituency, and St. George South did not know how to vote when you handed over the school building in St. George. But the hon. member must understand that the people do not vote for these things; the vote of the people in Barbados is not based on any buildings that are put up.

There is one other point I would like to make before I ask that the Resolution be passed, and that is in respect of the point that the hon. member made about it not being anything new about students of the Polytechnic doing community projects. Whether he likes it or not — and I am referring to the very files to which he refers — I know of no significant contribution that the students of the Polytechnic have ever made to construction work outside the Polytechnic; and the hon. member can shout as much as he likes, I do not know of it. It is a new departure to get the students at the Polytechnic to construct the very buildings they are going to be taught in. And I am making it very clear...

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of information, Mr. Chairman. Would the Minister of Education admit that the students at the Polytechnic have themselves worked on the very building in which the Polytechnic is now housed at Belmont Road? That is just one example. I will give him other examples if he needs them.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am willing to concede to the hon. member that they worked on the

building. But I am saying that they never constructed in the building in which they work. Obviously at the Polytechnic there would be a broken window pane and the students would replace the window pane. There may be a leak in the wall and the students may fix the leak. What I am saying is that I do not know of any instance in which the students of the Polytechnic constructed the building in which they are going to do the work.

On the motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, 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 motion of Hon. L. R. TULL, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Resolution was read a first and second time and agreed to.

BILL TO AMEND WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT, 1977

The first Order was called — A Bill to amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1977.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, the Weights and Measures Act, 1977, came into force in August of this year. But while passing through Parliament certain errors seem to have crept into the Bill, and this present Bill is to correct the errors printed in the Act. The errors cannot be considered very serious, but they affect the operation of the Bill itself. The words which are to be deleted will make the Bill correct the area of measurement where these errors have occurred.

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

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, just one brief comment. I have noted the explanation given by the Minister in respect of the need for this amendment. I am just wondering whether there are not other reasons why amendment to this measure is necessary. This piece of legislation passed this Honourable Chamber only recently — I think in July — and here we are a couple of months later with an amendment. I hope that the Minister will give an explanation. It is not unlikely that severe pressures are being placed on the draftsmen and that under these circumstances errors which would not normally be made are finding their way into these measures.

3.35 p.m.

I do not know whether this particular measure falls into that category, but I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that part of the problem is that the Draftsmen are under severe pressure, and it may be that they are under pressure to produce legislation at a very fast rate, which may be a commendable type of pressure. The point is that, working under those conditions, errors inevitably creep in and we have to deal with those matters. I just throw this out. I believe the Minister knows what I am talking about, but I just leave it at that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, any Government that wants to produce work, or to get on with its business, will put its officers under pressure, if they are not producing. The second point is that these errors crept into the Bill during its printing stages. Under the last administration, they had the habit of correcting Bills after they had been passed in this House and had been published. We are not doing it that way. We are doing it the way that it should be done. Those errors that can be corrected by the Law Revision Committee, under the powers granted to it by Parliament, will be corrected in that way. What cannot be corrected in that way will be brought to the House. That is the simple situation that has occurred here.

If the hon. member had read the previous Bill which had been circulated — I am going to ask for an amendment in Clause 2 of this new section which has been circulated — he would have seen where the errors occurred, and he would have understood that it was not any pressure on any Draftsman to produce Bills speedily. That is the situation. He has not read the Bill; he wants to get up and say something for the Press to catch him; so he gets up and says something. When we go into Committee Stage, I will explain to him in simple language where the errors have occurred, and he will then realise that no pressures have been placed on Draftsmen.

Mr. Speaker, if you have to put pressure on Draftsmen to produce work to enable the country to move forward, I will go down 100% as saying that I will put pressure on them. This Weights and Measures Bill has been hanging about under their administration for a long time, and I will put pressure on anybody to get it going because we have vowed that the metric system will come to Barbados in May, 1979, and it will come irrespective of the fact that I may have to go home and do some of the work. What foolishness are you talking about pressure?

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

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

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clauses 2 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the previous Bill was circulated in a manner in which Clause 2 would not have met the requirement for the amendment. I have just circulated a second Bill. I now move that Clause 2, as amended and circulated, stand part.

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

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I beg to move that Clause 2 be recommitted.

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

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

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, the position is this. In Clause 2 of the Bill we are correcting errors which appear in the original Bill. Under "Standard of Capacity" where it says "one square foot", we are removing the word "foot" and substituting the word "inch". It should read "one square inch", which will give the calculation.

(b) For the benefit of the hon. member, let me tell him the whole thing. In the original Bill it said one cubic foot equals 16.3871 cubic centimetres. The correct thing should be one cubic inch equals 16.3871 cubic centimetres. We

are removing the word "foot" where it crept in and replacing it by the word "inch". Now one pint US is equivalent, under the old Bill as printed, to 0.4738525 litres. The correct thing should be one pint US equals 0.473176 litres. One quart US on the old Bill was printed as equal to 0.947705, and the correct thing should be 0.947705. Those are the corrections we are making at this stage of the Bill. That is the reason why we came down with the amendments. It is not a question of pressure on Draftsmen. It is a question that the wrong figures crept in at the printing stages. We could not change them because the Bill had already been passed, but the Draftsman had done his work correctly. This has happened not only in this administration.

It will be remembered that the Attorney-General came to the House with several Bills that were passed under the old administration and had them corrected, not in the way that they were corrected before when they were corrected in the Attorney-General's Office without giving us notice. The legal way of correcting the Bills is to pass them through the House of Assembly again, through the Senate and have a correcting Bill, or they could be corrected by the Law Revision Committee at the end of the year. Since this Bill is operative as of now, since Barbados will be going metric and everybody has to recalculate his figures in accordance with the Bill, it is but right that the Bill should be corrected as soon as these errors were discovered. Some of these changes were made in Committee, but the amendments were not made when the printing had been done. When we discovered that, it gave us the reason for coming back here with the Bill.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there is no controversy about this matter. Even when the hon. member was reading out the corrections, he, inadvertently, read the wrong thing. He read what is to be amended as what it is to be amended for.
3.45 p.m.

What I was signalling to him was to ensure that what goes into Hansard is the correct thing, because he just said that zero point something is to be replaced by 0.947705, but the Bill that is before us reads "by deleting the words '0.947705' and substituting '0.946353.'" When he was reading it he said the wrong thing, and if you would ask the Reporter the hon. member would be satisfied that this is what he did. That is all I was trying to do, assist him.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, there are several stages which a Bill goes through before it reaches the final signature by His Excellency the Governor-General. As you recognise, we have and do find from time to time clerical errors in Bills. These are sometimes made in our Department, in the drafting department, and not picked up sometimes because of the speed at which one is reading and sometimes because of mere human error, but there are other errors which can creep in between printing and the debate in Parliament, and some have crept in from time to time.

Under the Law Revision Commissioners Act, just as the hon. member has said, it is possible for me as Law Revision Commissioner at the end of the year to correct some of these clerical errors which have occurred in Bills, provided they are not errors of substance, but we hesitate to use those powers except where it is necessary.

In some jurisdictions they have passed an Enabling Act which allows the Attorney General to move a motion and if the Clerk of Parliament certifies to His Honour the Speaker that these errors and clerical mistakes are there, and both Houses of the Legislature adopt the motion, the automatic changes take place in the Bill. Some parliamentarians object to this on the ground that it may show a derogation from the overriding sovereignty of Parliament in our making. I myself do not believe that that is a sufficiently substantial objection, I think it is probably more of an objection where the Attorney General will probably be moving Bills which affect the Ministries of other Ministers, and to that extent if one is not careful, we may have an Attorney General who appears as a super Minister, which is something that one would not want to encourage in any democracy, but we have been trying as much as possible, certainly in the drafting section, to pick up these errors which occur.

I just want to say that drafting is not an easy and straightforward legal exercise. It does take time, it does take consultation, and it does take in many instances a great understanding of the subject matter with which one is dealing, but the draughtsman's work is finished when a Bill gets here on the Table of the House. It really is not our responsibility from there onwards whether or not that Bill comes out exactly as we have sent it into Parliament. In other countries where you have staff available, Parliament itself has parliamentary counsel available to it. Now, in Barbados we have not got the financial or human resources to avail us

of having independent parliamentary counsel, and that is why I think you and hon. members, Mr. Chairman, would have noticed that from time to time I am up and down hopping out and in from the House to the ante-chamber in an effort to consult the legal draughtsmen, or even myself to draft amendments to Bills.

I would hope that we could advance to the stage where when your Clerks are possibly not so taken up with the day to day business, and probably if we had full time legal clerks where this sort of correction could really occur, and where members would have the benefit of the drafting skills of parliamentary counsel attached to Parliament itself. There is a strong case for that, because individual members may want to raise points and bring forth amendments, and they should have available to them the assistance of parliamentary counsel who are employed directly by the Debates Committee.

I just wanted to make these points, Sir, and clarify the position. The drafting department is working very hard, has worked very hard, and obviously they like to be appreciated. We know that we will make errors, we try to correct those errors wherever they occur. In this Bill I am happy to say that the error was not made in the drafting department, and contrary to what the hon. member said, I do not believe that the Bill that we sent down — I do not know what eventually came to the Clerk or indeed from the Clerk to the Printery — but the one that we did for the Department at the time had in the correct figures. It could be that in making changes and transcribing the final Bill eventually had errors in it. This is the position as I understand it, and I think the Minister has explained the position.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I now move that clause 2 stand part.

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

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

Clause 3 was called and passed.

On the motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, 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. C. L. BOLDEN, seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the next Item of Government Business be the Resolution to adopt the report of the Joint Committee of Parliament.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I take it, Mr. Speaker, a motion has been moved for the next item of business and seconded.

3.55 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House we would like to object to the consideration of this particular matter. We do not believe that the matter should be dealt with at this time inasmuch as inadequate notice has been given to members for dealing with this particular matter. The Report was only circulated during the course of this session and we have been unable to study and consult as far as the contents of this Report are concerned; and in these circumstances we believe that it is working a travesty or would work a travesty of the procedure and processings if we proceed with this matter.

I believe that members should be given ample time if the House has proceeded to set up a Committee to deal with a matter, to study a matter, and to evaluate a matter — the House should be given time to evaluate those findings; and we are contending from this side that sufficient time has not been given to evaluate the Report. It is not fully an hour yet that we have had this Report before us; and we are objecting on those grounds on proceeding with the matter, and objecting to the motion that is before us.

Even now it may be that the Report does not conform to Standing Orders. I am looking, Mr. Speaker, at the Standing Orders in order to refresh my memory on them, and Standing Order 60(4) indicates that the Minutes of proceedings shall record all divisions of the Committee including the names of the proposers of the motion and the votes of the members. Standing Order 62(2) states that a Report or Special Report together with the Minutes of proceedings of a Select Committee shall be

presented et cetera, and it continues, "and shall be ordered to lie upon the Table and to be printed without question put."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have not had time to study this report in detail; but after a cursory glance I see no where in this Report — and I stand to be corrected on this particular matter. I do not see anything relating to minutes, proceedings, recording the division of the Committee or the names or the proposers or the motion or the votes of members. That is one broad area in which from a cursory glance at this Report I have found it to be defective; but I am making the main point that if we are to prepare our work in this Chamber we must not be rushed and put tumbling over ourselves in order to study and evaluate matters. We are dealing with a very serious matter; and we are being called upon to decide upon a Report which we have not had time to study. This is a vital point that I am making; and if we are expected to deliberate and give our considered views on these matters more time must be given. Might is not always right. You may have the numbers; but for democracy to fully function, and for this hon. Chamber to carry out its functions as a deliberative body, consulting on these issues, it must be given adequate time to evaluate reports.

I have drawn attention to this and I may stand corrected. The Report may be a defective Report. To that extent it may not conform to what is required under the Standing Orders; and we are unalterably opposed to the discussion of this particular matter at this stage; and I am appealing to the Leader of the House and to the members of the Government not to use the weight of their majority in a way that will prevent this Parliament from doing its job effectively, efficiently and in a proper way. I am asking that this matter be postponed. I am appealing to reason.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, in lending weight to what my colleague has just said I do not intend to speak very long. I merely intend to ask the Leader of the House and members on the Government side to pay very special attention to the nature of the Resolution which they have brought to this House and which they are asking us to deliberate on today and to make a decision. It is not a decision that can be corrected next week or as we saw in amendment recently after it had been done that we can amend the Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you are familiar with the system from which this Hon. House

has evolved; and I know that you are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the matter that we are dealing with is a matter so grave that in that Place it is dealt with in terms of life.

4.05 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the same Standing Order which my colleague quoted, Standing Order No. 60 at sub-paragraph 13 says: "The evidence of every witness, shall be taken down verbatim and read over to the witness. The witness may correct errors which are due to inaccurate recording of his evidence."

Mr. Speaker, if I am going to be called upon to be part of the decision makers on the life of a man, I would wish to have some idea of what went on in this matter. (*Asides*) Mr. Speaker, I heard loud asides from those who apparently intend to press on with the matter say that it is my fault. Mr. Speaker, you yourself are aware that I am a member of the Debates Committee and therefore could not participate in the selection of this Joint Committee, but I go further, Mr. Speaker. I have reason to believe that there is some question as to whether the Select Committee was properly constituted.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to warn the hon. member that I think he is trespassing on pretty dangerous ground at this moment, to put it mildly. Speak to the motion and you will certainly be heard.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, you must forgive me if I do not know the dangers I am in. It seems to me that if this Report is to be ventilated properly, and if I as a member of this Honourable House am to give it the kind of consideration which I believe it deserves, that I would need to have sufficient time to study all of the implications of this Report, to seek all the information that is possible to seek in the context of this matter.

Earlier I heard the Hon. Prime Minister say that he will not tolerate something in this House. Fortunately I am not in the position where I have to be at the mercies of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in what he will or will not tolerate, but what I can say is that I myself will find it impossible to participate in the debate on this motion if they insist that by the very nature of their numbers they are going to proceed or they are going to force this House to proceed with this Resolution, and I got up merely to put on the record that I myself will not participate, cannot participate in what appears to be a case of the sheer exposure of naked power. If they have the numbers, it is their right, I suppose, since it is

their might to proceed how they wish, but I would hope that they would allow reason to go into their deliberations, and it is useless for anyone to get up and say that I should be aware of how other Governments or other Parliaments behave. This is my first Parliament and I have come to believe that there are certain principles which apply in this House of Assembly, and among those principles must be an appeal to reason; among these principles must be the concept that the wishes of the minority must be protected, even though as I once heard in here the majority must have its way.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, as the Minister responsible for Parliamentary Affairs, this matter is in my charge. I have listened carefully and attentively to the speeches made by the hon. members for St. Michael South and St. Michael South-West. For the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South West I have some regard and respect. The hon. member for St. Michael South West is a member of the Debates Committee and therefore in the nature of things could not have attended the Joint Committee and taken part in its deliberations although he could have given evidence or have been called as a witness, and therefore the argument which I am going to marshal at the moment in answer to the hon. member for St. Michael South does not apply to the hon. member who spoke last. However, the hon. member who spoke last remains a member of the Debates Committee and it will be open to him to attend the Debates Committee if this Resolution should pass, if it should become the instant order of the day, and then be carried, and at the Debates Committee it will be open to him to study the report, argue, to call for papers and to deal with the matter in some length. I do not know if the hon. member for St. Michael South is a member of the Debates Committee. Is he? (Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes. You will have to change the argument now.) Well in that case I will have to say that I have some regard also for his argument; and the same argument which I use to demolish the hon. member for St. Michael South West he may also adopt in demolition of his own argument.

We on this side cannot have any sympathy for any talk of postponement when hon. members opposite all specifically refused to serve on the Joint Committee. They treated the Joint Committee with contempt, those hon. members who did not serve on it. They decided that we were wrong and we should not in effect give the Clerk the couple of days in court. They even took it to the public; they took it to the newspapers that we were wrong and now they are

coming to say that they must study the report. They do not need to study the report; this is a report of people with whom they refused to associate; why are they interested? Why do they need to study it if their party could not come and sit down with us? Why now do they have to pay so much respect to what we say? If the two hon. members will get up and dissociate themselves with their party's decision not to participate in this, I will then entertain a plea for postponement. If the hon. members for St. Michael South and South-West will get up and say that the Democratic Labour Party was wrong in not deciding to participate in this Committee, I will then hear what they have to say. I will let them interrupt me; let them get up and say the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for St. John, the hon. member for St. Philip South were wrong, and dissociate themselves; then they can come with hands clean enough to argue for a postponement, but while they are members of the party ...

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will reminisce on what occurred in this House from the inception of this matter, he will realise that I said at the time it was a waste of time, that the Government had the numerical strength and if they wanted to get rid of the Clerk they could get rid of him without the assistance of the Opposition.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: And indeed it was the hon. member for St. Philip South who said the majority will have its way. The quotation which the hon. member for St. Michael South West produced, he was quoting his colleague on his right.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of explanation, if the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister would give way, actually I was quoting the Chairman of Committees.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: He may have been quoting the Chairman of Committees, but relevant to this matter on this occasion the hon. member for St. Michael South-West said it. Well, evidently the two hon. members are not serious. They have been invited to dissociate themselves from their party, they have been invited to say that their party's decision to boycott the Committee was wrong and they have not in any way risen to state it, therefore I cannot really take them seriously. They cannot approbate and reprobate; they cannot belong to the Democratic Labour Party when that party has decided it is having nothing to do with the meetings of the committee, and then say that they want time to study the Committee and give full weight to its

recommendations. You cannot say "Aye" today and "Nay" tomorrow on the same subject unless you happen to be the Clerk of Parliament.
4.15 p.m.

You can't say aye today and nay tomorrow. The hon. member for St. Michael South is more often guilty of misrepresentation than ignorance, but on this particular occasion I have to convict him of ignorance. He read out the Rules relating to Select Committee. If he had read the Parliamentary Privileges and Immunities and Powers Act Chapter 9, he would have seen that there is a distinction between Select, Sessional, Special and Standing or Other Committees of either House or Joint Committee. He has carefully read out — and I suspect the hon. member for St. Michael South West is guilty of this as well — from Standing Order No. 62, Report from Select Committee. The hon. member for St. Michael South West, lending a little weight to the ignorance, read out, I think, from Standing Order No. 60 the procedure of Select Committee of the House. Is this a report of a Select Committee of the House? And I say again that the hon. member is more often guilty of misrepresentation than ignorance. But I do not believe that on this occasion he is guilty of misrepresentation, I believe he is guilty of ignorance. The Rules about the Minutes of proceedings, and the division, have no application to Joint Committee. If he read a Parliament Act, Chapter 9, he will see that Joint Committee means any Committee of members of both Houses appointed by corresponding orders of both Houses. This is what a Joint Committee is and this a Report before the House.

The Clerk has been on suspension since January. From January to October he has received salary and has not turned a stroke. On an earlier occasion we were prepared to deal with the Debates Committee Report, and we leaned over backward to give the Clerk another hearing. We were wrong then. The Committee sat, and we came in here, and now hon. members are saying they must have more time. More time to do what? After many hours spent in the Joint Committee, we still have people asking for time; after twelve or thirteen hours listening to witnesses — including Your Honour, the Deputy Clerk of the House, the Leader of the House — after listening to witnesses, reading Minutes, getting data which we cannot reveal at this time — as the Leader of the House has pointed out — more time to do what. Hon. members are not only appealing the light; they are questioning the width of the bat, the height of the stumps and the sphericity of the ball. And when that is put to umpires, they come to the conclusion that

time wasting is intended rather than serious and honest debate. We cannot accede to this. The people have put us here to carry on the Government of this country.

The hon. member talked about a last appeal to reason. I remember the last famous person who make a last appeal to reason was Adolph Hitler. I was going to draw an analogy, but I do not think the hon. member for St. Michael South would put himself in a class with Hitler for personal qualities and leadership. So I cannot even say that he was copying Hitler in his last appeal for reason.

I urge the House to let us deal with this matter now and have it over and done with.

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SIMMONS, His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, Dr. CHELTENHAM and Mr. ODLE — 11.

NOES: Mr. SANDIFORD, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. TAITT — 3.

Mr. SPEAKER: Thirteen hon. members voted "Aye" and three hon. members voted "No", I declare the "Ayes" have it. Accordingly this Resolution is the instant order of the day.

At this point Mr. SANDIFORD, Mr. WEEKES and Mr. TAITT left the Meeting.

RESOLUTION RE SUSPENSION OF CLERK OR PARLIAMENT

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move this Resolution in the absence of a pack of miserable and sulky children who for the first time in my experience in the House of Assembly have run out following a vote for the House. I have seen hon. members leave following a Ruling of the presiding officer, but I have never before seen hon. members leave when they found themselves in a minority. It bodes ill for democracy in our country if people cannot take licks; if when they are voted down they have to run. I can understand a protest, right or wrong, against certain activities but I must say I find it hard to understand their refusal to accept the honest verdict of an honest vote.

The substance of this Resolution appeared from the Report of the Joint Committee which

was laid on the Table earlier today. The history of the matter is that as a result of a meeting of the Debates Committee on November 22, 1977, and another meeting held on 3rd January 1977, the Debates Committee suspended the Clerk of Parliament from his duties and reported the matter to the House and Senate. The matter came before the House and Senate, and the House and Senate by corresponding orders appointed a Joint Committee in accordance with the Parliamentary Privileges Immunities and Powers Act, Cap. 9, of the Laws of Barbados, to investigate the conduct of the Clerk and to make recommendations to the two Houses of Parliament. There were, as I recall, one or two amendments in the concurrent resolution, but after a period of time a Joint Committee was set up. Honourable members will recall that members of the Opposition — the Democratic Labour Party — refused to have anything to do with the Joint Committee.

4.25 p.m.

The Joint Committee met in the presence of Members of the Government and of independent Senators, and over two days, Friday October 14 and Monday, October 17, it heard the Clerk of Parliament, his representative and witnesses to charges laid against him by the Debates Committee. A Bill of charges was presented to the Joint Committee. The Committee met on Wednesday, October 12, to decide certain procedural matters, and on Friday, October 14, it heard Mr. Maurice King, a Counsel, assisted by Mr. Frank Walcott, General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, a Mr. Trotman from the Barbados Workers' Union, a lady who took notes, and I believe there were other members of the Barbados Workers' Union present on behalf of the Clerk.

He had a full trial, Sir. The Report indicates that evidence was given by Mr. George Brancker, acting Clerk of Parliament; Mr. Frank Blackman, Cabinet Secretary; Your Honour Mr. Speaker; Senator Nigel Barrow; Mr. Boyce himself; and the Leader of the House, the Honourable Member for Christ Church South Central. I can inform the House that the investigation lasted between twelve and thirteen hours. There was an address by Mr. King, which is reflected in the Report. The address must have gone on in all for about 1½ hours at the end of the whole matter. The members of the Committee deliberated; they came to certain conclusions, and their conclusions are summarised in the Report.

The Report states that the Committee considered the charges and the evidence given in support and in contradiction thereof, and found the following charges proved:

(a) That the Clerk, Mr. Chezley Boyce, did fail to disclose to the Debates Committee during its meeting on 22nd November, 1976 a letter from the Secretary to the Cabinet dated 1st November, 1976. The references are given, Sir together with enclosures on the subject matter of the revision of salaries of the staff of Parliament. The Committee found that the Clerk falsely inserted in the Minutes of the said meeting that the said letter and enclosures had been placed before the meeting.

I will pause at this point, Sir. The Clerk of Parliament is the person charged with the responsibility of keeping the minutes of Parliament and of Committees. I venture to suggest to hon. members that no more serious offence can be committed by a Secretary to a Committee than that of deliberate falsification of the minutes. Upon this occasion it has been found that Mr. Boyce deliberately falsified the minutes of the Debates Committee, and I submit that upon this charge alone his dismissal would be justified.

The Committee also found proved that the Clerk failed to disclose to the Debates Committee during its meeting on 22nd November, 1976 a letter from the Chief Establishments Officer relevant to the matter of salaries and captioned "Advice for the Debates Committee." I suggest this is also a very serious charge where a public officer charged with advice to the Debates Committee delivers that advice, and the Clerk fails to disclose it to the Debates Committee when a matter to which the advice related was discussed.

The Committee found, Sir, that the Clerk, Mr. Chezley Boyce, instructed or directed re the said letter from the Secretary to the Cabinet the following direction: "acknowledge and circulate to Union and Debates Committee as the only item for Debates Committee for next meeting in December 1976", and they found that this direction was given notwithstanding the clear confidentiality of the letter and its contents as matters to be referred to the Debates Committee and that it was not dealt with in a manner to which the consent of the Committee had been given.

Again, I will pause to deal with this charge. The Clerk received a letter from the Cabinet Secretary. It related to the revision of salary to the staff of Parliament including his own. It is a matter of common knowledge that the staff of Parliament is largely represented by the Barbados Workers' Union. The Clerk has upon occasion, indeed, stated that he is a member of the

Barbados Workers' Union. Hon. Members will recall that there was a strike called by the Barbados Workers' Union of the staff of Parliament around this time in the early part of December, 1976. We have a situation where our trusted servant, who owes us a duty of faithful service as Clerk of Parliament, and he owes us more than that, he is not an ordinary servant as the law understands the meaning of the word "servant". He is Your Honour's principal adviser; he is the voice through which Parliament communicates its decisions to persons; we rely on the Clerk for advice, assistance and direction in dealing with the staff of Parliament and in dealing with members of the public, and that Clerk took the Cabinet Secretary's letter and circulated it to the Union with whom the Debates Committee was negotiating without the consent of the Debates Committee! One can imagine, Sir, in Bridgetown what would happen to the Secretary of a Company who, in the middle of salary negotiations with the Union, circulated the Company's private memoranda relating to salaries to the Union. I submit that this charge is also a serious charge warranting instant dismissal.

The Committee further considered, Sir, that the letter which you wrote and addressed by name to the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union, as became a matter of record in earlier debates, you received an acknowledgment to that letter from the hon. member for St. Lucy, in his capacity as an officer of the Barbados Workers' Union, acknowledging the letter and an attachment. I believe that at the time, around the 10th December at the time of the strike, you indicated that you had made no such attachment. This charge, Sir, was found not proven by the Committee. That is the best expression that can be applied to it. They found that an attachment was made to your letter without your authority or consent, but the Committee found itself unable to determine the nature of the attachment or whether Mr. Boyce was the person who had attached it. Therefore, Sir, I would not ask the House to take any action on the basis of that charge made by the Debates Committee and the improper, or at least, unauthorised attachment to your letter.

The Committee also found the Clerk not guilty of failing to communicate to the Secretary to the Cabinet instructions given to him by the Debates Committee at its meeting of the 22nd November, and clearly, having been found not guilty, I would not urge any course of action on the House in respect of that particular charge. We are left, Sir, with a finding in which I may say, as one of the persons who attended the Committee, I utterly and entirely concur —

indeed a unanimous finding — that the Clerk falsified the minutes; that he failed to disclose to the Committee a letter produced for its advice from the Chief Establishments Officer, and that he circulated or he directed that the letter from the Cabinet Secretary be circulated to the Union, despite the clear confidentiality of its contents.
4.35 p.m.

I submit that they are grave and serious charges, that they amount to misbehaviour, that they amount to misbehaviour such as we cannot tolerate in the chief of our employees, the Clerk of Parliament, and I submit that the Joint Committee's unanimous recommendation to the Honourable the Senate and the Honourable the House of Assembly that the Clerk ought to be removed from office for misbehaviour pursuant to section 4(4) of the Parliament (Debates and Establishment) Act, Chapter 10 of the laws of Barbados.

I therefore have the honour to move, Sir, that the House of Assembly adopt the report of the Joint Committee appointed for the purpose of discussing the recommendations of the Debates Committee concerning the Clerk of Parliament which I laid in Parliament earlier today, and that it be further resolved that the Clerk of Parliament, Chezley Rosevyn Boyce, be removed from the office of Clerk of Parliament by the Debates Committee, pursuant to the provisions of the Parliament (Debates and Establishment) Act, Chapter 10, section 4(4) for misbehaviour by him in that office.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, in seconding this Resolution I would like to take the opportunity to state in very clear terms what in my opinion has been the most honourable conduct on the part of this House in dealing with this matter. This House was under absolutely no obligation to give the Clerk an opportunity to show cause. I want to make that point very clear, but because we believe that it would be wrong to discipline a person without giving him an opportunity to show cause, we concurred in the procedure whereby the recommendations of the Debates Committee would be sent to a Joint Committee of both Houses, and at that Committee the charges arising out of the Debates Committee's recommendations were circulated prior to the meeting in writing.

The Clerk was informed that he was entitled to be represented, he was in fact so represented, he had the opportunity to give evidence and to call witnesses. After that the Committee made its recommendations. I do not mind what anybody says, I am firmly convinced in my mind that if

there is one thing that cannot be truthfully said, it is that the Clerk was not given a proper opportunity in accordance with every rule of natural justice. It is not popularly known that an employer does not have to give an employee an opportunity to be heard. That is not popularly known, but we believe that that is the correct principle and that is why we adopted that principle.

I do not mind the antics of the Opposition. The Opposition belongs to a school of thought which believes that if you are placed in a position where you have to exercise disciplinary action, that the best manner of exercising it is not to exercise it at all. I do not belong to that school of thought, I believe that civilised society cannot be properly conducted unless there are rules and regulations, and unless there are sanctions for the breach of rules and regulations. The charges against the Clerk from the Debates Committee were of the most grave nature, they demanded an enquiry and they demand that the recommendations of the Debates Committee, having been confirmed by the Joint Committee of both Houses without any member of the Debates Committee sitting thereon, that the logical consequence be carried to the conclusion, and that is this Resolution. I believe that in bringing this Resolution to the House consequent upon the recommendations, consequent upon the procedure adopted, that this House today is acting in the interest of the proper regulation of this society.

I deplore the action of the Opposition, not only today but their whole dealings with this matter. It was nothing but an attempt to filibuster the proceedings, it was nothing but an attempt to evade the responsibility for cheap political glory. They do not want to be associated because they may feel it is unpopular. Mr. Speaker, that kind of popularity I do not want to have.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, when this matter first come to a head I told my colleagues in no uncertain terms that I was not going to vote for the termination of the employment of the Clerk. These things are not very popular because there is a certain unanimity of view on one such aspect, but after the nature of the evidence that has been brought against the Clerk during the past week, I believe that I would be doing a gross injustice to my conscience and to my responsibility as a parliamentarian if I did not support this Resolution.

I, for the most of my adult life, had to be arguing on behalf of the man against whom a charge has been laid, and perhaps I think this is instinctive reaction against terminating people's employment, but the evidence is so compelling, so cogent, Mr. Speaker, that I have to go along with the Resolution and support it right down the line.

The question that the report of the Joint Committee be adopted and the recommendation that the Clerk be removed from office be carried was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business. Accordingly, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn sine die.

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

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