
THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 26th September, 1978.

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

PRESENT

His Honour W. C. B. HINDS, J.P., (Speaker); Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, M.A., (Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning); Hon. H. deB. FORDE, S.C., M.A., LL.B., (Attorney General and Minister of External Affairs); Mr. D. A. C. Simmons, LL.M.; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, (Minister of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs); Mr. J. G. ODLE, B.Sc., (Chairman of Committees); Mr. M. C. C. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Q.C., LL.B., (Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Trade, Tourism and Industry) (Leader of the House); Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, (Acting Minister of Health and National Insurance); and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 1st August, 1978.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, these Minutes have been circulated and subject to any observations by any hon. member, I beg to move that they be confirmed.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no observations by any hon. member, the Minutes stand confirmed. (PAUSE). Those Minutes are confirmed.

PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On behalf of the Prime Minister, Sir, I beg to lay the Training Report for the year 1977–78, and on my own behalf, the Report of the National Assistance Board for the year 1973–74.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Bill to amend the Dogs Act, 1975.

FIRST READING OF BILLS

On motion of Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, seconded by Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, the Bill to amend the Dogs Act, 1975 was read a first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 8 be the first Order of the Day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 8 is the instant Order of the Day.

THE POLICE (AMENDMENT) ACT, 1978

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, this is a very short Bill and it arises essentially out of the changes being made to the Court Process Office for the transfer of Writ Servers over to the Court Process Office. As a result consequential amendments are being made to delete the sections dealing with Writ Servers in the Police Act, and obviously we would then have to provide the circumstances where a policeman may by warrant issued by a Magistrate or a Judge be able to execute such warrant and make an arrest.

That is essentially the purpose of the Bill. It will come into operation at the same time as the transfer of the Writ Servers to the Court Process Office, and hence the presence of Section 6.

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

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

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

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

*Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS entered the Chamber and took his seat.
12.25 p.m.*

Clauses 1 to 6 inclusive were called and passed.

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

On the separate motions of Hon. H. deB. FORDE, seconded by Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW, the Bill was read a third time and passed.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE LEASE OF LAND AT "FLODDEN", CULLODEN ROAD

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this is quite a simple Resolution which sets out Government's intention to lease to Mr. Frederick Cozier a parcel of land at "Flodden", in Culloden Road for the purpose of operating a day nursery. There is still a great need in Barbados for day nurseries, and Mr. Cozier approached the Government some years ago with a view to renting this piece of land. The land is available and I am therefore seeking the approval of Parliament for the leasing of this land to Mr. Cozier at a price of \$375 per annum.

I do not know if there will be any comments from my colleagues in the absence of any members of the other side. However, I do not anticipate any objection to the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I support this Resolution because the extension of day care services in this Island is a welcome step and it shows that private individuals are prepared to make their contributions to the general improvement of the community, and I am sure that where private citizens express the desire and put

such desires into effect the Government will give them support and meet them half way. My concern is about the lack of day care facilities in St. Philip, and I would be grateful to hear from the Minister what plans the Government has for the establishment of an additional day care centre in St. Philip, and especially in St. Philip North. There is a facility for young children at Sterling but this is not in the constituency I represent. There is no such facility in my constituency at the moment and I would take this opportunity to urge on the Government the early establishment, or at least consideration before 1981, of a day nursery in the constituency of St. Philip North.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for St. Philip North I would state that there is at Sterling in St. Philip South a home for young persons, but there is no day nursery. This Resolution seeks to assist and encourage private citizens in the effort at establishing day nurseries. But there is no day nursery as such in St. Philip North or South. I am glad that my colleague has brought this matter to attention, and I can state that there is an overall plan for the establishment of day nurseries and children's centres throughout the Island. There are at this moment plans to renovate and to make larger those centres that are now overcrowded, and there are also plans for establishing a day nursery at the Harbour Industrial Park and plans for extension of the day care centre at Indian Ground, St. Peter. My colleague raised the point about a day nursery in the Parish of St. Philip but I would not confine myself to the constituents of St. Philip North but will also be concerned about the constituency of St. Philip South, and will draw this matter to the attention of my colleague Senator Don Blackman that his Ministry look into the possibility of setting up a day nursery in St. Philip.

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

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Item Statements by Ministers be reopened. When the Item was first called the hon. Prime Minister was not present and my files did not indicate that there were any statements to be made. The hon. Prime Minister does have a statement and I beg that the Item be reopened.

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I must apologise for not being present when the Item was called. I believe Your Honour is aware that the statement I have to make relates to my visit to Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members — At the invitation of the Military Government of the Federal

Republic of Nigeria, I paid an official visit to Nigeria from the 28th August to the 1st September, 1978. The invitation had first been extended for me to visit during an International Trade Fair and Exhibition which was being held from November to December, 1977, but those dates proved inconvenient to me and a later rescheduling of the visit for early this year turned out to be unsuitable for the Nigerian Government.

During the visit I met with the Head of Government of that country and discussed matters of mutual concern in the areas of bilateral and multilateral relationships. The visit will have served to cement further the historic ties which have linked the people of that West African State and Barbados over many centuries and I hope that it will provide the basis for greater understanding of the respective roles of the two countries in the wider international fora where there has been a great deal of collaboration and co-operation up to date.

12.35 p.m.

The discussions centred on matters relating to technical cooperation between the two countries in the areas of training in petroleum technology for Barbadians in Nigeria and in the areas of training in insurance with the Insurance Authority of Nigeria as well as the possibility of training for the Barbados Defence Force, while Barbados has offered further assistance to Nigeria in the field of sugar technology and in the development of its tourism.

Barbados has already come to an agreement with Nigeria about the operations of Air Services between the countries and it is hoped that Nigerian Airways will soon be able to include Barbados in its operations between Barbados, Brazil and New York.

It had been hoped that agreements would have been signed between Barbados and Nigeria in the area of Cultural exchanges and in economic, scientific and cultural cooperation. However, these agreements were not completed in time for signature and officials of both countries will continue discussing these with a view to an exchange of notes in the near future.

On the international scene the Government of Nigeria pledged continued support for the efforts of Barbados and the other members of the Commonwealth Committee to bring about early independence for Belize with territorial integrity. These efforts will be continued both within the Commonwealth and at the United Nations. Barbados in turn has pledged its support for the efforts of Nigeria for bringing about early independence for Namibia in terms of the UN Resolutions.

On Zimbabwe — Barbados pledged support for the efforts of Nigeria and the Front Line States in seeking an end to the illegal Smith regime and early independence for a free Zimbabwe.

The Chief of State and myself discussed other political issues relating to Africa including the situation in Angola and in Eritrea. The Economic Community of West African States and CARICOM were also discussed as well as political and economic developments within the Caribbean.

The exchange of views was frank and lead to a greater understanding between us of the economic and political issues which are currently facing our countries and the neighbouring countries with which we are respectively intimately committed.

I was accorded every courtesy and consideration during the visit and received with the customary honours afforded a Head of a friendly government. Barbados and other Caribbean countries enjoy a good reputation in Nigeria and the coming years will doubtless see much greater cooperation between the peoples of the Caribbean and of West Africa with whom they have such close hereditary and historic links.

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF FINANCE
AND PLANNING, THE RT. HON. J. M. G.
ADAMS IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
ON 26TH SEPTEMBER, 1978

In April, 1977, the Cabinet decided that Government should seek to acquire total ownership of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company. At that time Government already had a minority interest in the Company, holding 100,000 shares out of a total of 292,000 ordinary shares which had been issued; and it was agreed that a team of public officers should be appointed to negotiate with the Commonwealth Development Corporation for the purchase of its shareholding of the outstanding 192,000 ordinary shares in the Company.

In March, 1978, the negotiating team reached agreement with Commonwealth Development Corporation on the following terms:—

- (a) that of C.D.C.'s total holding of 192,000 ordinary shares, the Crown in right of its Government and the Barbados Savings Bank would buy 100,000 and 92,000 shares respectively, at a purchase price of \$5.27 per share; and
- (b) that a Parliamentary Guarantee should be granted to C.D.C. in respect of an outstanding loan of £2,025,000 (sterling) advanced to the Company between 1969 and 1970 for financing of Mortgages.

This House gave its approval by Resolution on the 20th March, 1978 for the Minister of Finance to grant the required Guarantee to C.D.C. in respect of the

loan referred to earlier, and the transactions have all now been finalised.

As a result of that the Government of Barbados held 200,000 ordinary shares and the Barbados National Bank, 92,000 ordinary shares in the company. There is no other issued share capital, but in addition to the C.D.C. loan mentioned earlier, there is other loan capital of \$8.1 million dollars.

As a matter of policy the Cabinet agreed to vest the majority of the Government's shares in the Company in the Barbados National Bank and a minority holding of 2,000 shares in the Insurance Corporation of Barbados, and that the Mortgage Finance Company, while retaining status of a Company, should be under the control of the Bank. This transfer of shares has also now been completed so that the Bank holds 290,000 shares and the Insurance Corporation 2,000 and as at the 1st September, 1978, the Company's Board of Directors consisted of the following members:—

Mr. L. V. H. Lewis — Chairman
Miss June Clarke
Mr. I. E. Collymore
Mr. R. E. Howard
Mr. L. E. Whitehead
The Manager, National Housing Corporation
and
The Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Housing

In respect of the issue of Housing Bonds, to raise funds for expansion of mortgage finance by the Company which I announced in the Budget in April of this year, the Barbados National Bank is now engaged in completing the formalities of issue and the first offer of \$1.5 million in bonds is expected to be before the public in November. The total issue will be \$5m. and the bonds will have a 10-year maturity and will carry interest at 7%.

This interest will be tax-free on holdings up to \$25,000 and I anticipate that the bonds will prove an attractive and rewarding investment for those anxious to help our country grow by taking part in this first instalment of our savings spree.

Mr. GREAVES entered the House and took his seat.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL
ESTABLISHMENT (GENERAL)
ORDER, 1978

Item No. 4 — A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (General) Order, 1978 — was called.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of this Resolution last week on behalf of the Minister of

Finance; and I am now asking for leave for the Minister of Finance to deal with it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of items all related to salaries division — Items 4, 5 and 6 and ancillary items relating to Pensions, all of which are connected with the Resolutions under immediate consideration.

12.45 p.m.

The Resolution is in the usual form for members who have studied it who would be able to see what the new salaries have been agreed at. I do not propose to analyse in any great detail the individual rates of pay, but of course, any assistance will be given hon. members when I reply.

I want to deal with the matter of the revision as a whole. Hon. members will recall that on the occasion of the last salary revision in 1976, I was then Leader of the Opposition and used to speak for the Opposition on financial matters in the House. What I said on that occasion has been the subject of the usual misrepresentation by members of the Opposite side, but the principle which I took carefully to announce was that the Barbados Labour Party has strong objections to the manner in which the salary revision was forced on the public servants, and I am glad to say that members of the Barbados Workers Union, two of whom then sat in the House, joined with the Opposition in their votes at different points during the debates proposing salaries revisions and shared our views on the improprieties of the behaviour of Government upon that occasion. Much water has flowed under the bridge since that time.

What is most important now is the fact that the time has come that public servants are actually awaiting another salary increase and I am very glad to tell hon. members of the House that we have been able to avoid dictating and legislating a salary increase on the Unions which represent a great majority of the workers in the Public Service and this has come about despite the adverse conditions then prevailing in Government finances during the latter part of 1977.

During the last quarter of 1977, Mr. Speaker, indications were that the Government would not have been able to meet the costs of salary revisions for public servants when it became due in 1978. At that time various resources had fallen to a low level and the state of Government finances had become somewhat disconcerted and it was against this background that I had discussions with the Unions representing public workers in 1977 and in confidence I sought their co-operation in a policy of wage restraint principally by postponing any claim for increase in wages for at least a year in order to give a breathing space for corrective measures to work.

Subsequently I stated to the Unions, that despite the call for wage restraint, any workers in receipt of \$400 per month or less, the figure for \$400 was negotiable, these would be the workers who would feel a rise in the cost of living the most, that these workers would be granted an interim payment from the discussions of the salaries revision at a later stage. The reaction of the Unions to this proposal is now history. All but one of the Unions, the Barbados Workers Union, replied through the media indicating that the call for wage restraint would be unacceptable. The reply from the Barbados Workers Union which was delivered with much greater propriety and discretion indicated that it could not accept the call for wage restraint and the Union had then submitted proposals for a further revision of salaries. Now Mr. Speaker, corrective actions being taken to restore the economy of the country from the condition in which we found it when we took over power in 1976 began to bear earlier fruit that we could have anticipated, it was therefore possible to re-negotiate with the Unions on the proposals which they put forward, and for the benefit and specifically for the workers who were represented by these Unions, I want to say a few words about the factors which have influenced the level of the increases of pay for the public servants.

There seems to be some belief that the Government would withhold pay increases for its own sake. I want to put that belief absolutely to rest wholly and solely at this time. It is not an argument in which this Opposition or our Party when in Opposition have ever been guilty of for the political parties at least know what it is to be in Government and know what the factors are which the Government have to consider, but it is to the public interest that Government cannot likely undertake what amounts to the printing of money to pay public servants. We are not employers out of whose individual pockets the money come. It is not a question of balancing profits against the wages of the public sector but we have the entire economy to consider and we can only give what the Government can afford and what is just in light of the legitimate claims of the Civil Servants.

One of the most important facts in determining the level of increases in salaries is the cost of living. Relating this specifically to the circumstances of 1978, the Government explicitly and the Union rather more tacitly I think, both agreed that only a modest increase in salaries could be justified on the basis of the Retail Price Index Figures. Gaged by this index, the cost of living rose by a mere 15% over the period under review in April 1976 to March 1978, and during that period the workers did indeed to the 1st of April, 1977 have an increase of 15% arising out of the previous wage settlement, and I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the rise in the cost of living was the point on which much

emphasis was given during the discussions between the Unions and the Government negotiators.

On this occasion indeed, according to my opinion, the only point which the Unions raised was to indicate that the previous settlement by the previous Government was insufficient and therefore they should be given a little extra to make up for what they did not get in 1976.

The next factor which we took into account is the comparative pay in the private sector and I think that on this occasion this was undoubtedly the most justifiable plan on which Civil servants could ask for a pay increase and I do not only mean civil servants I mean all persons who are paid salaries by the public exchequer.

12.55 p.m.

You cannot have in any country a two-tier system of salaries. The Government is the biggest business in Barbados. I have heard the Leader of the Opposition say on more than one occasion that you cannot have people running Government at any level whose salaries are noticeably less than the salaries of persons with lesser, I cannot say comparable, responsibility outside the area of Government itself. Some differentials will undoubtedly exist, but if you want people in the public service, from the Permanent Secretary down to the Clerical Officer, who will give good service to the people of Barbados, you must pay them adequately and give them adequate conditions under which to operate.

Of course in 1978 within the immediate ambit which the negotiators were considering only a modest increase even on the criteria I have just set out could be justified, for analysis indicated that very generally contracts entered into in the private sector and between the Statutory Boards and the Barbados Workers' Union had fairly uniform increases hardly exceeding 15% for a two year period. In other words, 7½% per year but cumulative, and many of these contracts were in fact not cumulative, but were a certain amount the first year and another sum in the second. The major exception to this rule was probably the Barbados Light and Power Company which I believe paid increases of the order of 23% over two years, but apparently this company has been able to transfer the incidence of these increases to increased productivity, and no doubt in the fullness of time you will hear that the new wage level justifies some increase in the price of electricity.

Nevertheless on this score although the rate of increases in the private sector was modest, compared to increases in previous years, the figure of 15% we thought would justify some increase in payments to the public service, even although the increase in the cost of living had not been so great over the period under

review. Ancillary to what I have said about the raise in pay in the private sector being an important factor is the factor of attraction and retention of staff. I would just say in support of my argument that a modest increase was sufficient this year to the public service, I would point out that the movement of staff in most areas of employment in the public service has been at its lowest during the past two years. We have lost fewer civil servants during the past two years than for some very considerable time in the past. It appears, I hope, that the service is having some power to attract and retain public officers once they have undergone training.

With this background, we looked at the Government's ability to pay. During the first quarter of 1978, the economy showed some improvement and as a result the eventual out-turn for the financial year 1977-78 was more favourable than had been predicted, very very much more favourable than was predicted by the Leader of the Opposition when we spoke at the time of the Estimates, and indeed more favourable than I had dared to hope when I saw the reports for the first three quarters of the financial year. Particularly we have been fortunate enough to have been able to maintain the foreign reserves at a satisfactory level, and therefore to give us some confidence that the inflationary effects of a considerable salary increase would not result in any immediate exhaustion of the reserves.

There is little doubt that when the reserves fell to the levels that they were at during the worst months of 1977 that there was little possibility of the economy being able to absorb the effect of a sudden surge in purchasing power. Consequently the Government negotiating team was authorised to make an offer for a salaries revision applicable for a three year period on the basis of an average 10% increase in the first year and subsequent increases of 5% on average in the successive two years. I am talking about the total wage bill. This offer which was estimated to cost an average of \$20 million a year over the three year period was intended to allow the Government to forecast fairly accurately its commitment in the area of salaries and wages over a longer period, and so facilitate effective planning for a continued improvement in the economy.

I would like to emphasise, Mr. Speaker, that to be able to undertake long range planning with a certain knowledge of what Government's expenditure commitments by way of salaries are likely to be, is a major factor in being able to plan an economy properly. But, Sir, we did not in the end pursue the matter of a three year agreement. The Unions submitted their usual gradiose claims. The National Union of Public Workers asked for 60% at the bottom of the scale and 14½% at the top in two instalments over a two year period. This would have led to an annual increase of \$41 million in

Government expenditure. The Barbados Workers' Union asked for much less at the bottom, only 35%, but rather more at top, 25%, and that would have produced an over-all cost of \$39 million a year. The Police who I believe in the past have asked the biggest increase any union has every asked for, on this occasion asked for 44% at the bottom and 24% at the top. The "p" scale of the Teachers asked 34% at the bottom ranging to 12%.

After a total, I would not go into all the meetings, of fourteen meetings between the NUPW and Government and the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government, differences narrowed and eventually evaporated and I am very glad indeed to say, Sir, that with these unions we were able to reach agreement based on a spread, of 20% at the bottom and 10% at the top of the pay structure.

Now, Sir, no agreement has as yet been reached with the Teachers' Unions or with the Police, and I would like to give some indication of the state of negotiations with these bodies. I agree with what the General Secretary of the Barbados Workers' Union has often said to his colleagues, not to his colleagues in the Barbados Workers' Union, but to his colleagues in the trade union movement, that union negotiations should not be carried on in the Press, and they cannot be carried on if every offer and counter offer is going to be made public at the time. Nonetheless there has been a drawn out negotiation with these two Unions, and therefore I think that I should say that despite three meetings with joint delegations of the BUT and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Association, we have still not been able to come to an agreement along the general lines reached between the Government and the NUPW. The difficulties principally lie in the non-wage areas. The Unions proposed that the salary scale of Erdiston trained teachers be extended by three points in order to achieve a five point overlap with the scale for graduate teachers. I do not want to go into all the details. The Secondary Teachers' Union also wants a satisfactory overlap between qualified non-graduates and graduate scales. As recently as August 8, 1978, the two unions have jointly spoken about this overlapping of scales.

1.05 p.m.

The Barbados Union of Teachers has indicated that it will not accept any settlement in the area of salaries until its demand for a five point overlap is settled. We are not, therefore, Sir, asking at this stage for the House to approve any salary increase for teachers, and the Cabinet has directed that the Establishments Division in consultation with the Ministry of Education, the Teachers' Unions, and such other appropriate authorities or bodies should undertake a complete examination of the gradings in the entire

teaching service immediately following the revision of salaries. This decision has been communicated to the Teachers' Unions and a firm response is now being awaited. We do not have any intention of imposing a salary increase on the teachers, and submission to Parliament of legislation governing the salaries and conditions for teachers has therefore been delayed until a settlement is reached, or can be reached.

In the case of the police the situation is somewhat different. The police have gone a step further than the teachers, since they indicated by letter that they could accept the Government's latest pay offer provided that discussions were re-opened immediately on certain proposed changes in the structure of the P scales under which the police are paid. In reality the police have accepted the salaries as proposed for posts of the level of Superintendent and above, while at the same time proposing adjustments in the scales below which would result in all those persons except constables and Assistant Superintendent at the maximum point of their salary scales receiving an additional increment. Dialogue is continuing with the police in the hope of finding a just and amicable solution to the problem, and the Government has certainly not ruled out some possibility of regrading. However, it has been pointed out to me that some of the arguments being put forward by the police in respect of constables are exactly the contrary to arguments which were put forward, I think, four years ago when there was a regrading relating to the position of long service constables.

There is also of course the matter of the duty allowance now received by the police and which they pledged could be phased out if a suitable increase in the establishment of the force was brought about. This, we are not at this time suggesting to the police that the increase consequential upon the removal of writ serving duties from the Police Force, that that increase would be sufficient to justify any alteration in the duty allowance, but there are nonetheless all these matters to continue, and further talks will be going on very soon between the Establishments Division and representatives of the Police Force. Well, Sir, I have always been a firm supporter of the view that salaries should be negotiated and should never be enforced by the employer, if this is at all possible or conceivable, but on this occasion it has been necessary to include in the Orders before the House revised salaries for the P scales under which the police are paid.

I want to stress here that this is not an attempt to force agreement on the police. The decision to include these revised P scales is made necessary by the fact that Prison Officers and Firemen are also paid on P scales, and indeed one can argue that police officers of the rank of Superintendent and above, and it would be

iniquitous, especially in the case of Prison Officers, for whom the National Union of Public Workers has negotiated and agreed to deny these persons a revision of salary when other public workers are receiving an increase. Hon. members will take note — I hope I can find it, Sir — that the usual clause is contained in the Order — it should be contained in the Order, Sir — that any person who does not wish to accept the increase salary need not do so. I believe it is the customary clause, Sir, I can't draw the attention of hon. members at the moment to it, but certainly it is not our intention to force a salary increase on anybody in this particular case.

The situation is that any police officer who wishes to receive the increase is free to receive it, and if he does not wish to receive the increase but wishes to wait for a further stage until the negotiations have been carried out, he is also free so to do. This is not an attempt to force agreement on anyone.

Finally, Sir, I want to turn to a topic which has evoked some discussion among retired public workers. I said at the start that I would like my speech to deal generally with all the matters that are contained in the ambit of salaries revision, and this will come up in Committee, Sir, but I think I would like to set out the principles at this stage. This topic refers to the pensions paid to retired public employees and the method employed to grant these persons increases from time to time. In the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for the general election in 1976, it was proposed that there should be an adjustment in the pensions of retired public officers to take account of the salary currently and from time to time paid to the relevant office holder rather than pegging the pension to the salary paid to an officer at the date of his retirement and adjusting it by *ad hoc* increases on each occasion of the revision of salaries for public officers. A survey has, however, shown that such an adjustment carried out precisely in the terms of the pledge of the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto might very generally accord pensioners who have held posts in the lower rungs of the Civil Service less benefit than they now enjoy at the present time.

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

At present, of the 3,900 Government pensioners on the rolls of the Establishments Division, approximately 3,000 receive less than \$200 a month in total basic pensions and cost of living additions granted from time to time. A random sample recomputation of current salaries has shown that it would be persons from among this large majority of pensioners who would be worse off if the new method is adopted for revising pensions. We are still looking at ways and

means of improving the positions of the slightly better off pensioners who are in the minority, but within this context there are a number of factors which it is very important to consider, and first among these factors is that in many cases where there is a wide difference in salary between the current holder of an office and the salary of holders long since retired.

1.15 p.m.

That difference is not to be ascribed only to the general increase of wage level of the public service that have taken place from time to time, but can also be ascribed to increases in responsibility for the holders of the posts which have resulted in a regrading, particularly the position of Chief Education Officer that is perhaps the most noticeable example. I believe the Chief Education Officer is now graded on a level with the Permanent Secretaries. Some years ago when the post was created I doubt the holder got as much as the Headmasters of Harrison College or Lodge School. But responsibilities have altered since that time and there have been numerous regradings.

In respect of the pensioners the Government has decided that with effect from 1st April, 1978, an increase of \$25 a month will be given to all Government pensioners in receipt of total allowances of less than \$250 a month and an increase of \$30 a month to those in receipt of a pension of \$250 a month or over.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we come now to the question of cost. The total costs of the increases at the rates agreed on by the Barbados Workers Union and the National Union of Public Workers will amount to \$22.22 million in a full year. Of this amount \$10 million will go to established staff; \$7 million to unestablished and casual staff and temporary employees; \$1 million extra to teaching and non-teaching staff of the older secondary schools and the Community College; \$1.7 million to statutory boards operating mainly on Treasury subventions; acting allowances and contingencies will absorb \$1.25 million, and allowances for pensioners \$1.22 million, making a total of \$22.22 million. There will also be consequential adjustments to the remuneration of judges of the Supreme Court. I am in correspondence with the Chief Justice on this matter and it is hoped that very soon we will be able to reach agreement on these points and the adjustments which should take effect from 1st April, 1978, will be submitted to Parliament in due course.

The last point which I would like to raise is a subject which has been the whipping horse of many in recent times, that is a revision of the salaries and allowances payable to members of Parliament — Ministers, Senators and other such persons. Consideration is being given to the revision of salaries of

members of Parliament. I do not think that after five and a half years this will come as any surprise to members of the House, even if there may be members of the public who think that Parliamentarians should continue to be under paid five years on. I see one hon. member who has recently entered the House shaking his head. It is not all of us who have the means such as his that we can claim to be able to retire at his age and yet suffer no diminution in standard of living for the remainder of our lives. I would suggest to the hon. member that he above all others should be careful in saying that the salaries of members of Parliament need no increase; leave it to hon. members whose means are not perhaps quite so ample as his. Nevertheless, this consideration is being given in the context of the report of the Committee appointed in 1976 specifically for the purpose of analysing, reviewing and making proposals as to remunerations for Ministers and other members of Parliament. Hon. members will appreciate that time has overtaken the proposals made I think over a year and a half ago in respect of the salaries of members of Parliament. The Committee at that time did report that the increases should take effect immediately upon the acceptance of their report. Hon. members will also remember that I indicated that during the period of restraint no increases in the salaries of members of Parliament could be contemplated, and I gave a pledge that while the Government was unable to contemplate an increase in the salaries of public officers there would be no increase for members of Parliament. We were able to negotiate a suitable increase in the salaries of public servants, and in due course the report of the Salaries Commission will be laid in this House along with the comments made by the Chief Establishments Officer and his analysis of what was one of the main findings of the report, which I would say briefly was that members were not overpaid in 1973. On the basis of the principles arising out of that Commission's findings the Chief Establishments Officer has analysed the salaries of Permanent Secretaries and other senior officers in the public service and indicated what level of salary would have to be selected for Ministers to conform with the Commission's findings. Other recommendations will be made for the salaries of ordinary members. The entire report, comments and comment by the Government will be laid on the Table of the House hopefully sometime before the end of the year and it is proposed to refer the entire matter to a Select Committee of Parliament for consideration of the facts found, comments made and members' views. It is intended that the entire package will be related to the rates of pay for the public service, not the increase which they got in 1974 or 1976. We accept that the public servants will have had three increases before we have had one but we are not considering the two earlier increases but relating our consideration to the increases granted as a result of the Civil Establishment Order.

I think I can also see with the view of the hon. member for St. Michael South that the salaries of parliamentarians should go up at the same time as the salaries of public officers and thereby avoid a lot of unnecessary and cantankerous controversy. This view has been accepted by members of the Government. I say members of the Government since the Government itself will have to await the recommendations of the Select Committee; and I would like to congratulate the hon. member for the clear enunciation of those views on earlier occasions.

1.25 p.m.

So, sir, we will have to wait on the Select Committee's deliberations before we deal with the thorny subject of parliamentary salaries; but I very sincerely hope that in the same way that the public can accept that Public Officers must be given regular increases, and that their rates of pay must be made comparable to rates of pay existing in similar positions in the private sector, that the public will understand that Barbados has to be governed just as any other country has to be governed. We do not live in a country where there are enormous rewards waiting for ex-politicians greater than the remuneration that they enjoyed as Ministers. That is true of many of the countries where ex-politicians, immediately upon leaving office, can expect to be offered positions at a remuneration greater than they enjoyed as Ministers. We live in a country where, thanklessly politicians are turned into the street after they have given service to their country for many years in a highly exposed and disputative position; and hon. members on both sides of the House have examples readily to their minds that they can consider and put forward.

Sir, I hope that no hon. member will find it in his heart to oppose this Civil Establishment (General) Order which now comes before the House. It has been reached as a result of a settlement worked out by a process of free collective bargaining between workers' representatives and representatives of negotiators for the Government. It is therefore in that spirit that I put it before the House; and I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that this Resolution do now pass. Hon. members in favour will please say aye.....

Mr. TAITT rose.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. On what has the hon. member risen? Is it a point of order or a point of disorder during the division? The only point before the House is

that there is nobody against the Resolution. There is no other business before the House. With great respect, hon. members have voted "aye". There are two other Resolutions to come up right away so hon. members can speak to their hearts' content. With great respect, on a point of order the Rules of the House relating to divisions are quite strict; but what has the hon. member risen on? There are two Resolutions and debate in Committee, and hon. members can talk to their hearts' content. There is no reason to give anybody any latitude. They do not need the latitude.

Mr. TAITT rose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: On what point is the hon. member rising?

Mr. TAITT: I did not hear anyone second the Resolution. I waited to hear someone second the Resolution and then get up to speak on it. I do not know why the Prime Minister feels constrained to make a noise. If he does not wish anybody to speak on the salary revision, he can say so. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I have consulted with the Clerk at the Table, and my information is that the Resolution was seconded.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, could the Deputy Speaker please inform the House who seconded the Resolution?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: My information is that the Resolution was seconded. The Clerk at the Table has so informed me. (*Asides*). Order please. Hon. members in favour will please say "aye" and those against will please say "no". I think the "ayes" have it.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (PART-TIME OFFICERS) ORDER, 1978

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 5 be the next Order of the Day and that I take charge of the Order.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

Order No. 5 was called — A Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Part-time Officers) Order, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Resolution approving the passing of this Order do now pass.

Hon. members will have an abundance of things to say on the general matter of salaries revision; but with great humility I would suggest that Order No. 6 may be perhaps dealing with matters that are more pertinent because that deals with relatively lower salaries and pensions.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

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

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO UNESTABLISHED STAFF AND CASUAL EMPLOYEES AND THEIR CLASSIFICATION AND RATES OF PAY

Order No. 6 was called – A Resolution to fix the conditions applicable to unestablished staff and casual employees and their classification and rates of pay, with effect from 1st April, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to adopt my remarks made on Order No. 4. This is that part of the Public Service whose salaries are not fixed by law and whose salaries in due course have to be appropriated. Indeed, sir, it may be found that the persons represented by the Barbados Workers Union are very largely embraced within this category. On behalf of the Government, I would say that far from not wishing the Opposition to speak, I very much hope that the Opposition will speak on this and I will welcome the contribution that they make; and I will give them the same attention which I have given to all the speeches that the Opposition makes in the House; and indeed I look forward to their contributions on so important a subject.

I beg to move that the Resolution do now pass.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: I beg to second that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I rise to make a contribution on this particular Resolution, particularly because we are looking at an area where thousands of workers are involved. Now, in doing so, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to refer to some of the comments made by the Prime Minister, and particularly dealing with the established group of workers in the public sector. As you are well aware, I have had some kind of relationship with this group of workers in terms of being able to get their views on the kind of increases which they felt were necessary, and being able to sit down and try to work out a strategy on these negotiations.

Now, I think that you will be aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there is a history surrounding the negotiations for workers in the public sector, particularly when one looks back not too long ago when the now Prime Minister, who was then Leader of the Opposition, and when one takes into consideration the remarks which were made by him in 1976 relative to the increases which were given by the then Government. This morning the Prime Minister in introducing the first part of the Civil Establishment Orders, indicating that on the occasion the two representatives of the Barbados Workers Union who were sitting in the House at that time voted with the Opposition.

1.35 p.m.

This is a matter which Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been discussed and debated on occasions subsequent to the one on which the vote took place and I just want to remind the Hon. Prime Minister if he would check the record that he would see that it was the Opposition that voted with the two hon. members. This is important because I recall vividly that when the Prime Minister made his reply, at least when the then Leader of the Opposition made his reply and he spoke on the Resolution he was not sure what position he was going to take and he indeed waited and looked across to get some indication as to how we were going to vote.

I do not think that we left any doubt in anybody's minds how we were going to vote on that particular matter. At least, I just want to set the record straight on that particular occasion, because I think that those of us, at least to members of the public who know what the position of the Barbados Workers Union is on matters of this nature, whether it is to do with a party which some of the members support, or whether it is to do with another party, the BLP, is not the point at issue with me, particularly with matters of principle and that is how we are going to be guided in these particular matters.

I said initially that this is a matter which has some history behind it and I would like Mr. Deputy Speaker to draw to your attention and to the attention of the House the earlier excursions of the Prime Minister into this area of the negotiations for public servants in 1978 and you will recall that earlier in the year the Prime Minister made his position very clear on Television, Radio and Press about the Government's proposition in the first instance to limit increases to 5% and certainly we received communication from him indicating that he wanted to have what is described by him as a "wages pause". This is to get it extended for 30 years.

I think that the fact of the matter is that the Unions were particularly opposed to this proposition

and could not accept this position as announced by the Prime Minister. We sent in our proposals and negotiations were started. There were difficult negotiations and I do not have any doubt that were it not for the fact that by accident a by-election came along in the meantime or probably we would still be locked in at the bargaining table and we would not be in the position that we are in today, that is, getting the kind of increases that we finally have agreed to because it seems to me, and I have been involved in these negotiations, that the Government was determined to dig its toes in at a particular point much lower than the point which we agreed to, but as I said, the by-election came along which fortunately we won, and I think it had the effect of changing the picture somewhat because the Government was then of the view that people were not particularly happy with the position which they were adopting.

Now the Prime Minister indicated that the settlement which has been reached will bring workers at the bottom to an increase of 20% and generally workers at the top to 10%. If my memory serves me right, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be right to point out because there are a number of people who would get misled by the bottom, and what is at the bottom.

The 20% applied as far as I can remember only to those workers in Categories 1 and 2 and so that when you reach above Category 2 it means that you will not be getting 20%, it will be less than that. The bottom does not spread very far and this is one of the matters which we felt strongly about. As you are aware, negotiations in the public sector are conducted by more than one union and we had a situation where one union had gone ahead and agreed, and particularly in that area, and it was a very difficult situation that we were placed in and I want to draw to your attention that as recently as the 10th August, the BWU wrote a letter to the Chief Establishments Officer where the point was made that at this time of our development and certainly with the kind of wages which were being paid to the people in the artisan grouping, particularly those people who fall in Category 7. We feel that the increase given should be more than a 20% and a very good reason for this I believe and one which we hoped would have found some support in the Government sector so the fact is that we would want to see every encouragement given to artisans and semi-skilled people who are crucial to our development and who we would want to ensure get the kind of rewards which were considered fair and equitable for the work which they were doing and as I said this is what we suggested, but again the Government did not buy this suggestion and the other Union which was involved in this particular area had gone ahead and signified its agreement with the proposal which came from the Government in this particular regard.

I want to say Mr. Speaker, that when one listens to the Prime Minister, it is difficult to really understand what is happening in a particular area. I just want to move on from the area of the unestablished staff and look at some of the comments which he made relative to some of the other areas where particularly in some other aspects were related to the unestablished staff.

You will recall that the Prime Minister indicated that agreement had not yet been reached with the Police Service Association and the Unions representing the Teachers. Nevertheless, we have a situation where the Prime Minister has come down for money which would cover increases for these categories of workers and I think it is important that we recognise this.

I see in one of the Civil Establishment Orders and I hear the Prime Minister mention that the increase for Teachers in the new Secondary and the older Secondary Schools would be in the region of \$1.75 million and I think I recall hearing the Prime Minister make a point like this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a friendly point of order, we are not coming down for any money today. An indication of the overall costs was given if the financial settlement, and I specifically used the word, was at the level agreed with the BWU and the NUPW. I specifically said that. We are not coming for any money today, we are only coming with the Orders.

Mr. GREAVES: You are not coming to the money today but only with the Orders. But the Orders today contain an estimate of the increases, but I saw the Deputy Prime Minister shaking his head and you say yes and he say no and I do not know who is right. He does not seem to know what is going on and you do not seem to know either, so who is right? I pause for a reply.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Sir, the hon. member does not know what is going on.

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, I agree with you Mr. Deputy Prime Minister. I thought the Deputy Prime Minister who is a Minister in the Cabinet would know what is going on, and I was taking the lead from him, so I would not know what is going on if he does not know what is going on. Be that as it may.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, all three of us are right, the hon. member, the Deputy Prime Minister and I. The Addendum to the Order contains an estimate, so does my speech, and the hon. member is nodding to indicate that it is in the Addendum. I am telling you that we are not coming down for money today that the Orders are for the posts. The Addendum is not a part of the Order in the sense that it provides money.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as far as the policemen are concerned, the Prime Minister has, I recall, indicated that again agreement had not been reached with the Police Association but he was indicating and I can remember correctly, that the Police Scale which would cover the Policemen was included in the money which was being sought, and the policemen would be free to get the increase which was offered or wait until an agreement was negotiated.

1.45 p.m.

I would like to look at this very carefully, and it is from the point of view of a situation where what the Prime Minister is really doing in my view is either dangling a carrot before the Policemen which he hopes they would snatch at, or in a round-about kind of way trying to court them into a situation of accepting what has already been agreed. We will have to wait and see what will be the final result, because this seems to me to be somewhat odd to be continuing negotiations but at the same time indicating that the money is there, the increases which have been agreed by other parties are there, and if you want them you can take them. Some policemen might be in such straitened circumstances that they might want to go and take the increases, and when once some of them have taken the increases, then the Prime Minister would say that some policemen have taken the increases, there is no point of negotiating anymore because indications are that this is the increase which the police want. So that the Prime Minister is playing a very sneaky game here, and I would hope that the Association negotiating for the policemen would not fall for that kind of carrot which is being dangled before them.

Over-all I think that one has to make the point that when one talks in terms of increases, and the Prime Minister laid very heavy stress on this, one has to take into consideration an increase in the cost of living. Now anybody who negotiates would recognise that this is one of the factors which would be involved in any negotiations, one of the policies in which proposals would be submitted to anybody with which the Union is negotiating, but it is not, and the Prime Minister knows that very well, the only factor, and I think if one were to read the Minutes which were prepared or the notes of the meetings which were prepared by the Chief Establishment Officer, you will see very clearly that the arguments which have been advanced by the Barbados Workers' Union went over and above the argument of the cost of living, because if you negotiate an agreement purely on the basis of cost of living, then you must ask yourself the question, what really is the purpose of negotiations? Is it purely and simply to maintain a particular standard, or is it to move ahead? Is it keeping up or moving ahead? I think that quite apart from the fact that one would like to see the living standards of the workers in the public sector or

any sector for that matter keep up with the cost of living, the other objective would be to see that they move ahead, otherwise you are not going to have any change in their position, because if you merely negotiate increases, you will see the point I am making, but the whole question of the social mobility which will be attached to higher wages and the fact that people are able maybe to save more and to invest in other areas. This would not then take place if you only negotiated increases which are commensurate with the cost of living.

Now I seem to recall, Mr. Speaker, and I was hoping that the Prime Minister would have made some reference to some statement which he made recently relative to the fear which he expressed about the increases which are going to be given to the public servants finding their way into a spending spree as it were. I thought the Prime Minister would have made some reference to that, and I just want to allude to that somewhat, because I think what one has to bear in mind is that we are dealing particularly with a group of people in the unestablished and casual area, people who are getting wages which are still relatively small, and when you take into consideration that over the last three or four months prior to some time in late July workers in the unestablished and casual sector in the Ministry of Communications and Works have had to undergo a very serious economic strain — I am referring, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the imposition of the four day work week or the reduction of their wages by about 20% — in that period the amount of money which they have lost on the basis in some instances of \$20 to \$25 per week, when you therefore grant an increase which in most instances is the 20% which they suffered, you will see quite clearly that they would have had to live very heavily on borrowing, and would have therefore to make up now to try to put their position right so that they would be in a more liquid position than they were in the past.

I do not know why the Prime Minister would have wanted to restrict that, because what we would want to see obviously is some generation in the economic activity, and I think it is fairly clear that Barbados being to a large extent a wage-earning community, the problem is that when people get money they will utilise the money to purchase goods and services, and this will have the effect of stimulating the economic activity in this country. I think this is one of the very important aspects of negotiations and increases which unions negotiate from time to time. When one relates the statement of the Prime Minister on that occasion to the statement which was recently made by the Governor of the Central Bank about the fears which he was expressing about very high liquidity in the banking sector, almost to suggest that people were saving too much money and that the banks had that

amount of money lying down and did not know what to do with it, I think it is a problem; and when you add that further to the fact that, and I am sure the Prime Minister would not want to deny this, the National Insurance Funds which are millions of dollars — I am talking in terms of the impact that this amount of activity would be having on the baking sector — are there which they cannot find enough investment to have the funds channeled into, when you are pursuing a policy which would tend to restrict people from being able to spend so as to encourage economic activity you can see the kind of problem which we are going to be involved in. I am sure that before the year ends we will hear a lot more about this kind of activity and the kind of problems which are going to be found being created in the economy by that rather restrictive economic outlook which the Prime Minister would want to see pursued.

But let us get back to the question of the increases for the unestablished and casual staff. I want to just point out that when the Prime Minister talks in terms of the 20% which has been negotiated, that the negotiations were by no means easy.
1.55 p.m.

It was as a result of the fight which was put up, because these increases were not granted just by the Prime Minister out of the kindness of his heart, I mean they were hard and difficult negotiations and I think that one has got to recognise that in the fight which has been put up we moved from a position of no increase, a bit, an agreement for a year, then we moved to 5%, and we have ended up at a point of 20%, so that in truth and in fact we have been able to fight hard to get this.

We recognise that the workers in the public sector when compared with the rates in the private sector still do not reach or have not reached the level of wages which are paid in the public sector, and where the Prime Minister indicated — I think one must not fall into this trap — I think he indicated that there was only one set of workers in the private sector which as I recall he said got an agreed rate in excess of 20%, and that was Light and Power. What he did not however do was to say what the increases were on and where they would take the workers, and I am sure that a careful analysis of this would indicate that workers in the private sector are still in a better position in terms of actual quantum which they receive as a result of negotiations pursued on their behalf by the Barbados Workers' Union, so it is not to say that the workers in the public sector are now on par with the workers in the private sector where wages are concerned, and I think that point has to be made.

I hope the Prime Minister when he replies would really attempt to enlighten us on this matter relative to

the policemen and to the teachers because I believe it is a matter in which he did not, maybe deliberately or otherwise, express as clearly as one would have hoped and I hope he will give us some more enlightenment on that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: No other hon. member wishes to speak so I will be very short. The point which the hon. member mentioned about the by-election, he is in a position better than me to know it is not true, because he was in the negotiations and he would know the stage the negotiations had reached by the end of June. I will say no more on this.

As far as the police wages are concerned, the hon. member I am sure accidentally and unconsciously has put out a scare about the police wages. We must be very careful with this. When I was making my search although I had paragraph 10 in mind as being the escaped clause I actually read paragraph 10 of the Order. You will realise that it does not declare itself to be an escaped clause, the point is that the police have accepted the salary scale subject to a revision of other conditions of service which have the effect of giving not a different salary scale but an increment within the scales that are proposed for certain officers. That is the whole point. It is not a question of the police saying the salaries are insufficient, the Police Association has said that it is prepared to accept the scales subject to negotiations about regarding, and I said in my speech that most Assistant Superintendents, everybody from Superintendent up, that is agreed. They have not put forward any proposals for them. Constables at the top of the salary scale, that is agreed, but they are asking for something that is equivalent to an accelerated increment for people already in the Service. That is the effect, they are asking to shorten the scale for constables with some consequential amendments, they are not asking for the maximum for constables to be increased. I think there is some question of overlap of long service constables and corporals, because under present conditions a long service constable can get more than a newly appointed corporal. I do not have the details at my fingertips, but there are certain points in the corporal scales which overlap and I think there is some argument there, but it is not the salary scales that the police object to, it is the grading, the number of points for constables and so on and so forth, and a large number of police ranks are not affected by the present area of disagreement, so it is very dangerous for the hon. member to suggest that somebody is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the police.

As far as the prison officers and firemen are concerned, we have no argument with them anyhow, and I am sure that the hon. member would not wish me to take a step to stop the prison service from getting the increases to which they are entitled after

they have agreed with them, because that is the effect of our taking any other course of action.

On the general state of the economy, I heard the hon. member say that there is too much liquidity in the bank and that they should be stimulating economy activity in the country. Well, the hon. member has his views and those who advise the Government have their views, but the point about the difficulties that we have had with spending and its impact on the balance of payments is that injecting a large amount of money into the economy does not only stimulate the economy of Barbados, it also stimulates the economy of Japan, of Great Britain, of the United States and all the countries which we import things from, and that is the danger. He is asking us to stimulate by the encouragement to buy goods in the shops the economies of those who export goods to us, so the hon. member must realise that the economic theories which he absorbed in the course of his university training are probably economic theories that are written in the United States and Great Britain. He must see there is a different set of realities for Barbados.

As far as the liquidity in the banks is concerned, I just want to say something about the banks. The Commercial sector ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time is ...

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I will be finished right away, do we not have until ten past two?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Standing Orders say that we should suspend at two.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is not two yet, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: How long do you expect to be?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: About one minute and a half.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Continue.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The commercial sector of the banks have given the public of Barbados a very raw deal over the question of the economic restraint generally. Things that they do not want to do they tell the public the Government does not want to let them do. They do not want to lend people money to build houses and repair houses, they want to lend out money to buy motor cars because they make up to 25% on motor cars and they do not want to lend out money at 8 or 9 per cent for house repairs. That is the answer to the liquidity problem, and the hon. member

should not be taken in by the bank managers who lie and tell people the Government says they cannot get money to build or buy houses. Do not be taken in by that. There are no restrictions on economic activity generating, arising and going on inside Barbados, you can go into the bank and tell the bank you want money for house repairs, there are no restrictions on lending for this purpose of which I am aware imposed by the Government. That is the answer to the problem of liquidity.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

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

On Resumption.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is now Question Time. (*A Pause*) Since there are no questions we move on to Private Members' Business. The hon. member for Christ Church East.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give way to the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it would be advisable to indicate to the hon. member for Christ Church East that I want to speak on the amendment to my Resolution. Technically, the matter before the House is the amendment to the substantive Resolution, so we are discussing the amendment now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which Resolution are you dealing with? Your Resolution?

Mr. GREAVES: I am speaking on the amendment to my Resolution. An amendment was entered by the Hon. Minister of Health and National Insurance and I am speaking on the amendment. This is established Parliamentary procedure, so I do not know what the Prime Minister is talking about.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, first of all, in the absence of some other indication that Order No. 1 is the first Order of Private Members' Business, Order No. 1 would have to be postponed. On a second point of order, I would welcome a ruling on the procedure for speaking on motions and amendments. I used to think that I knew the answer, just as the hon. member for St. Lucy feels that he knows the answer. Some years ago in similar circumstances I rose, as the mover of a motion which was sought to be amended, to speak with the aim of getting in three speeches — the speech I had already made, one then and one later, and Sir Theodore Brancker — the then Speaker — ruled that I could not speak. Mr. Cumberbatch who was then Clerk of the House and whose opinions on Parliamentary procedure

were hardly ever to be gainsaid, told me I was wrong and that Sir Theodore's ruling was correct. Indeed, the hon. member for Christ Church Central also told me Sir Theodore's ruling was correct and that the amendment to a motion in those circumstances does not give the original mover the right to speak. Now I have had my doubts about it and would like a ruling on the matter because when I spoke at the time I recalled to hon. members recent history of the West Indies which pointed out that Dr. Jagan's Government fell in Guyana because at the very end of the Budget debate the then Speaker allowed an amendment and proposed to allow the entire Opposition to speak on it; and when Dr. Jagan objected to his ruling Dr. Jagan and four other members of the party were suspended and the Budget was defeated, leading to the events of 1964. This may take us a little way around the earth, but Your Honour will get an idea of what happens when you allow Parliamentary debate to be prolonged by people waiting until the end of the debate on a motion and allowing an amendment, and then the whole motion is started up again and everybody who had spoken tries to speak a second time. This in effect means that the mover of any motion can arrange to make three speeches, everybody else can arrange to make two, plus any speeches which the Government may have the right to make in reply. In the interest of the curtailment of the debate I would at the very least appeal to the hon. member to exercise his right to wind up the debate, because as I see it — and this is subject to Your Honour's ruling, and I am not trying to influence you — there is nothing in this motion critical of the Government which would justify a Government Minister speaking last. You may rule otherwise, but I see nothing critical in the matter. The hon. member for St. Lucy, therefore, as I see it, has the final right of reply. I do not know what the Clerk will advise or what you will rule, but I will really appeal to him to say what he has to say at the end rather than perhaps delay consideration of this motion beyond what is reasonable at this point.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Prime Minister has with some excursion into recent history alluded to the question of the right of hon. members, and he said he would like a considered opinion. I assume that opinion cannot be given this afternoon and therefore we can only be guided by the Standing Orders before us.

As I understand it, Order No. 1 of Private Members' Business was called. The hon. member for Christ Church East got up and indicated that he was not ready to proceed and that he would give way to Order No. 2, and I think my colleague correctly pointed out that in the context of Order No. 2 an amendment was before the House. And if you look at Rule 28(17) which states: "A member who has spoken may speak

again when a new question has been proposed by the Speaker or Chairman, such as a proposed amendment, or a motion for the adjournment of the debate or a dilatory motion." I submit, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the inherent right which the hon. member has as the mover of the Resolution to wind up is not curtailed mainly because an amendment has been proposed. If we can accept that, then to deny him the right to speak on the amendment would be denying him the right set out under Article 28(17), and I submit that the hon. member does have the right to speak on the amendment without reference to his further right to wind up the debate on a motion he has proposed.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on this question of my right to speak or not to speak, I wish to draw your attention to May's Parliamentary Procedure, 19th Edition. At page 386 Chapter 28 on Process of Debate, Section C, Amendments to Questions, etc., — and I quote verbatim: "As indicated earlier, an amendment is a substantive motion moved in the course of debate upon any motion which interposes a new cycle of debate and decision between the proposal and the decision and the main motion and question."

3.00 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is obviously a matter of some importance, and I think that it would be wiser if the matter is thoroughly researched before a definitive ruling is given. If the hon. member would agree, I would hope that we can have a written ruling on the point at some stage of the proceedings; and we can proceed after the ruling has been given.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not sure that you understand the difficulty. I was going to point out that we are in the throes of this debate where this amendment has been introduced and points have been made on the other side which I think it is necessary for someone to rebut on this side and attempt to set the record straight; and the longer we delay this, the more difficult it will be for us to set the record straight. You will recognise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the impact of the debate has a lot to do with the cogency of the contributions to the debate; and whatever we may think, it is based on two submissions which have been made to you, one from our Standing Orders and one from the authority on Parliamentary Procedure, Erskine May, so that you would have been in a position to make a decision on this particular matter.

I am sure that you are aware, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the question of rulings which we have obtained in this Parliament in previous sittings as far as I have been able to observe — I am sure that you will forgive me if I say

that unlike your good self I have been in this House for a period of over seven years; and I have had the opportunity to observe other occupants of that Chair indicating that they were making rulings relative to a particular situation at the time without making any reference to what has gone on in the past; and indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite recently a ruling has been made which to all intents and purposes would bind Speakers in the future. What we are saying is that the present situation, in my view, is clear; and that because of the submission by the member for St. Michael South West relative to our Standing Orders, and because I have drawn your attention to Erskine May's position, I feel that you should be able to make a ruling at this particular point so that the debate could be proceeded with at this particular stage.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would seem to me that the weight of evidence, both from what exist in the Standing Orders and what exist in Erskine May, and what the Hon. Prime Minister said that he understood and observed to be the practice of this Hon. House, should certainly induce you, when making a ruling at this point in time, to lean towards continuing to practise that which has obtained in this Hon. House over the years.

If, indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, some definitive ruling on this matter of amendments is to be taken, it would seem to me that it would require an alteration of the Standing Orders; and so I think that the situation which is always obtained is the one that should apply to this matter particularly when three important factors operate — (1) practices (2) the Standing Orders and (3) Erskine May's; and certainly with these balanced against the confession by the Hon. Prime Minister that he himself has always felt that this was the procedure and has operated on that basis in this Hon. House before; but two instances, one relating to some events in Guyana and the other relating to some events some years ago which you said were not recorded, I think that the balance must be in favour of the continuation of the debate on the amendment.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I recognised that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central rose on a point of order, but made a speech; but you are the one to decide that. As I understand the background, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as a result of a Resolution which was brought here by the member for St. Lucy, an amendment was made by a member on this side. The discussion apparently now centre around who should speak first or who should speak last. The member for St. Lucy, as I understand it is hopeful that he can, and I believe that he should have the right to speak on the Resolution as amended; but as far as we are concerned, I happen to know from a previous debate that we agreed to the Resolution in principle. So I do not see what all this time wasting is for.

When I was in the Opposition, at Private Members time, we grabbed every single opportunity to present our case or to harass the then Government; but for the past 20 minutes they have been reading Erskine May which I do not believe that they understand very well. They have been trying to interpret the Standing Orders which I do not believe that they themselves understand what these Standing Orders are all about. (*Asides*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. Is the hon. member making a point of order?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No sir. I was speaking on the Resolution. Well, sir, I am speaking on the point of order out of the point of order by the member for St. Michael South Central. I see no reason why, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that they should not get on with the Resolution. We have agreed to it in principle. So who should get the credit is not material right now. We have agreed in principle with the Resolution. If they want to speak on the amendment, speak on it. I personally do not believe that they have anything to say on the Resolution. That is the problem with them; so they will get up and read Erskine May and argue with you and the Clerk. That is my point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: With all respect, from what I have heard the practice is that only two speeches can be made. That has been the practice in the past. 3.10 p.m.

My understanding is that according to the appropriate Standing Order a member may speak the same time after a Question has been put, that is Standing Order 28(17).

"17. A member who has spoken may speak again when a new question has been proposed by the Speaker or Chairman."

Mr. GREAVES: Thank you very much Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is really a storm in a teapot, not a Tom in a teapot.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when we look at the amendment to the Resolution in it you will see very clearly that in a way it attempts merely to expand on what my original motion was dealing with and it is for this very reason that we on this side have indicated that we see no reason why the amendment should be made to the Resolution.

Now let us look at some of the arguments which have been advanced in favour of the amendments and I want to look at some points which have been raised by the hon. member for Christ Church East, the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. Minister for the City and the Deputy Prime Minister and the kind of arguments

which they advanced last week relative to the support which they were attempting to galvanise for an amendment to the Resolution.

The member for Christ Church East was, in my view, playing on a very sticky and dangerous wicket. He indicated in the first instance that he saw the Resolution and the terms of the Resolution as a logical extension to the Social Security legislation and he regarded it as a desirable and necessary development and he went on to make a big play about his view that Barbados would eventually become a welfare state. But then, Mr. Deputy Speaker, one saw a modern welfare state or whatever the qualification is on that. Then he went on as it were to dig his own grave when he unleashed in my view an unwanted attack, and I would hope that the hon. member for St. James would get up and set the records straight as far as the criticisms which the hon. member for Christ Church East have been making for the proposed National Health Scheme and the Old Age Pension of which the hon. member for St. James has indicated that he is the champion, because what we seem to be doing in this Chamber is, at it were, loading the Government with more and more expenses, and what he wants to see is more productivity within the economy.

Nobody is saying that this is not the case from the point of view as far as the country is concerned. There is a need for more productivity in employment and more productivity in investments. If you were to examine very carefully the context of the Resolution, you will see that my Resolution has nothing to do with unlimited and total unemployment benefits for the people of this country. It is a specific Resolution and one which the contents were acknowledged by the Minister of Health and National Insurance when she said that she understood the Resolution very clearly, that the Resolution was referring specifically to those people who had been making contributions to the National Insurance Scheme and who for one reason or another found themselves out of work and the Resolution indicated that the payments of unemployment insurance benefits will be for a limited period and the whole idea being that it would give people time to pick up during the time they were going through a difficult period.

What I detected was that the Hon. Minister of Health and National Insurance related in detail and almost word for word the arguments which I advanced on a previous occasion relative to this Resolution, at least on the afternoon when I was introducing the Resolution, so that what I was witnessing from the side of the Government was that the hon. member for Christ Church East was singing one tune, and some of his Party colleagues were singing another tune.

I think we must recognise that the hon. member for Christ Church East is one of those members on that side

who is attempting to project or portray himself as an alternate leader and he is always making these kinds of statement which do not go in harmony with the statements of his Party, but I see that he wants to cut out as it were a leash for himself, but this is a matter for them with the kind of confusion they are having on that side.

I would like to indicate a number of other things and I want to move on from the hon. member for Christ Church East to the hon. member for the City, the Minister of Health and National Insurance. As you will recall, and it is a pity that the gracious lady is not here today, that last week when she was speaking she seemed to be confused in the date which she was giving. I myself up to this day am not sure what she was attempting to say in a newspaper interview which the Prime Minister had. I am not sure whether the newspaper interview related to August 1977 or 1978 because as I understand it she was trying to make a point that in any event the Prime Minister had indicated before this Resolution came to this Honourable Chamber that it was the policy of the Barbados Labour Party to pursue this whole question on unemployment insurance benefits. If, for argument sake, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the date of the newspaper is August, 1978, I would respectfully draw to your attention that the notice of my Resolution was given on the 11th of July, 1978 which was the date prior to August. If, on the other hand, the hon. Minister has indicated that it was August, 1977, I want to draw to the attention of the Honourable House to a Debate. I am going to quote the date of the official report. Tuesday, 19th October, 1976, on page 97 and it was in connection with a speech which I was making in reply to the First Throne Speech which was made by the present Government, and at page 97 it reads:

"We can now move on to a vital area relative to workers in this country in respect of National Insurance."

3.20 p.m.

"There are a number of people who contribute to this scheme. In the International Labour Conventions on which our National Insurance Scheme is based, there are nine basic provisions and as you will realize and appreciate the Democratic Labour Party have made preparations for the extension of this scheme. I want to make this point, that is, that people who work and who are self-employed, are also working too and they contribute towards the scheme; they make their contributions to the scheme as well. Now you must recognise that there are occasions when people will be put out of work, and we have a very clear example of this situation over the last week-end when about 120 workers were employed by Oran Limited and today they are in a very difficult position so far as their future is concerned.

Now this is a serious matter because it touches on the bread and butter of people and those people from Oran Limited are out of work and their contributions to the National Insurance Scheme is no benefit to them because there is no provision under this scheme which means that although they have made contributions to this scheme there will not be any immediate benefit to them."

Then I went on to say: "And I hope that the Government would make it possible for people who lose their jobs in this way would receive some benefit in the same way as it is done for people who go on sick leave as they can draw their national insurance benefits for a period of six weeks."

So that you will see very clearly that the whole content and the ideas which were expressed in that speech on the 19th October, 1976, are incorporated and embodied in this Resolution which we are considering here today. When it comes to the question of history of the question of who brought the Resolution first, that is of no consequence. As a matter of fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, as you will recall, and if you check the records you will see, no big play was made in this House on who brought the Resolution first or last. As a matter of fact, it would seem as if that side is very concerned about the fact that we have been able to project this kind of thinking on to the Government as it were, and we have been able to force them into a situation where they were probably caught napping and we have given them something to chew on, and they now want to make it look as if this is something they have been pursuing for all the years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the Hon. Minister was making her presentation, she said she was quoting me correctly when I said "the scheme must creep before it can walk". Yes, those are my words. I said that. It is my view and I am sure from judging from what has been said on the other side that it is the view of hon. members over there that the scheme has now reached the point where it cannot only walk, but it can do a little jogging or even maybe a little running, because you will recall that this scheme was introduced by the Democratic Labour Party in 1967. Over the period of time that the scheme has been in operation, there have been a number of benefits added. For example, there are certain benefits which are added: maternity benefits, invalidity benefits where there is a pension and grant, old age pensions, funeral grants, survivor's benefits both in terms of pension and grant, and there is employment injury benefit, and this is in terms of death, disablement or what-have-you. You will see therefore that over the years the Democratic Labour Party has built up the scheme and added more and more benefits to the scheme, so that what we are saying today is that in 1978 some more serious consideration should be given to adding unemployment benefits to the National Insurance Scheme.

What I do not understand, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the position which has been taken by the Hon. Minister in this. Remember that she has introduced an amendment to my Resolution. The amendment reads as follows:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House accept the principle that unemployment benefits be payable to contributors to the National Insurance Scheme, and urge the Government to undertake an actuarial investigation into the feasibility of extending the scheme to provide for the payment of such benefits."

The Hon. Minister indicated when she was speaking that she understood me very clearly to have said that an actuarial survey or study must be done before consideration is given to this. I would not be as reckless to say that this should not be done. I recognise that the scheme is based on the actuaries and their findings and what-have-you but I feel that the years which have passed and the experience and expertise built up would enable the Government to give very favourable consideration to this proposal. Mark you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister in the course of her address said very clearly that at the present time there is an actuarial survey which is currently being undertaken and she has given specific instructions to the actuary to look at the possibility of making recommendations for this unemployment position that we are talking about today. If we are to believe the Hon. Minister, and I would not like to misbelieve her, there are two things we have to look at, either the Minister is telling us the truth or she is lying to this House. If as she says, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there is an actuarial survey which is going on at present and she has given instructions to the actuary to look at this aspect of it, what then would be the point in moving a Resolution for at least an amendment like this which urges the Government to undertake an actuarial undertaking? Is this an actuarial investigation of the actuarial investigation which is at present going on? That does not make sense to me, so that what we see very clearly is that this is merely an attempt as it were to save face. The Government is attempting to save its face here in this amendment. I am sure that they would not want to have the Resolution passed as it is in my name; they would want to have the Resolution in such a way that they had an input into it, and this is why we could not of course be caught in the situation which the Prime Minister attempted to push us into just now, because as you will recognise, we would have to vote on the amendment first, and if the amendment was carried, there would not be any need to vote on the substantive Resolution because that would be the Resolution which the House would have accepted. It seems to be a simple and logical matter so we have set our position very clearly on this particular matter.

Now you will recall, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Hon. Attorney General and hon. member for Christ

Church West in the usual Barbados Labour Party style praised the speech which was in my opinion contradictory of the hon. member for Christ Church East as being a profound logical speech. I suppose it was profound in its illogic and nonsense; but the hon. member for Christ Church West went on to refer to the Prime Minister making a statement in the House, in the Press and in public about this particular matter, so that throughout the length and breadth of his speech, what he attempted to do was to play some politics with this, and what we have indicated from this side of the House is that this Resolution is not a partisan Resolution. This is not a Resolution which is designed to promote the interest of any particular Party whether it is the Democratic Labour Party or the Barbados Labour Party. If it so happens that it comes from this side we would have to take whatever public praise there might be, but we are not doing it for this particular reason at all. We are concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the kind of problems and difficulties which people whom we are talking about are placed in and have got to face from time to time, and that is why we have sought to move this Resolution.

The hon. member for Christ Church West went on to talk about unemployment and he made the point that in 1961 that is, the year when the Barbados Labour Party lost the elections to the Democratic Labour Party, and from that period until now all sorts of things have gone wrong with the Barbados economy. 3.30 p.m.

The hon. member for Christ Church West made the point that in 1960 unemployment was lower in Barbados than in 1976 when the Barbados Labour Party took over. I do not think that I should waste the time of this Hon. Chamber by going into any demographic information which would be available, no doubt, to members of this Chamber, but I think that any sensible reading of the situation would indicate a number of things.

In the 1960-61 period there were large numbers of people who had left Barbados in the years previous to that who around this time would have been coming into the labour force and who were not then there, so that it was not a question of the fact that the Barbados Labour Party had been creating so many jobs within the society that they were able to solve all the unemployment which there was at the time, indeed there was a lot of unemployment existing, because the Democratic Labour Party when it gained power in 1961 had immediately to embark on a programme to put some money in some people's pockets, and not in the way the Barbados Labour Party began their reign in 1976, but the fact of the matter is that even if you were to examine very carefully that it was about 1962 that emigration to the United Kingdom came almost to a standstill, and again, what you are going to find is

that by 1976 you would have been having people moving into the labour force who were then becoming of working age, and who ordinarily would not have had the opportunity to emigrate to England as the people in the previous years, so when you attempt to make any comparison between unemployment in one period and unemployment in another it is mere nonsense, because there are a lot of factors which have to be taken into consideration, and in any event, the population is growing, so how can you make a logical comparison between the two periods?

I think we have to be very clear in this particular matter. We indicated very early that this is a matter of national concern, and I would want to reiterate what I consider to be an important point that I made at the outset, that what I see needs to be developed in this — because I did not indeed limit myself only to the provision of unemployment benefits for people who found themselves out of work and who had been working previously — but I went on to make the point that allied to all of this the Government has got to be able to develop training and retraining programmes, because I made reference to the rapid technological changes which are taking place in the world and which are bound to affect us in one way or another, and so that one of the ways in which we have got to be able to approach this is that added to what we are doing here in terms of providing some wherewithal for a limited period for people who might find themselves out of work, we have got to develop training and retraining programmes for people so as to enable them to fit into meaningful jobs within the society, and this point of course was not taken up by the members of the Government.

I think this is a fundamental point which is allied to the content of the Resolution we have here.

The member for St. Michael South Central reiterated the point which I made at the beginning also about the need for trying to establish an agency which would be able to monitor the unemployment situation and to monitor jobs as they are created within the society and which would be able to place people into these jobs, so that it is a total package, not only one dealing with the provision of unemployment benefits to workers but it also has to do with training and retraining, and at the same time having some kind of monitoring system on the job placements within the society, so that you will see very clearly that this is a matter which has very wide and far-reaching implications.

As I have indicated, the Resolution as it originally stands makes the point very clear, and we see no reason for accepting the amendment to the Resolution particularly in view of the fact that the Hon. Minister of National Insurance has said that this is already being

undertaken, and we are submitting that it would be very foolish to pass a Resolution calling on the Government to do something that according to the Minister the Government is already pursuing.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, this amendment which we are discussing at the moment, in my view, stems from the kind of contempt in which the Government of Barbados holds the masses of people in this country and the kind of game which they are prepared to play in relation to a serious Resolution of this nature.

We on this side have pointed out that this is not merely an emotional commitment to a particular social benefit but that this Resolution stems from a long series of policies which culminated in the national insurance provisions in this country, and the benefits that stem from that. We also pointed out that in our view unemployment benefits for persons insured under the national insurance scheme was but a further logical extension of that scheme. Every speaker, both on this side and on the other side, has indicated that it will be necessary, it would be the duty of any Government to make sure that as one of its important administrative steps that an actuarial study would be done of the feasibility to introduce any such scheme. Indeed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, not only would an actuarial study be very necessary, but there are many other administrative steps that would have to be taken. For example, on a previous occasion I have mentioned that it would be necessary to introduce effective employment agencies in Barbados. I have stated that it would be very necessary to introduce effective placement services, because no unemployment benefit scheme can function purely on the basis of having established the feasibility study, determined the level of contributions that would have to be made, determined the type of funding, whether part of the general fund or part of a separate fund, unless at the same time as part of that very study you consider how it is that you will be able to determine when a man ceases to work for one reason or another and is eligible for benefits under the provisions of the particular unemployment scheme, that he can be placed in a suitable job.

3.40 p.m.

So that the inclusion of the business of an actuarial study in the substance of an important Resolution of this kind is just making nonsense of the whole Resolution and this is why we are not prepared to accept it. The question of whether or not an actuarial study is done, and of whether or not various other administrative steps are taken is a problem for the Government; but indeed every speaker on the other side has said he accepts the Resolution in principle; they cannot say otherwise. But when it comes to the question of taking that statement to its logical conclusion and indicating their full support for

this kind of Resolution, then we get this kind of inept amendment being presented. I wonder what kind of assessment they have made of this side, and indeed it becomes even more inept when we consider that the Minister responsible for National Insurance has assured this House that she has already given instructions about the actuarial studies being conducted in the Ministry of Health. I presume it is an actuarial study for the assessment of the health of the national insurance operation today and she has given additional instructions to look at the question of unemployment benefits under a National Insurance Scheme. How on earth will it make sense for anyone in this House to give consideration to this kind of amendment which is purely a face saving device? Indeed, arising out of the discussion the hon. member for Christ Church East made a very useful contribution in the sense that he suggested that social welfare benefits and all sorts of promises should be related to productivity and the capacity of the economy to disburse benefits of this nature. It is regrettable that he did not have the opportunity to contribute to the writing of the Barbados Labour Party's 1976 Manifesto, otherwise it would appear that the situation would have been a bit different. Indeed, the hon. Leader of the House in his usual post-prandial exuberance wondered how we would pay for these unemployment benefits; and he wondered whether or not we were saying to this Honourable House that we should borrow money to pay people who were unemployed. We made no such suggestion. Every member on this side of the House and on the other side made the point that the scheme would be limited to those who were insured, and I presume that since we all stressed the concept of an actuarial study, by implication it suggested that the scheme would pay for itself or else the monies would be allocated from some other source. But that is just a matter for those who have the duty to look after the people of this country for the short period until 1981 or sooner. (*Asides.*) We are talking about a revolution in thinking, and whether there are 36 or 60 in the new Assembly the results will be the same, no matter how many Ministers of Constitutional Affairs may be appointed between now and then.

And so Mr. Deputy Speaker, we feel that this is a very necessary step at this stage, and I emphasise that the step has become even more necessary because of the policies of the present Government in not being able to solve the unemployment problem of this country and even more important those decisions stemming from victimization in political life that has resulted in such a large number of people who have contributed for years to the National Insurance Scheme in this country being put out of work. However, as we said, this is not the kind of Resolution in which we will want to score party political points, because as I said when I spoke on a previous occasion, we have always felt that there were certain basic assumptions shared by both sides of this House on the basis of the democratic society in which we live; and part

of those assumptions would be that if a man is temporarily unemployed for one reason or another, there should be something coming in to bridge the gap. We also probably share the belief that the State is responsible for ensuring that every person born in a country finds suitable employment, and therefore if for one reason or another this does not happen, then I think the logical extension of that belief must be that the State has a duty to reduce the hardship consequential on unemployment.

So serious is our Resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we will not brook this kind of treatment, and indeed I would feel that it would be negligent on our part if we allow this kind of political gamesmanship to be introduced into this piece of legislation. Indeed, we would invite the other side to reconsider their position and recognize that what is inserted as an amendment is purely an administrative step. And we will take them at their word, a word repeated by every speaker on the Resolution, that they accept it in principle and we hope that they will be able, with the assistance we can give the Great Combination, to get this scheme going. Indeed it would be only fitting that the momentum for social development and social benefits for the vast majority of the socially deprived people of this country should not be interrupted after so long: 1967-76 sickness benefits, maternity benefits, invalidity benefits, old age benefits, funeral grants, survivor benefits. Do you not think it is about time after two years that the momentum should be restored and that some new thing be introduced? After all, there is not much more we can add to a National Insurance Scheme. And when we start here and introduce a Resolution of this kind we would have hoped that we would be simply accelerating the process, and the Minister indeed assured us that she has instructed the actuaries to do so.

So I hope that I have been able to take this matter out of the political party arena and at the same time I would be expecting that this amendment be withdrawn and that we get on with the true business of the House since all of us who have spoken on both sides say that we accept the Resolution in principle. I will add that we will be glad to help in any way with the administrative steps.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot understand the contribution of the members of the other side. We are all agreed, and the hon. member who has just spoken concedes that there is a unanimity of outlook and approach between this side and the other side that is very desirable when one of the extensions to the present benefits of the National Insurance Scheme should be a provision for an employment benefit for contributors to the scheme.

3.50 p.m.

What we on this side have seen, on the other side does not seem willing to accept, is that it is impossible in

the present state of the economy of Barbados for any scheme of unemployment benefits to be introduced other than one which is contributory. The other side accepts that fact, but as the Hon. Minister of Health and National Insurance has said, this Government is committed to the next phase of the expansion of benefits under the National Insurance scheme and to health benefits; and already this Government has signed an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank for the technical co-operation and assistance in the form of money to carry out a feasibility study and the projected cost of the health benefits.

I cannot see the argument on the other side. I know that the other side is trying now to introduce a red herring across the trail by trying to project into the public's mind, do not mind Health; that is not important. Let us get unemployment insurance. That is what the hon. member....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. No one on this side has even mentioned anything about health benefits under the National Insurance Scheme. Where a certain reference was made to sickness benefits, it was to the previous benefits; so I think that that statement is not in order.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Health and National Insurance was very specific and careful, and she pointed out that our experience with National Insurance was that there was a time lag between the conceptualisation of benefits to be received and the economics of working out the cost of the levies and things of that kind. She was at pains to point out that it was her own father who first conceptualised the scheme for National Insurance in Barbados, and had the Stockman Report from the time of the regime of the Barbados Labour Party; and yet it took five years before the Democratic Labour Party could approach. She spoke logically based upon experience and took pains to explain to hon. members that at the present moment this Government was committed to the next expansion of health benefits and agreed with the necessity for unemployment insurance, but that these must be phased in after Health, and we did not see that it was possible to do that before a certain time frame; and that is why from this side we accept the principle, but we would say that it would have to go to the actuarial investigation. What is wrong with that? You are using the benefit of experience. We have accepted the principle; and then we are going to be accused because we are realists; because we draw to the attention of the other side our experience, we are being accused of playing a game. There is no game in this. Health is next.

I will tell you why Health is next. At the present moment, under the existing law, people who are unemployed do have some relief in the form of national

assistance; but the health needs of this country are greater than those which would be necessary for the unemployed. So we must tackle the most urgent problem first; and we are not going to be moved. We are not going to be diverted. Health is going to be first and unemployment thereafter. As the Hon. Minister has pointed out, you have to consider the question of unemployment benefits in relation to severance payment because none of the hon. members on that side has yet adverted to the point that she made that if you have a severance payment scheme which is already giving benefits which are granted under the National Insurance Scheme in terms of delegation from the Minister, that to that extent that severance when paid is a mitigation of the impact of unemployment; and all hon. members have never denied that. They cannot deny that.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order. Would the Leader of the House admit that every person in a job and who became unemployed does not qualify for severance pay?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member obviously has not fathomed what I said. What I said was that to the extent that you are unemployed because of severance that your situation is mitigated by the amount of payment that you get under the severance scheme. What has that to do with people who are unemployed and out of the severance payment scheme? We are not talking about unemployment outside of severance. I particularly said that to the extent that you were unemployed caused by severance, that your situation was mitigated.

I do not understand how hon. members cannot agree with the amendment. Perhaps I have not followed it. The Hon. Minister was very careful in pointing out that in dealing with unemployment benefits there was a variety of causes of unemployment; and that already under the scheme of severance payment you had a provision for unemployment benefits.

I go further and say that under the existing law severance is covered. National assistance benefits also mitigate the impact of unemployment; and I say that of the two of those, as a matter of priority, health is more important; so that our conscience is clean; and for the information of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the Barbados Labour has nothing at all to fear about social welfare concepts, absolutely nothing to fear. This was the political party that laid the foundation and centralised the starting and implementations of social welfare in Barbados. Our historical record is good; and since we have been in power for the second time — hon. members on that side have only been in power for the first time, and they may never be so again in the future — since we have been in power for the second time we have carried on our conception of using

the power of the state, especially through legislation to ensure and to see that there is a re-distribution, and that there is a minimum standard of living below which nobody in this country will fall.

We have increased and enlarged the number of old age pensioners. We have reduced the qualifying age; and next year, we will be granting pensions to people irrespective of the income of the other partner in the household, something which the hon. members on the other side had 15 years to implement. We will move into Health and we will move into unemployment benefits thereafter.

4 p.m.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Question is that the words proposed to be left out stand part. All those in favour please say 'aye', those against please say 'no'. (Pause) I declare the 'noes' have it.

Mr. GREAVES: Divide. (Pause) On a point of order, are you in some trouble as to what you should do next? I called for a count; I do not understand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: A division has been called for.

The Question that the words proposed to be left out was put and resolved in the negative the House dividing as follows:—

Noes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. ODLE and Mr. GREAVES. — 11.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House is voting on the.....

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what are we voting?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, a member is entitled to vote against his own motion, let him vote "No."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All hon. members who are in any difficulty, please check Standing Order 25(3).

(Clerk called Dr. Haynes.)

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on what are we voting, the motion or the amendment?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. The question has already been put. If you are in any difficulty please look at Standing Order 25(3).

(Clerk called Dr. Haynes.)

Mr. GREAVES: Before the votes are recorded Sir.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. Lucy please take his seat. If there is any difficulty please read for yourself Standing Order 25 Rule 3. May we have some order please.

Mr. GREAVES: From the explanation of the Clerk, I want to change my vote to yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

Dr. HAYNES: On the explanation offered to me my vote is "yes" and it looks as though the joke is on the other side.

The question that the words of the proposed amendment be there inserted was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. ODLE — 10.

NOES: Mr. GREAVES and Dr. HAYNES — 2.
4.10 p.m.

RESOLUTION RE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN ST. LUCY

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am asking for leave to postpone this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The next Item stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, who is not now in his place.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is not in his place and I ask that the matter be postponed.

RESOLUTION RE REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COM- MISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Item No. 5 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Philip North.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not ready to proceed with that today and I crave the House's indulgence to defer the matter.

RESOLUTION RE NATIONAL APPRENTICESHIP SCHEME

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the hon. member for Christ Church East.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg leave to defer consideration of this matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That ends Private Members' Business for today.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Government Business is now resumed.

When the sitting was suspended, Order No. 6 was being discussed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I think the question was about to be put, but really I think I have said all I have had to say on the matter. We have reached an amicable agreement. I hope I have cleared up — I do not think there was any misunderstanding to clear up about the police, but if there was a misunderstanding, I have cleared it up.

The only thing that was drawn to my attention was that I should give some indication of when we can expect the Resolution appropriating the funds for the salary increases. I cannot promise them within the next three weeks, but it is very much hoped that before the end of next month we will come down with Resolutions for the appropriate funds to pay the back-pay from 1st April, and I expect that early in November civil servants will be able to get their back-pay, and I hope that they will hearken to what I have said about not going on a consumer-spending spree at this time. Go to the banks, repair your house, build on some more house if possible.

There is just one further note that should be made; there would be no Christmas advances this year in light of the fact that in effect the raise of pay for seven months will become payable during November so there will be no Christmas advances at this time. I do not think anybody would expect that.

Hon. members on this side have suggested that the Daily Press is so given to representing Government policy at its lowest common denominator that they would be inclined to headline not that civil servants get an increase of pay by agreement and that they will get their money in November, but that there will be no Christmas advances. I do not believe that the representatives either of the broadcasting organisation or of the Daily Press will carry distortion to the effect of summarising an entire debate with an able contribution by the representative of the Barbados Workers' Union who sits in the House and an important contribution made on this side, it is not for me to judge whether it was able or not, I do not believe that the Press would be so degrading as to think that that was the only matter of substance. The matters of substance surely are that for the first time in many years

the Government has been able to reach agreement with the Workers' representatives, that the economy has recovered sufficiently to allow for a modest increase for public servants, and that industrial peace has been restored in the public sector, that civil servants are not leaving Government employment as they have been accustomed to in the past, and that we do not have some of the difficulties to contend with which we had this time a year ago.

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

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, a number of notices have now arrived which had not arrived earlier, and I would ask leave that the subject "Government Notices" be reopened so that we can give notice of them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If there is not objection leave will be granted.

There being no objection, leave is granted.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U.S. \$67,000 to be borrowed from the C.D.B. to assist in financing the costs of services of Consultants for completing a study of Planning and Development of Speightstown.

Resolution to approve the use of the sum of U.S. \$3.44 million to be borrowed from the C.D.B. to assist with the financing of the Governments Industrial Development Programme.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$135,000 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79 Part I — Current as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79 No. 9 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

Hon. DeL. O. BRADSHAW: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:—

Resolution to amend the note to Item 17 — Head I — Post Office of the 1978-79 Annexed Estimates.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$10,255 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Annexed Estimates,

1978-79 as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79 No. 3 which form the Schedule to this Resolution.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE SUM OF U.S. \$10.0 m. FROM ORION BANK LTD.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 stands in the name of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, in my Financial Statement and Budgetary Proposals presented in the House on 12th April, 1978, I announced that the main thrust of the Government's fiscal policy would be the progressive achievement of fiscal balance through selective reductions of the level of public expenditure combined with judicious foreign borrowing rather than by large increases of revenue through increased taxation. I am quoting there. I know it is a debate of this session and I do not think Your Honour would object to that but I then proposed that such borrowing would be as far as possible contracted on favourable terms from international financial institutions of which Barbados is a member such as the Barbados Development Bank, the Inter American Development Bank and the World Bank. 4.20 p.m.

We have pursued such borrowings and we have been very fortunate in being able to formulate projects that have attracted concessional terms of finance from these institutions. A moment or two ago I gave notice of the borrowing of \$6.8 million in Barbados currency from the Caribbean Development Bank for the financing of factory construction. Here I would like to pay a public tribute to the hon. member for Christ Church East, the Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation, that the areas for which he has responsibility have been such as to persuade us that we are really at the beginning of a boon in manufacturing, industry and other activities carried on in the projects sold to industrialists by the IDC. It is worthy of mention, Mr. Speaker, that I was able to announce at a Press Conference held recently in Montreal on the occasion of the meeting of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers that in at least one small country, Barbados, our manufacturing exports now exceed our agricultural exports, and indeed I think I am correct in saying that the United States is now our largest trading partner, the largest receiver of exports from Barbados.

We have also been able to persuade the Inter-American Development Bank that a number of projects are worthy of concessional finance, we have been able to re-start the polytechnic project with the IADB — that is a matter of history — we are pursuing with the Inter-American Development Bank a rural integrated

agricultural development scheme and we of course have been able to get 90% of the way there for the formalities of the infrastructural development by way of roads and these do not exhaust the projects which we are discussing with the Inter-American Development Bank. Other areas that we are now pursuing include the development of petroleum resources particularly the expansion of the distribution of natural gas in the island.

I can pass on to the House without comment certain remarks which were made recently to me by a Director of the World Bank. It was indicated that a new breath has appeared in the proposals which are made for World Bank financing of projects from Barbados, and we are discussing a number of these projects with the World Bank. I have meeting with the Bank later on this week in Washington at which a number of matters that I have already stated I will not really be able to advert to until my return, if even then, will be discussed. But concessional finance will not by itself be able to fill the entire financing gap in the capital projections which we have for the projects of Government now underway, and in addition it is considered desirable that some part of the financing of the foreign exchange part of these development projects should be financed from other foreign borrowing to be raised on straight forward commercial terms. At the time of the Estimates the overall deficit of Government was projected to be \$121.7 million Current and Capital. It was considered, as I said in the Budget, that this was a task beyond the Government, we could not carry a deficit as then thought of more than \$100 million, and I still think that \$100 million is an amount beyond which we should not seek to go. At the time of the Estimates Current Expenditure was approved in the amount of \$295 million, Capital Expenditure \$84½ million, making a total spending of Government projected at that time of \$379.6 million. Revenue was approved only at \$257.9 million and prudent management, Mr. Speaker therefore dictated that the deficit be reduced, and after consultation with all concerned instructions were conveyed to accounting officers setting new limits for public expenditure during the current financial year, so that the latest projections indicate that Capital Expenditure will be in the order of \$74 million instead of \$84 million voted at the time of Estimates, while Current Expenditure, the limit I imposed was \$287 million but I think \$290 million may be nearer the mark by the time we reach the end.

The reduction in Capital Expenditure from the voted limit is of course nothing new. The previous Government regularly used to vote say, sixty or seventy million dollars for Capital and spend only thirty five or forty. What we are attempting to do is to set realistic targets, bring Capital budgeting more into line with reality. With this in mind, Sir, I have prepared a project list which I will be glad to show to the Leader of the Opposition if he wishes indicating Capital works in

progress towards which the current loan will contribute. I will deal with those a little later on after I have said some things about the loan itself. We had various offers for the commercial loan which we intended to raise this year and of the options available to Government — and believe me, Sir, we could have chosen from a number of options — we had offers of funds from Arab resources, we had offers of funds from persons who indicated how good they were at fund raising, but bearing in mind the unfortunate experience of the previous Government many years ago with a Trinidad-based organisation headed by — the Leader of the Opposition will remember the name, a very good friend of his — based on the failure of those attempts after large sums of money were paid out to the Trinidad entrepreneurs restricted somewhat our areas where we searched for the funds. An offer was made to us by the Morgan Guaranteed Trust — this was made when I attended the Inter-American Development Bank meeting earlier this year in Vancouver — and an offer was made by the Orion Bank which is the consortium of the Royal Bank and of German and of British interests. We have already discussed some of this in here, Government is satisfied that the offer from the Orion Bank represented the best available on the market at this point in time, and we have accepted it.

Again, I can make available to the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes to see it, a comparison between the Morgan Guaranteed Trust offer and the Orion Bank offer, but this obviously is of a confidential nature, so I am not going to refer to its terms in the House. They were the only two offers which we considered seriously, and, as I say, we committed ourselves to the Orion Bank. 4.30 p.m.

In this particular case one of the attractions of the Orion Bank loan is that we can draw down as we require. Funds will be paid to the Central Bank account at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and the Central Bank will then provide credit for the Consolidated Fund to the extent of the monies which it receives in New York. Repayment on the loans are to be made by eleven equal consecutive semi-annual instalments, each one-eleventh of the amount outstanding. There is a grace period of twenty four months after the date of the first drawing, and we expect to draw down some portion of the fund before the end of the year.

The final point I would like to clear up is a matter that has been the subject of some contention about the nature of certain foreign currency reserves carried by the Central Bank. Anybody familiar with the various Central Bank Reports will be aware that there are such things as official reserves and general reserves. People who have access to this information will also be aware of the Consolidated Fund which effectively is the bank account of the Government at the Central Bank.

Now I want to make a point about foreign reserves. In a certain sense the foreign reserves belong to all of us; they are not the Government's own funds and they do not necessarily represent a fund on which the Government can draw at any given moment for a particular activity. I remember some years ago a statement appeared relative to the last Civil Servants Salary revision in the middle of the negotiations being conducted the present Leader of the Opposition who was then Minister of Finance, and the newspaper published that the Minister of Finance was concerned that if he gave civil servants all they were asking for he would have to pay them out of the foreign reserves; and the Minister of Finance quite correctly had a denial published in the Advocate-News paper. The situation is still like that today, although he seems to have forgotten it; the transition from Minister of Finance to Opposition backbencher at the time seemed to rob him of his grasp of monetary affairs. The foreign reserves are there to finance all foreign purchases by Barbadians. When you want to buy a stove or a refrigerator, the merchants have to apply to the Central Bank to bring them in, and the Central Bank's response to the merchants is contingent upon foreign reserves being available to back the flow of funds outwards from Barbados. So the foreign reserves, although they may be held by the Central Bank — and the Central Bank has investments in Tokyo, in Frankfurt — I hope it has some in Sterling now that sterling is rising — and backed by these it finances the foreign spending of all Barbadians. The Consolidated Fund is a different matter altogether. The dear old lady who wrote to me this week and said that the Governor of the Central Bank had stated that Barbados had a surplus of \$35 million, so why not pay her her income tax refund, is mistaken. The Government's surplus on foreign balance is not available to pay income tax refunds, any more than it is available to the Minister of Finance to pay civil servants. So when the Trinidad loan was drawn down, it is regrettable that someone who had held the position of Minister of Finance did not have a sufficient grasp of the situation to realize that that was purely a Central Bank function and that no funds out of the Trinidad facility ever found their way into the Consolidated Fund to be available to pay civil servants. Trinidad money came to Barbados as a facility and it was invested by the Central Bank — I cannot tell you where; but no corresponding sum was paid into the Consolidated Fund.

Now in the situation of the loan currently under consideration, when the funds are paid into the Central Bank account in New York, a corresponding sum will be paid into the Consolidated Fund and will be available for the Government to use. That is the difference between this loan and the Trinidad facility,

and all hon. members and members of the public who take an interest in public financing would do well to bear in mind the distinction between the Central Bank's private finances in which it is free to get credits from overseas holders of non-Barbadian funds and between the Government's finances in which the Central Bank acts as banker to the Government. The Central Bank has its reserves and those reserves do not necessarily correspond to money in the Consolidated Fund which is the Government's bank account at the Central Bank. You, Sir, must have a bank account. I have a bank account but nobody will suggest that because my modest bank account at the Bank of Nova Scotia is held there that if the bank of Nova Scotia has \$400 million I am in a position to pay out \$400 million to anybody. Broadly speaking, the Government has an account at the Central Bank and the Government can pay out only what is in that account. It cannot pay out the reserves of the Central Bank. I know there is some confusion in the public's mind; I believe that following the experience of another place the Leader of the Opposition has had the opportunity to resolve such confusion in his own mind. He owes it to this House and to the public to indicate that he was mistaken on the earlier occasion and indicate that he did not know or understand that the Trinidad loan had never been made available in cash to the Government of Barbados itself. And as far as the Orion Bank is concerned, I would like to state here and now that the monies from the Orion Bank are being made available to Barbados for its capital projects and I will tell the House what major capital projects are expected to get underway before the end of this financial year. The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic is expected to spend \$1 million between now and March; Barbados Marketing Corporation's new facilities \$800,000; the new access road to the Flour Mill planned by the former Government and unfortunately being built in our time — I say unfortunately because the wrong road was started; they planned the wrong road and we have to build another at the cost of \$700,000.

4.40 p.m.

The Spring Garden Road, Sir. Before the end of the financial year we are expecting to spend \$100,000 on the Spring Garden Road itself. We will spend more than that on the section between Fontabelle and Exmouth; and the Government Analyst Laboratory that is to be built at Flodden, Sir. All of this money is coming from the Government. We would spend \$800,000 on that before March. The Ministry of Agriculture's new office — I have been out of the island for a week or so. I heard a voice behind me saying that the tender has been awarded. I would like to see it started. We are expecting to spend \$1.8 million on that before the end of the financial year.

We are having an expansion at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation — a new building and an improved television service for the Corporation. New and larger buildings and new equipment, and we expect to spend \$1½ million on that in this financial year. Youth Town — we are going to rebuild Youth Town in Bridgetown at a cost of \$200,000 before the end of the financial year. A great deal of fun was poked at the Attorney General in respect of his, I thought, very excellent dissertation on the new subsidiary urban development in Barbados. Well, Sir, the new town at the St. George's Glebe which is to be developed in collaboration with the Anglican Church — the projections are that we will start this year and spend \$800,000. On the Oistin Fisheries Scheme, we will also spend \$800,000 during the balance of the financial year. The sewage scheme — the note is that we should spend \$1½ million before the end of March.

The pulverisation plant in St. George, Sir, the equipment for which was hanging around rusting for two years under the previous regime — we expect to spend \$800,000 on that during the financial year, out of a total of \$2½ million. The polyclinics, Sir? The plans for these were held up in the Ministry of Health and we found that no action was taken, and that the European Development Fund agencies complaining that the Government of Barbados had not drawn down the funds assigned to it. I found that they were languishing and that the European Development Fund agencies were complaining. We spent the funds on Litchfield. We have nearly completed the centre at Black Rock up to the proposed standard, and we are moving towards clinic at Oistin and Wildey; and another \$800,000 will be spent before the end of the financial year.

The Students Revolving Loan Fund, Sir — we expect that we will have cause for \$100,000. The general scheme of credit to farmers — the Agricultural Credit Scheme — we expect another \$100,000 to be disbursed. Industrial Estates, Sir, we expect to carry on factory construction to the tune of \$600,000; and it has not been fully announced that we are carrying on a major new World Bank project on Education which is designed to provide full educational facilities for all Barbadians who can reasonably be expected to be of eligible age by the end of the 1990s, Sir. It is proposed to have new primary schools to replace schools which are out of date at present. The Minister of Education is not here; and in due course a full statement will be made to the House on where we expect to put the new schools, Sir, but at least we hope to spend at least \$100,000 on that before the end of the year.

The continuing work at the airport will absorb \$1½ million in the next few months; and the Holiday Village at Heywoods which is being held up by a legal wrangle. Apparently the former Government which had

entered into an agreement to purchase land from Golden Mile Limited ignored the fact that Golden Mile Limited had not carried out instructions and had only partly carried out the instructions that speak of the building of a road. The road has been declared to be sub-standard, and before we can complete the project, there will have to be either a law suit or a settlement to reflect the cost to the Government of bringing the roads and drainage up to a proper standard; but despite this, at least we are projecting \$1 million in expenditure on the Golden Mile Holiday Village.

The total of the amounts that I have read out to the House is \$14.57 million and I will just mention that the bulk of the expenditure on these projects will occur after March 1979, so the House had better brace itself next year for really substantial capital expenditure since the projections of the public investment unit of my Ministry are that in the second half of 1979 we may spend three to five times as much as the amount which they have estimated from September this month to March next year. Be that as it may, Sir, the planning and priorities committee of this Government, the Cabinet, has met and set out these particulars. Again I can let the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes to have a look at the documents submitted to me in respect of these projects. If he wishes, he is very welcome to study it and to analyse which of the projects are continuing and which of the projects are new. I do not think that he will find that the new Government has a bad record in the conceptualisation of new projects, Mr. Cameron Tudor notwithstanding. The document is available; and I think that the House will have little difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the Orion Bank Loan and the purposes to which it would be put to represent a useful development for the economy of Barbados, and supporting this Resolution which I beg to move do now pass.

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, right at the outset, I do not intend to enter into any conspiracy with the Prime Minister and the Ministry of Finance who, several times during his delivery, said that he would allow the Leader of the Opposition to see this, and that he would allow the Leader of the Opposition to see that. It means that if I were not the Leader of the Opposition, and the lately departed member from the Chamber was Leader of the Opposition, that I as a member of the House would not be able to see the information, or even you, Mr. Speaker, would not be vouchsafed the information which I feel that Your Honour is entitled to see. I do not wish to see any document that other members of the House....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have just begun to speak.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is on a point of order.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is the channel through whom I convey information which, as members of the House of assembly they should have. If I wish to give something to the Leader of the Opposition privately, I would use the word "privately".

If he did not hear the word privately, or he has not been written by the Cabinet Secretary to say on a confidential basis, he may assume that he can show it to members on the other side.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not assuming anything from the hon. member. Apart from my official statutory duties I want to inform him as a member of this House that I do not want to see anything from him, if you, Mr. Speaker, or no other members of the House cannot see it at the same time or even before I see it if I am not in my place. So, if we are going to have open Government, let us here and now on the floor of this House stop this conspiratorial atmosphere that he is trying to create here today, and that there is some special club in which only Ministers of Finance and ex-Ministers of Finance are entitled to membership. He has told me now that I can assume that when he says that he will allow the Leader of the Opposition to see something that he means that I can show it to my colleagues; but I just want to establish it here and now as a matter of principle that firstly if the Government does not have the time to print the development plan, if they have something new they should have the courage to put it in the development plan. That is the first point I wish to make. They have had two full years — that is 24 months. If they have a development plan, they should say so now.

4.50 p.m.

They have had two full years, which is 24 months. If they have any ideas for the economy of Barbados, if they have any new ideas, if they have any continuation, extension or improvement on the existing development plan it is their duty to come before the House with a comprehensive scheme and say we intend to carry out such and such a programme and we intend to finance it in such and such a manner.

What we are being treated here with today is a statement from the Minister of Finance and Hon. Prime Minister to the effect that we are doing this and we are doing that. I have made a careful list of all the things he says he intends to do with this money which he has got from his friend in the Orion Bank. He has said that

there was some scheme in Trinidad that some friend of mine had set up.

I just want to make it clear that the West Indies Stock Exchange is an Institution in the Island of Trinidad and it is not headed by any friend of mine. The Barbados Government raised a loan which I came on the Floor of the House for and he himself and the National Bank are now trying to do what the Stock Exchange has been doing successfully for the past 10 years. Therefore, we did raise the money through the West Indies Stock Exchange and I did come on the Floor of the House and got approval for the loan, so do not say we did not do it in Barbados.

The West Indies Stock Exchange has also financed several things, but I am not concerned about what happens in Trinidad and Tobago. One of the present Ministers of Finance in Trinidad, Mr. Mervin DaSouza is a prominent member of the West Indies Stock Exchange, and no friend of mine has ever been chairman of the West Indies Stock Exchange. The representative of the West Indies Stock Exchange in Barbados was the General Manager of the Chase Manhattan Bank in Barbados. Anyhow, I do not want to waste time on that, but do not let us make those snide remarks about friends and being unsuccessful.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir I object to the expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for St. John please contain himself. I take it that you are too mature to notice him.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I object to the expression of snide remarks and dirty insinuations. All hon. members now present in the House, if you want to talk about dirty insinuations, would remember that when the West Indies Stock Exchange loan fell through and the hon. member for Christ Church South Central attacked Mr. Bruce Procope the Leader of the Opposition got up and said that he was only attacking him because.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Prime Minister please take his seat. The Hon. Prime Minister has made his point. I want to say this to the hon. member for St. John, I am relying on you to make your contribution in the way I think you should be able to develop a contribution to the debate of this House. Please do not invite and I would not be able to allow these kinds of heated exchanges. They will not be carried on in here.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I just wanted to set the record straight that the Government in Barbados

raised a loan through the West Indies Stock Exchange and it was not headed by any friend of mine.

Mr. SPEAKER: You have already made that point. It need not be repeated. Get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You said that....

Mr. SPEAKER: I will not allow the hon. member for St. John to be heckled.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Why are you rubbing in on your colleague like that?

Mr. SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The point I was making is this and it is a very simple one. We have a Resolution here for a sum of money. The hon. member at various points punctuated his speech saying that he would allow the Leader of the Opposition to see this and he would allow him to see that. What I am saying is this, Sir, if they have a programme they should do what my Government did, publish a programme in a development programme and set out as we have set out from time to time, how you are going to finance this programme so that it is there for all to see. But the truth of the matter is, if you go through the list, there is nothing wrong in borrowing money to carry out capital projects. I never objected to that. I always did that because I had always maintained that future generations should contribute towards the cost of development in this Island. I have always maintained that.

I have nothing against the Orion Bank. The hon. member knows that he only came to know about the Orion Bank because the Orion Bank had offered to lend money to the Government of Barbados when I was Minister of Finance and I did not need it, just in the same way I turned down the Trinidad loan which was for the shrimping trawlers. I do not want to go into that because it has been the subject of an enquiry in another place. If he wants me to go into it chapter and verse and tell about various exchange resources I can bring documentary proof that that money was not intended for any foreign exchange resources, but because they were ashamed, and I do not want to start talking about the trawlers now because the people of Barbados are very perturbed after the big allegations made that they were the only Government to execute an agreement with the Government of Brazil. Millie and everybody else has gone to Brazil and some are coming back and not coming back alive. Millie did not come back alive either, but we are not going into that now.

The hon. member knows Lord Cassia was the head of the Orion Bank. He came down here and he saw me.

Or you did not even know that? (*Aside.*) You did not know that and you went to England.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Tell him that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am going to warn (a) the hon. member for St. John and (b) any other member from this side who is...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: (a) is over there and (b) is over here.

Mr. SPEAKER: But remember the hon. member for St. John told this House that the people at the Orion Bank were the friends of the present Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes you did. The record is there and we can check it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There is nothing obnoxious about that, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us get on with the debate please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was not trying to insinuate....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please leave out the cross talk and let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not quite understand the remark about being friends of the Orion Bank.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am saying that the hon. member knows....

Mr. SPEAKER: You said he borrowed from his friends at the Orion Bank.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: The Orion Bank is a private bank. I can tell you who all the shareholders are. Lord Cassia....

Mr. SPEAKER: It does not matter who are the shareholders.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But this is the bank Sir, it is important who the shareholders are. Lord Cassia came down here at the time when there was a cricket tour on and he came in and saw me and a consortium was formed. He gave only two of the

shareholders and I am going to give you all. Then after that he sent down Sir Samuel Goldman and Mr. Kelly who said they were interested in development in Barbados. They were impressed with the development taking place in Barbados and I told them thanks very much, we were not in need of any loans, we had our development programme well on the way with all the financing and so arranged through international sources. 5.00 p.m.

He gave only two of the shareholders, but I am going to give you all of them. After that he sent down Sir Samuel Goldman and Mr. Kelley and said that they were interested, in the development of Barbados; they were impressed — I can read it out here — with the development taking place in Barbados, and I told them "thanks very much, we were not in need of any loan, we had our development programme well underway with all the financing and so arranged through international sources at that time." That was in 1974, Sir; this is now 1978. Sir Samuel Goldman had a meeting with me on the 26th April, 1974, and when he went back to London he said the results of the talks were very fruitful and their firm was still of the opinion that Barbados was a good place for them to invest. I am not criticising the Government for borrowing money from wherever they can get it for this kind of purpose; to carry out development in Barbados, yes. I have not heard the rate of interest up to now. All I know is that it is 1 and 5/8% above the London Interbank's Best Offer; so we do not know whether it is going to be 10%, 15% or 28%. We cannot tell, but as Jackie Opel said, you got to pay.

Similarly the loan which we are going to deal with later on from the other bank; I think it is the Royal Bank, the \$2½ million one for the Euro-dollar loan. I think that is between 1½ % and 2½%.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is that before the House now?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It will be shortly.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it before the House now?

Rt. Hon E. W. BARROW: I am just comparing the rates. The shareholders in the Orion Bank are Chase Manhattan Overseas Bank, the Credito Italiano, the Mitsubishi Bank whis is a Japanese Bank, the National Westminster Bank Ltd. which is one of the English big five, the Royal Bank of Canada and the West Deusche Landesbank. The Directors: the Rt. Hon. Lord Cassia and Mr. McFadzean and the Managing Director of course was the gentleman who himself came to see me, Mr. Samuel Goldman at the time. So all this started, even the source of the loan, in 1974, but I did not need it.

But let us get down to what the hon. member says he is going to do with this money. I am trying to shorten it as much as possible. He went through a lot about the Capital Estimates and how Government had said in my time that we were going to spend \$65 million when we had only spent \$37 million; but this year he said at the time of the Estimates he put in \$84 million but they were only going to spend \$74 million, and in current account he is going to keep it down to \$290 million, and he is trying to keep his over-all deficit down to \$100 million. How he is going to do that and pay civil servants another \$20 million which he says they do not need because he tells them they must go in for a saving spree, I do not know. Now if you need money to meet the cost of living, I do not see how you are going to go in for a saving spree; but the additional bill for the civil servants alone which was not contemplated at the time of the presentation of the Estimates earlier this calendar year is another \$20 million, and since then we have had things added on which were not in the Estimates. I would not say it was expenditure which arose ex-improviso. As a matter of fact I think the hon. member has been very ingenious because he has saddled the despositors of what used to the Savings Bank, not the Government's Savings Bank — the Act does not say so — but The Savings Bank of Barbados with paying for a building which the Telephone Company put up for auction twice, this is a fact, with a reserve price of \$600,000, and nobody offered them \$600,000; but the hon. member got the Directors of the Savings Bank to pay them the reserve price of only \$300,000 U.S.; half the amount, but in U.S. He did not have to come to the House for that money, but in his scheme for having a National Bank of Barbados, that was capital expenditure; but it was capital expenditure at the expense of the little man with the donkey cart, the woman with the tray of sweets on her head, the little school children who put their Christmas savings and so on the Savings Bank.

Money was spent out of the Savings Bank to buy the Telephone Company building which was not designed to be a bank, but was designed to hold equipment and machinery, and I do not know what services the Barbados Telephone Co. performed for the hon. member before, during or after the election, but the hon. member felt himself constrained to pay them a price for that building which they had twice failed to get at public auction.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the fact that I am smiling at the filthy insinuations of the hon. member does not make them any the less filthy. Once in here I had to described him and had to withdraw the words, as a purveyor of casual filth. He is living right

up to that description. I submit he must withdraw the insinuations that there were any

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Do not let us have two hon. members on their feet.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Hon. Prime Minister rose on a point of order.

Rt. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member, I submit, must withdraw any insinuations about services rendered by the Telephone Company to anybody. He knows absolutely (a) that it is untrue, and (b) it must not be made, and I submit it must be struck from the record. To accuse an hon. member in effect of bribery on the floor of the House is the sort of accusation that gets a vote of censure based on the member that makes it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not withdrawing anything. I said nothing that has to be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understood you to say you are not withdrawing anything.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because I said nothing that has to be withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said I did not know what services were performed by the Barbados Telephone Company either before, during or after the election that made the hon. member feel that he should pay to them out of the savings of the small people of Barbados a price which they had twice failed to get at public auction. That is what I said. There is nothing unparliamentary about that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you finished?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said you were not going to withdraw anything.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because I have not said anything unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: You said you were not going to withdraw before I asked you to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Because you were not going to ask me to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am now going to call on you to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: To withdraw what?

Mr. SPEAKER: The imputation against the hon. member.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have not made any imputation. I have made absolutely no imputation.

Mr. SPEAKER: No argument, please. The moment I call on you to withdraw....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What words do you wish me to withdraw?

Mr. SPEAKER: The moment I call on you to withdraw, you will withdraw. There will be no argument, no speech no anything.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to know what I am being asked to withdraw. I have been speaking for about twelve minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is simple, the insinuation that you did not know what services the Telephone Company rendered.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say to him. I said I did not know what services they rendered either before, during or after the election.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is exactly what I am saying, that you did not know what services they rendered either before, during or after.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: It may be services to the general public or to Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: There will be no argument. You will withdraw and let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will withdraw that. Now will you make him withdraw where he said that before he even made it

Mr. SPEAKER: Please. We will not be carrying on like this. You will now continue to address the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Now, Sir, I am now addressing the Chair. The hon. member when he got up said that before he was even going to withdraw that I was a purveyor of filth.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the proper thing to have done was this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I got up, Sir, and you asked me to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: The moment the offensive remark was used by the Prime Minister, you should have called on the Chair to have him withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I got up and you asked me to sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER: Just a minute. The proper thing to have done was that....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you remember, Sir, that I got on my feet and said "on a point of order" and you asked me to sit down?

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not remember that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But it did happen though!

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not remember that. I remember that you got up and continued arguing.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. I got up specifically to object to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please do not argue with the Chair. I have ruled that in future you will know and you will remember.
5.10 p.m.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I have been in here 28 years, Sir, longer than you, and I got up immediately, and the hon. member said he knew he would have had to withdraw.

Mr. SPEAKER: You will find that you need more than time in here to learn. Continue to address the Chair, please.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There are new things going on all the time that I will never learn, Sir, in this country and in this Chamber.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will you address the Chair, please?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I will. I am going on with my address now and I am saying that the hon. member paid in Capital projects things that were not in the Estimates. He has come in here today with a loan. The occasion of a loan is no occasion to inform hon. members, even confidentially or otherwise, in a kind of conspiratorial way where even some of his members on

his side were kind of advising him that he did not really have to tell them what he was doing with the money. This is the kind of atmosphere that was prevailing over there today when the hon. member was speaking. I am saying that if they are speaking about open Government, when we had a development programme that development programme was printed and debated, and I want to say this. We have heard in other places that the former Government ran out of ideas, but if we ran out of ideas they never had any because they are still carrying on the ideas that we were supposed to have run out of. We heard this in other places, but what is very interesting and of special significance is that in all the development plans that were brought before this House between 1961 and 1976 they never voted against or put in new material into the development plans. They made speeches about them, but there is not a single record of a dissenting voice against any development plan we brought before the House in the way of a division against a development plan. That is very, very significant, and we got a recital today almost as if we were being done a big favour. I heard voices on that side admonishing the Minister of Finance, suggesting that he should not — it is true that the voice which was loudest in this kind of advice is not generally credited in Barbados for having the most political wisdom, judging from recent events or even in the opinion of the Leader of the Government party of being the most qualified to hold the most important Ministry — but there were voices over on that side advising the Minister of Finance asking him what he was telling them for, but this is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am sure that you can make a speech much better than this instead of just repeating yourself. I am sure the hon. member for St. John is capable of doing better.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But you are just repeating yourself. One repeats oneself to emphasise a point, Sir, and you subconsciously did that to impress upon me in the same way I am trying to impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, and this is normal rhetorical practice, it is not meant to offend the Chair, Sir. As a matter of fact, I think I got that from you, Sir, when you used to be on this side.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us stick to the rules of the House.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: These are the projects which we had from the hon. member. The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic — no comment, Sir. That was the first one. The access road to the flour mill. Now, the hon. member, I heard him say this before even on television, because it is very difficult for me to sort out whether his speeches and his important public announcements are made on the floor of the House or on

television, but the hon. member did say previously on some occasion, whether it was here or elsewhere, that I think it was during a Press Conference — that they had to redesign the road to the flour mill. He said now the cost of this new road is \$70,000. My recollection is that two years ago there was no road built to the flour mill and there was no flour mill built, although we had arranged the financing, we had gone to Maple Leaf of Canada, I signed the agreement, arranged the financing, arranged for the rubble bank to be built which the IADB wanted another four years to study, and as a result the flour mill is going up in the air today. But there was no road down there in September 1976, the construction on the extension of the harbour started in August, 1976, the contracts were awarded some time around about May and the dredging and so was going on apace at that time. Now, for the hon. member not on one occasion but on two occasions to suggest that I or somebody in the Ministry of Finance — preferably a political person, a member of the Government — had put in a road there, which road now had to be abandoned and they now had to spend \$70,000 is a lot of nonsense. Roads drawn out on paper mean absolutely nothing at all. As a matter of fact, the Government had an argument with the contractors in respect of the same area, whereby the contractors were claiming \$1 million for extra work, but if the extra work called for \$1 million that is a matter for them. I do not see what great constructional or political point that is at all. As a matter of fact, I am not even aware of where the location of the road was going to be, because if you have a facility it stands to reason that you have to have some kind of road to get there, but there certainly was no road construction constructed at the time, in September 1976, so there would be no remedial work except in so far as tearing up a piece of paper and putting a new drawing if you want the road to come from a slightly different direction, so he said he is spending \$70,000 on that, but that is money well spent as far as I am concerned.

The next project he mentioned was the Spring Garden Road. Well, they say that Barbadians have short memories. The Minister of Housing, the Minister of Trade of the former Government and myself and several Government officials walked from Land's End not to "John O' Groats" but certainly to Walmerlodge on more than one occasion. I started negotiations with a Barbadian who is now Marketing Manager with Texaco, Mr. Ralph Carter who is a brother of Dr. Carter, about the acquisition of land at Spring Garden in order to put an industrial estate and to bring a road through from Land's End, and it is on the physical development plan which was laid before this House. That was Item No. 3.

So we pass to Item No. 4, the Government Analysts' Lab. Well, I do not know what the priority is on that, Sir, but this has been under discussion for a fairly long time.

5.20 p.m.

But whether it is a priority, I am not prepared to argue on a lab for \$8,000. I do not see how productive that is going to be. The Government analysts that we have had have always had ideas about spending more money on the Government Laboratory, so I will pass that over. Let us say that it is a new project. There are other people who deal with that Ministry who are more qualified than I am to speak on that particular subject, but as far as I know it is nothing new.

Then the hon. Prime Minister went on to say that the Ministry of Agriculture will have new officers for \$1.8 million. Well, you have new Ministers, so you must have new officers. I do not know what that will do for agriculture in Barbados, but we shifted them from Queens Park, sent them up to Codrington, brought them back down to Queens Park and we did not improve agriculture in Barbados. So I hope that when they get these new offices they will get something closer to the hon. member for Christ Church South Central; maybe under his inspiration we will see some improvement. But just let me say this: You know what my view of agriculture is in Barbados? There is only one good Minister of Agriculture, and that is the Almighty. I don't care how many degrees you have, how many qualified technicians you have in the Ministry of Agriculture, if we don't get rain, I don't care how many acres of land you have under cultivation, if the rain is not distributed throughout the area in the right quantities you are not going to get a good sugar crop. So I don't know what the new offices will do for agriculture, but I wish them luck. We have done things at Graeme Hall and I know that sometimes the private sector did better than the Government's planned programme did out of all these facilities that the Canadian Government gave us at Graeme Hall. We wish them luck, but shifting about Ministers and shifting about offices — we changed the Minister of Agriculture too and we got from bad to worse and then back to better; and I don't think they will find any big improvement despite all the protestations and the charm of the hon. member. But this is the luck of the draw. If the hon. member hits a bad year he is going to be a bad Minister of Agriculture. In my opinion they may be a bit overstuffed and that is why they need so many offices. But Barbados is a small place geographically with 106,000 acres of land completely at the mercy of the elements as far as I am concerned. We do not have the reserves of water to carry out a wide scale programme of irrigation — at least we have not yet discovered such reserves.

We will now pass on from the much maligned Ministry of Agriculture with its new faces to the new building for CBC. Maybe that is why they need a new Minister for CBC because they are going to spend a quarter of a million dollars on a service which the users

of that service should be paying for. Anyhow, the Minister has to have something to do and what else would there be for him to do? Supervise the building programme. He says he is not Minister of Propaganda, so if he is not going to be Minister of Propaganda and he is not going to interfere with the public relations people or with the Government Information Services, and there is a building programme for him to walk about looking at, that would be a very good thing. But he is the worst possible person I would put in that position, because I remember that on one occasion when some relatively inoffensive article appeared in one of our prominent journals he wanted to ban the newspaper. And that is the sort of person you are going to put in charge of the Press. But we are not discussing the reshuffling; we are discussing the edifices that the new Minister of Agriculture must have, and new building for the new Minister of Information. This is the most expensive reshuffle we have had, and I don't mean in terms of the disaster that will be done to the economy in Barbados, but I mean in terms of the construction cost in order to accommodate these new personnel. It is the most expensive reshuffle that we have ever had, and I hope that we do not have any more reshuffles for a long time because I do not think the economy can bear it.

We come now to Youth Town — \$200,000. I do not know where Youth Town is going to be, but it is a crying shame. The school which I attended and which I understand belongs to the Methodist Church, where Youth Town used to be, has been allowed to deteriorate to the delapidated condition of what used to be the old Wesley Hall Boys' School at the corner of Sobers Lane and Tudor Street. Somebody ought to be ashamed, either the Government or the Trustees of the church property. But wherever the blame is the point is it is a shame to ask young people in this country, if you want them to attend sewing classes or play table tennis, to have them as much exposed to the elements and to vermin as if they were outside playing in the gutter. So as far as Youth Town is concerned, \$200,000 is not enough. I hope the \$200,000 is not going to be spent on that location, because as far as I am concerned it is totally inadequate both as to size and atmosphere for the kind of activity we would like to see carried on.

The hon. member went on to say that they are going to have a town in St. George. You know what this town in St. George is? Again, I do not know what they owe the Anglican Church. The Anglican Church is one of the biggest property developers in Barbados. They are like the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in London. And I would not like to tell you what the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in London own, because most of us who were students there, although we might not have frequented the area known as Sussex Gardens and Paddington and all around there is owned by the

Ecclesiastical Commissioners and it is not a district with the best reputation. We are more fortunate in Barbados because the Trustees of the Anglican Church have never concerned themselves with low cost or workers housing, but if you go down to a place called Vauxhall in St. James — many hon. members here may not know the area but is immediately past Sandy Lane before you get to Holetown. And a representative of the parish in this House was the first person that started a high class development by selling off Glebe Lands. Then it moved on to St. George where a substantial portion of Glebe Land was sold off; then they moved down to the Church House where we had a Diocesan development and so on. The township or whatever it is in St. George is apparently a further development of the portfolio of the Anglican Church Investment Committee.
5.30 p.m.

The hon. member has told us here today that the Government intends to put \$800,000 into that scheme. Well, I hope that some of the poor people in Parish Land in St. George — there are no poor people living on the Glebe as far as I know. Somebody who lives in St. Michael is going to tell me about the Glebe Land and Parish Land. I notice that when I was speaking about St. James nobody interrupted me; but I am speaking about Parish Land and Glebe Land as being two separate and distinct pieces of property. I have gone through the cane fields many a Sunday morning along Parish Land and along the Glebe on my way to church, having a great great grandfather and a father with interests in the church, and a grandfather who was Churchwarden. I know the people, and I know Parish Land. There are no poor people living at the Glebe.

Parish Land belonged to the Southern District Council. There is no decent road in Parish Land up to now; but I hope that when this development takes place, and the Government is spending \$800,000 on the big scheme, because the architects designed it for the Anglican Church to make money, that there are going to be some working class people and some working class housing sandwiched in between there. I know that perhaps the Hon. Minister of Finance may not want the value of his property to deteriorate too much; but I do not think that he is so completely insulated now by high class housing up in Walkers Development that there is no danger of any encroachment of low class housing in his immediate environment. Everybody will be down below him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you suggesting that in bringing this Resolution the Minister was seeking to protect the value of his own property?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. I am saying that there is the danger that it may deteriorate the value of his property if the project was carried out.

Mr. SPEAKER: If that could have been his motive, you must withdraw it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. I am saying that it might deteriorate the value of his property.

Mr. SPEAKER: You would not argue with the Chair?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Which part of my speech am I supposed to withdraw? It is difficult for me to know, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If you do not know, please take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: What am I supposed to withdraw, Sir? Which part of my speech do you find offensive?

Mr. SPEAKER: I certainly do not want you to stand up talking for the sake of talking.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am speaking specifically on the development in St. George.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not sufficient for you to tell me...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Tell you what, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: That in bringing this Resolution it might seem that he was seeing that the value of his property will not deteriorate.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not say that, Sir. I beg your pardon, but you misunderstood me completely and utterly. I am very sorry.

Mr. SPEAKER: Explain and then withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that I would explain...

Mr. SPEAKER: Whenever you are finished explaining, you will withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Very well, Sir. I concede that anything I might have said in relation to the development of the Anglican Church property might more tend to depreciate the hon. member's property rather than increase it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Nothing of the kind.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: That is what I said, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your insinuation was a direct one in relation to the mover of the Resolution that in moving the Resolution....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: No, Sir. I am sorry that you got it completely wrong. As a matter of fact, I think that he was already completely insulated from any possible effects.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am calling on the hon. member to withdraw.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Do you want me to withdraw my whole speech, Sir? I do not know what I am supposed to withdraw because if you told me....

Mr. SPEAKER: You made an insinuation, and this is the last time I will ask you to withdraw it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I said that if there was an insinuation....

Mr. SPEAKER: No argument with the Chair.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But I do not know what particular words insinuated that; but if there were any such words, I withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: If there were any such words?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes, Sir. You have not pointed out the words to me, and I say that if there are any, I withdraw them.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am not going to try to point them out to you.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I think that we have settled the matter, Sir. The hon. member himself said that we had a pulverisation plant lying down for two years rusty. Now I want to say this, Sir: the pulverisation plant was one which was at a site in Workmans, St. George. This was in respect of garbage disposal. Now, if the hon. member was aware that the pulverisation plant was lying down at Workmans or somewhere else — I do not know if all the parts are at Workmans — if he knew that it was lying down idle for two years, why did he take another two years before he activated it? He is activating it now at a cost of \$800,000 which seems to be the magic word throughout these projections. The Government Laboratory is to cost \$800,000. The St. George's contribution to the Anglican Church development is \$800,000. The Oistin's development, also started by the Government from the European Development Fund — and while I am on that, I want to find out why is it necessary for the padding out of this impromptu development programme.

I cannot see why it is necessary for him to bring the Oistin Development Plan into this when the European Development Plan is committed to a sum of money towards that development itself. Maybe the member for Christ Church has the answer about the local costs. The question of development at Oistin also started with the former Government through the European Development Fund. The hon. member is aware that this was started by our asking the European Development Fund to get interested in funding the development of Oistin as a fishing port.

The pulverisation plant — \$800,000 again. Why if it was rusting for two years has the Government taken two and a half years now to get the pulverisation plant going? No explanation has been given. Now we heard the other day — I think from the Minister of Health — that we never had any plans for polyclinics in Barbados. The other day we heard I think, from the Minister of Health that polyclinics plans have been held up in the Ministry of Health for years. Ministers do not hold up plans. It is Civil Servants who hold up plans; and although we had no plans for polyclinics, we have heard that they were being held up in the Ministry of Health long before they even came into office. So at least let us be a bit consistent about it. The Students Revolving Loan Fund — again this is something that we do not need to talk about because the history of that is a long history going all the way back. The only difference between the Students Revolving Loan Fund then and now is that the Minister of Education felt it necessary soon after he came into office to go to Washington and sign, in the same way that the Minister of Finance himself broke new ground by going up to London to sign this loan for \$10 million from the Orion Bank who came into see me twice at their own expense in 1974. So all the more reason when they are about to consummate what they had come to interview me on, that they should have come down here, and the Minister should never have found it necessary to go to London except from the public relations point of view — I picture going up the plane steps, waving and coming back down the plane steps on arrival and giving a T.V. broadcast. Apart from that the Minister of Finance should not have to go to a banker. The banker should come to the Minister of Finance.

I do not blame the Minister of Education for going up to Washington to see what things are like up there and to sign the Students Revolving Loan Fund; and maybe he could initiate other projects. The Minister of Education found it necessary to take a trip to Washington; and yet I do not have anything to say about that. Industrial estates? I do not have anything to say either on that. World Bank projects on education — This is another project for 1990 and I do not think that I will be in here in 1990. You may be Sir; and you will not even have to use that wig because your

own hair will be that colour and that long by 1990. You will not need that wig at all, so this is in the "never never". The airport — \$1½ million. Well, the airport started so long ago that it is not even necessary for me to remind Your Honour about it, and now they say that there is a legal wrangle over Heywoods. 5.40 p.m.

The only reason Mr. Speaker, why there is a wrangle over Heywoods is because they put Heywoods before the Duffus Commission. They are telling people how we have gone into all this...

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order Sir if the hon. member does not understand the Rules of the House after twenty something years he had better not comment. I want to draw to your attention that the Attorney General has been served with a writ in relation to the Heywoods matter and as I understand it, it is not proper to go into it in detail. I think it my duty to say so. I have been served with a writ and obviously the plaintiff's statement of claim is and our defence is going to be filed, without prejudice discussions going on and I think we should not go into the details on the matter at this time.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was surprised to see the hon. member when he got up. I did not know he was here, and obviously he was not here when the Hon. Prime Minister got up and spoke because the Hon. Prime Minister said they were going to spend \$1½ million — sorry, he did not say how much they were going to spend on Heywoods, but he criticised the last Government....

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us by-pass Heywoods for now.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I was only telling the hon. member that I was not the person who raised it. I did not know....

Mr. SPEAKER: But let us leave that out and go on to something else.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I did not know the hon. member had another writ served on him Sir. I unfortunately cannot contribute towards his expenses because I do not have the where-with-al but I am sure he will be able to settle it in some proper way to his satisfaction. This is all I want to say. (*Aside.*) No, Sir, I could not leave him in mid-air like that. The hon. member would get the impression that I did not care about his predicament.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like the hon. member for St. John to take his seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You want me to sit down Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: No, I want you to make a contribution but not about Heywoods.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: You will be glad to hear that I am now on the home stretch and this is in St. Peter. You will be glad to be on your home stretch in St. Peter but I am on my home stretch now, Sir, I am nearly finish my contribution. The hon. member said that next year there is going to be three or four or five times the amount of capital expenditure and there will be a great accelerated programme. I will end where I began. The proper way in which to present a programme is not to tell us incidentally as a by-product of a Resolution to approve the borrowing of money in London but to come up with a programme and discuss the programme.

I very well appreciate the hon. member's predicament that there was nothing new to discuss. He could not come in here in due honesty and say well this is the Government's development programme because there is nothing new and so he has to support the application form alone with projects which were well defined and well examined and which after two years deliberation they now find themselves in the enviable position to define, consummate, and complete to the satisfaction of all of us we hope.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened with great interest to the long and rambling speech of the hon. member who has just sat down, and it is no surprise to me the content of his contribution. It is fairly obvious that the hon. member is stunned by the magnitude of the projects that the Government now finds itself in the fortunate position to implement and in these circumstances not having anything to criticise, we have to be treated to a recitation of the historical record of these projects.

It is a fact Sir that every Government which succeeds a previous Government finds itself in the position of having to implement a number of projects which were uncompleted during the previous term of office, just as when the hon. member in 1961 when they came into power found a number of projects which were about to be completed, a number of projects which were half-way being completed, and a number of projects which had been conceptualised but the amounts of money and the stage of implementation of the projects did not reach the point where the previous Government was in a position to implement them, so that it is nothing new for successive Governments to have to complete projects. What would have been wrong would have been for us to have said because the previous Government conceived them we would have abandon them.

Our conception of the national interest is not so narrow and petty as the hon. member would like us, and would like the public to believe. We have deliberately

decided to judge the projects on their respective merits modifying and changing some as we have done in a large number of these to suit our own conceptions and to ensure that the taxpayers money is well spent and I will go through the list. The Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic: it was well known that there was a great argument going along within the previous Government as to where to site the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic. The hon. member as Minister of Finance and Prime Minister went on to site it in the flooded area next to the hospital and the reason why.

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member on the files stated that he wanted it sited there in spite of the fact that the foundation would have cost \$6 million to \$16 million, because everybody was uncertain.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir, somebody gave the hon. member the wrong information over there. Pile driving on the site would have cost between \$120,000 and \$180,000. That was the information given to me. Six million was probably not the whole cost of the project, but he cannot add.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: With the greatest respect, for the hon. member to talk about \$100,000 to \$120,000, that would not even cover the cost of the bulldozer to assemble on the site. It would not even cover the Contractors pay for depreciation of the bulldozer. The hon. member said that he wanted it there because we would have high visibility quotient. In other words, he was prepared in an effort to build a monument to himself and his Party to sacrifice taxpayers money to the tune of \$6 million and additional expenses.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But the hon. member cannot say that Sir. He is putting bad motives to proper motives and furthermore, the foundation work of the Polytechnic could not cost \$6 million because the whole Polytechnic cost that Sir and the reason for siting the Polytechnic there was the socio-economic consideration of students having to catch two buses at 10 o'clock at night.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member is asking me to withdraw the words "high visibility quotient" or words to that effect.
5.50 p.m.

I said that despite advice the hon. member was prepared to sacrifice the taxpayers' money.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member rose on a point of order when the hon. member for Christ Church South Central said that he

was prepared to build a monument to himself and sacrifice the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that these words are offensive. He is imputing improper motives to an hon. member.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Are you calling on me to withdraw, Sir?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am not.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Very well, I will go ahead. The cost was well-known. I want to show you how stupid that decision was. This was a stupid decision and I will tell you why. When the previous Barbados Labour Party was considering a site for the hospital, they were advised it would be wrong to site the hospital in that area because of the high cost of flood control measures and they had to buy the Deanery and shift it towards the Bay Street side so as to get at the higher ground. I remember that clearly. I have been in politics long enough and I have a long memory, but the hon. member, despite the advice of professional advisers, was still prepared to use that site because, as he said, it had a high visibility quotient. In other words, he wanted to get maximum political mileage in the centre of Bridgetown, and that is one of the reasons why we had to modify it, because we were not prepared to run the risk of using taxpayers' money to put it underneath the ground and incur the risk of having foundation problems to that tune and magnitude.

You talked about holding up projects; it is your bad planning and the failure to take objective decisions upon independent advice that has held up these projects. In 1971 the Polytechnic project was conceived. In respect of the B.M.C. site, again we had to change the site. Hon. members had picked a site for the B.M.C. underneath a church in St. Thomas, up by Barpac. The land came from Packer.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member is misleading the House. The hon. member must know that the site chosen at Edghill was a result of a specific recommendation by the Caribbean Development Bank, and in the face of repeated efforts to have the site rejected, the Caribbean Development Bank on all counts and each time indicated that it was the proper site, and the hon. member can check with the Prime Minister who must have seen the file and with whom this question has been discussed before.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very glad for the intervention of the hon. member, because they obviously had no persuasive powers because we had absolutely no difficulty in persuading the Caribbean Development Bank that it was the wrong

site and they have agreed to change it to Wildey after we had produced the survey. I do not understand. If the objection was from the Caribbean Development Bank, the same Caribbean Development Bank is now financing it at Wildey after we had produced a survey to show that the vast majority.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the point I made was that the hon. member was misleading the House because he sought to give the House the impression that the site at Edghill was chosen for some other reason and decided by the hon. member. The fact that they are more unscrupulous is neither here nor there; it is totally immaterial. The Development Bank will do anything they say should be done.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: No, no. The hon. member must not indulge in abuse in order to cover up his own deficiency. The hon. member must not tie up himself in a knot so obviously. He is tying up himself in a knot.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, he should be the last person to talk about tying up in a knot. If you heard him on television last night, you should never talk about being tied up in a knot. He is the biggest joke I have ever heard on the other side.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Could we get back to the debate?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member says that they did not want to put the B.M.C. at the Edghill site, but it was because of the insistence by the Caribbean Development Bank that they put it at Edghill, and my reply to that was very simple, that it is quite strange that the Caribbean Development Bank insisted under their regime to put it at the Edghill. Site when we had absolutely no difficulty with the Caribbean Development Bank in pointing out that Edghill was the wrong site; so I do not see the point that the hon. member is making.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the hon. member continues to mislead the House. The point I made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that he was casting aspersions on the hon. member's motivation. He was indicating that we made the decision to put it there in spite of advice to the contrary. He is now doing a sleight-of-hand to suggest some foolishness that they were able to persuade the Development Bank. (*Asides*) You could object from now till tomorrow. Why don't you get up and object too?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member does not object, I am objecting to the use of the words "sleight-of-hand".

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. Will the hon. member for St. Michael South West not shout across the Chamber?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member for St. Michael South West believes that he can shout to people to sit down, he would really get me shouting back at him. I will treat him as he deserves.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, no.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: He must understand that he must abide by the Rules of conduct of this House.

Sir, I am objecting to the use of words that the hon. member might be more unscrupulous than anybody else and using "sleight-of-hand". Those are unparliamentary.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I do not understand it. The basic.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the hon. Leader of the House continuing his speech?

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The position is very clear. It was as a result of our evaluation of a decision which was taken which in our opinion was a bad decision by the previous administration that we enter into negotiation with the Caribbean Development Bank after carrying out a very careful survey to show very clearly that the potential resources of the B.M.C. facilities were situated more in the South of the island than in the North and therefore siting it in the north of the island was in the wrong place, and they agreed with us and that is one of the reasons why the project has not been implemented. I do not know what the hon. member is quarrelling about. (Mr. TAITT: You are shifting the position?) We are not shifting any position; we never had a position because the position was dictated to you.

Now, Sir a number of the other projects that we talked about were projects which were conceived as long ago as 1966 in the Barbados Labour Party manifesto but we were not in a position to implement them until 1976, therefore it would be obvious that as soon as we were in the legislative and political position to implement them that we would elevate these projects into a matter of immediate priority. Again, Sir, when the hon. member over there talked about the question of the access road to the flour mill, he obviously did not hear what was said on this side. The hon. member said that the plan which was drawn up during the course of the time of the Democratic Labour Party by Herkes the engineers for access to the flour mill, now that the flour mill is erected, was found to be an inconvenient method of entry and they had suggested that you had to change the method of entry to

accommodate the flour mill. What is the hon. member quarrelling about? There should be no issue about that. There is nobody trying to say that we reclaimed the land.

6.00 p.m.

Now, Sir, on the question of the Oistins Fisheries Development. The question of the development of the sub-towns in Barbados came out of the Barbados Labour Party in 1966. Check the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto of 1966; I know, I helped to write it. (Aside). Because the Barbados Labour Party conceived the projects as long ago as 1966, that is why you took from 1966 to 1971 to adopt them, because you could not adopt them previously, because you would have thought we would have accused you of using our ideas. That is why you wilfully and deliberately deprived the people of Oistin, the people of Speightstown, the people of St. George and the people of St. Andrew of proper urban planning for so long a period of time, because of your wicked approach, because we originated the ideas and you did not want the people to think that because they were our ideas you were trying to implement them. You tried to sneak them in through the back door in the last days of 1976. It took you all of those years, nine years, you were prepared to hold the people up to ransom not to implement good ideas because they did not come from your brain.

I want to deal also with this question of a lack of plan. I have always said that one of the worst things ever done in Government in Barbados was perpetrated by the hon. member for St. John. He centralised Government in this country to the point that everything was handed down from the Ministry of Finance, but we do not believe in plans being handed down from any demi-god, and that is why we have encouraged the separate sectors to do their own planning and then we will do a comprehensive plan, and we will only do this after the initiative has come from the various sectors. That is why we have a tourism plan, that is why we have an industrial development plan, a health plan, a housing plan, that is why all these plans are being published separately and individually, and each particular year the particular aspects of those plans which come to be financed within that period of time will be the subject matter of a debate in the Estimates, and if the hon. member cannot carry all those things in his head, it is too bad for him, we can conceptualise it and contain all in our heads.

That is the position, there is a big difference in conception, there is a big difference in attitude. You want to have everything in the Ministry of Finance and everybody else as little boys around you. That does not work with this administration, we believe in giving the other Ministries initiative to put forward their ideas, because we believe they have ideas, you believe that

they never had ideas. That is the fundamental distinction. You have not seen them yet, but the projects are coming off the ground one by one and they are adding up. I think there are now seven, eight or nine starting and that is what is worrying the hon. member. It is not the fact that we do not have projects, it is the fact that we managed to get them off the ground, so that the hon. member will understand and appreciate that of course they will take a long time, because we had to try and recapture the economy from the bankruptcy which you had it in.

Now, Sir, other than that, on the question of the education project, the hon. member has always been abusive of the World Bank, the hon. member for St. John has never been able to persuade the World Bank to finance a project at all in Barbados. I am not saying that there are not faults with the World Bank, but the basic position is this, that this Government has been able to persuade the World Bank to finance an educational scheme for primary education and for one secondary school in Barbados, something which the hon. member's Government in all the years of membership of the World Bank has never been able to do. The former Minister of Education made a statement in here previously that they could never get the World Bank to be interested in financing education, and I remember the hon. member for St. George South getting up in here and contradicting the hon. member. He had the facts and figures in his hand, because the former Minister of Education did not know then that the World Bank had agreed as a result of a UNESCO survey and study as to our educational needs. When the hon. member for St. George South shoved the information before him in here the hon. member was stunned. The hon. member has never been able during the course of his time to interest the World Bank in education. As a matter of fact, the only projects that the hon. member was able to get some kind of interest in were the cement project and the Heywoods project, and both projects, as the hon. member in another place and at another time has always said, that if the World Bank had not pushed their mouths into it uninvited the cement project would have been off the ground. (*Aside*). Those were the hon. member's words, I am not misquoting him, he said if they had not pushed their mouths in it uninvited that it would have been started.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to correct the hon. member on one thing. He said we never interested the World Bank in any project except Heywoods and the cement plant. The World Bank had a loan of \$10 million (U.S.) for the sugar industry, and I pointed out to them that the Barbados sugar industry was relatively efficient in so far as factory organisation was concerned, and \$10 million was not going to increase the recovery of sugar in Barbados, and they did another survey and realised that rainfall was the

controlling factor in our sugar production and that our sugar factories were not as inefficient as they had believed them to be, so that was another project they were interested in.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: It is a good thing they did not push their noses deeper in the sugar industry, we would have been a position whereby the peasants in Barbados and the other land owners would not be able to get the factory price that they get now because they would have had to pay the World Bank costs of appraisal and things like that.

Anyway, the basic position of Heywoods is that Heywoods has had to be modified and adapted to suit our own conception of the development of Speightstown as a whole, and the hon. member will understand the logic in this if he looks at it. This Government is pursuing a logical path of development, we do not see Heywoods as one isolated development of Speightstown, Heywoods is part and parcel of a comprehensive development scheme for Speightstown for the northern area, and I hope that the hon. member for St. Lucy will understand and appreciate this and would be very grateful to the Government for this broad conception.

6.10 p.m.

I have no doubt that the projects that have been outlined are good sound projects worthy of a capital development programme and I want to assure the hon. member and the public of Barbados that in the evaluation and choosing of projects we will look to see those projects which are in the national interest of Barbados, and whatever may be the origins of the project, once we have analysed them and found that they will provide employment for Barbadians as a whole, irrespective of origin we will pursue them, and we look forward to the speedy implementation of those projects because we know once these projects get off the ground there will be more employment for Barbadians irrespective of political affiliations. So nothing by the other side can persuade us to change our course or stop us from carrying out our programme.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is very little I can add to the brilliant speech by the hon. member who has just sat down. He has answered all the points and the non-points made by the Leader of the Opposition.

One small matter relating to the World Bank loan to the sugar industry: I am advised that the industry itself did not see the need for the loan. I am now hearing this for the first time and I would certainly reactivate it because I am not satisfied that the sugar industry's provision for renewal of its factory plant is going to be what is needed when the factories can no longer

cannibalize themselves and can no longer improve the efficiency of the few remaining factories by picking up the bits of the old ones. I also do not think that rainfall alone is the only requirement for the prosperity of the sugar industry in Barbados. Having seen the sugar industry in Nigeria where the main areas of producing are the bank of the River Niger, they do not have as much rainfall as we have but they irrigate abundantly and still do not produce as we produce; so I am not at all convinced that water alone is the answer.

The only other thing I think I can reasonably add to the entire debate is a short commentary on the nature of Government's planning. The Opposition is flogging very hard the fact that the projects we are carrying on are projects which were in the stocks. To me this illustrates an aphorism that came into my mind recently. They have spent fifteen years in Government and we have spent fifteen years in Opposition and in two years we can teach them something about Government and in two years they can teach us something about Opposition; because I would never have been so bold-faced as to look at the other side when I first entered this House of Assembly and use as a matter of criticism the fact that even in 1966 they were still carrying on the projects which the Barbados Labour Party had left on the files. A Government when it comes into power cannot stop the projects which it finds going on. We could not stop the development of the airport; we have nothing to be ashamed of in continuing the work at the airport. What the Democratic Labour Party has to be ashamed of in building the hospital or continuing what they found going on at the airport in 1961? But the peculiar talent which has been brought to bear by the Ministry on the current capital works has brought about the corrections to which the Leader of the House refers. So we had to stop the folly of building the Polytechnic on Bridgetown's virtually only area for containing flood waters in the City. There was some nonsense about the piling for \$180,000. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has got his figures wrong — the figure is \$1.8 million for the piling. But that takes no account of the flood control that is necessary to stop Bridgetown being flooded every eight years if you cover Delamere Land with a building. Every time there is a flood Delamere Land absorbs a few feet of water — sometimes as much as ten feet — but it would go into Martindales Road, and those acres there prevent the water from running down Broad Street, because the water would find its way into other parts of Bridgetown if you did not have Delamere Land, Weymouth Playing field, Harrison College playing field to absorb the flood waters. Remember in 1919 the flood waters covered the then Governor's gate at Queens Park so that all you could see was the globe on the top of the gate. And if you put the Polytechnic on the top of where these waters have to gather, ever so often you would have a flood in Bridgetown. So that was something to be corrected.

Obviously Edghill was not the right place to put the BMC. When a new Government comes in there is a continuing programme of development, but the new Government makes its input in a certain way. I believe the Leader of the Opposition has forgotten that one of the projects in 1961 which he constantly hails as a DLP project was the canalization of the Constitution River. And yet work actually started on that before the 1961 election. He can look at the files if he wants to. There was a Board up when I came back to this country at the end of 1962 which read something like "Government of Barbados, Constitution River Canalization programme — Starting Date December 1961."

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker. We started work on 19th December 1961. We came in on the 9th and programme started on the 19th. We did not need plans to clear out the mud from the centre of the stream. We started the people to work and the plans came after.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The canalization of the Constitution River was a project conceived perhaps as long ago as 1958, but the plans were drawn and the actual physical work of showing up the site began in December, 1961. It was put up on a Board; the hon. member knows that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: There were only plans in 1958; work started on December 19, 1961.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would be amused, Sir, if the files were examined and the date December 19 turned out to be a figure out of top of the hon. member's head. If he had said December 17, I would have known he invented it because as soon as you see a seven you know it is a mistake. But the point is not of enormous importance. The fact is that plans have to be continued by incoming governments. The exposition in the Democratic Labour Party's Manifesto as to its present programme in 1976 at the last election bears a remarkable resemblance to the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto for health in 1961; but that does not mean that the Minister of Health in those sad and dying days read the BLP Manifesto. Precisely what it means is that a policy for health was worked out around 1961 — a long term programme for health, for the hospital, and so on. Freddy Miller put it into our Manifesto in 1961, but it took fifteen years of the Democratic Labour Party's regime to work it out. And there has been no new programme for health during the fifteen years that the Democratic Labour Party was in power. But what I mean about our party needing to learn something about Opposition — unfortunately it will be many years before we have to put these lessons into practice again — but what it really means is that we are being shown how to oppose where no ground for Opposition really exists. What do you want us to do? Shut down the projects?

I hear about the Spring Garden Road and I want to take the opportunity to deal with that.
6.20 p.m.

That Spring Garden Road formed part of our Manifesto in 1966. We talked about it in here. I remembered the hon. member for Christ Church South Central and myself speaking to Mr. Stevens the Town Planner, about various matters, and the expression that we used in the Manifesto was "subsidiary urban development centres" and a general development plan was published. I think that it bears the date 1965 and it was to deal with these plots, but the plan was published later. The ring road was identified. It ran not exactly where the Spring Garden Road will go; but it was identified. The Democratic Labour Party then rejected the concept of the ring road and they allow the Town and Country Planning Department to give permissions to build houses over the very line of the road.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would like to correct the hon. member. The Democratic Labour Party rejected not the ring road but the spine road which would mean demolishing a substantial part of the City of Bridgetown; and members will remember that I said that it would entail the destruction of a great deal of human habitation; but we were ready to pick up somewhere along by Deacons. That part of the spine road was never abandoned, the part that would have continued from the Deep Water Harbour to Spring Garden. If you look at the revised plan you will see that that was taken out.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad for the correction. It is the spine road and not the ring road; but when I said that we were 15 years in Opposition and we could handle the business of Government perhaps better than those who have been 15 years in in Government, that is just what I mean. However, thanks. The hon. member says that they never abandoned the development of part of the spine road which continues on from Deacons Road. We were astonished. The Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Hon. Leader of the House and the Town Planner and myself took a trip looking for a site and we saw a big hotel — and I mean a 17 room apartment hotel right where the road was supposed to be. A gap had been barber greened and three or four bungalows have been built there. We asked the Town Planner about this and he said that the spine road had been abandoned and the land was released.

The hon. member may feel that this was not what was intended. I am telling him the facts. It may not have been what was intended, but he did not have the capacity to see that his intentions or non-intentions were obeyed.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. I would like to point out to the hon. member that development control is one of the main functions of the Chief Town Planner. The Chief Town Planner has his instructions. Development Control is not the function of the Minister. As a matter of fact, my criticisms of the Town Planning Office, if any, was that they spent too much time on development control measures, to see if somebody's guard wall was six feet from the gutter and 19 feet from the centre line of the road, and that type of thing, instead of doing proper planning.

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you making a speech?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: This is something arising out of what we were discussing before Your Honour came in. It is an explanation, Sir. We revised the Development Plan, Sir, and that part of the road coming out by Walmer Lodge was modified and changed after several meetings at which the Town Planner was present, and the Planning Committee; and then the Development Plan went back to the printers. It may be that when it was back to the printers that some of the junior officers in his office — I am trying to give a charitable explanation — if you understand what I mean, Sir — gave people permissions to build where they should not have given them permissions to build; but I am not a Development Control Officer. I do not spend my time driving about to see whether anybody has infringed a building right and that kind of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is well taken; but the real point is that the road which the hon. member said was not abandoned had a hotel built across it; and a serious point was how would we handle this. I said this; put it on the roundabout. You build the road around the hotel and leave the hotel in the middle of the roundabout. Of course this was bad planning and they may have thought that I was not serious, Sir.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I can explain that, Sir. This is not a point of order now, Sir. This is explanation now, Sir. If the hotel he means is at the top of Paradise Hill, I remember when the planners came in looking at the revision of the road, that there was a serious problem if the road had continued through where that hotel — Littlepage, I think it was — if the road had continued in the same direction to come out by Walmer Lodge, there would have been considerable bridge work. So that it was decided then to bring out the road closer to Danesbury; so the plan was modified and that hotel really was built with the knowledge of the Town Planner and everybody else after the modification had been made. The road, as drawn on paper as it were, when it was examined in

location, there was a very deep gully or gorge which would be right where the roundabout is, coming back to where the Rum Refinery used to be. So it was decided at that stage that it would be better to bring out the road a bit further to the south, and not through Walmer Lodge as before. That is my recollection.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, that is why this cut and thrust of debate is of interest to all concerned; because we are now getting some knowledge which perhaps we did not even have before. Our instructions are that the entire spine road was abandoned, and therefore the deeds were released. The Danesbury exit which was mentioned to us was always the subject of planning permissions. Look, I have a list of acquisitions here in my hand. I happen to have to go to Washington; and this is one of the matters that I have to talk about in Washington; and three of the 31 acquisitions on that list are of three newly built bungalows at the Danesbury point. I have dictated a minute only today to the National Housing Corporation to ask them immediately to see whether these people could be accommodated at National Housing Corporation houses, and to advise them early that their properties would have to be acquired.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation. No building construction has taken place at Danesbury, much to the annoyance of the landlords, as a matter of fact, to the extent that the people have not been paying any rent and they may have acquired a prescriptive title down there at Danesbury because they are not paying any rent. So there is no problem. There is no permanent housing that has been constructed on that side of the road in Black Rock between Dan Springer's land — as a matter of fact, all the way down to the entrance to Paradise Beach. So I do not think that that should prevent them from getting what they want in Washington.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think that the hon. member is confusing Danesbury as a property with Danesbury as an address. I am speaking of the property known as Danesbury of which we are going to acquire some. We have really had to introduce some new concepts in the physical operations of Government. There are 11 chattel houses in all. Today I have dictated to the National Housing Corporation that they must rightaway find somewhere to put 11 people whose houses are in the parth of the road, and the three people who have bungalows, and who must be given, if possible, other and similar suitable accommodation by the National Housing Corporation.

6.30 p.m.

And certainly those three bungalows have been built since this Spine Road concept was introduced and we

are told that it is as a result of the Spine Road being abandon and the permission being released.

There is a property, and I do not want to call the name of the developers here, but there is a property in the open land at Brightons between the Chandler property and the Hutchinson property on which general permission to build was given and general permission to cut up house lots was given.

We have got into the minutia on the Spring Garden Road, but these things are important to Barbadians first of all because this is not the only road project or acquisition project that we will ever have, and secondly because it gives some insight as to the determination you have to have if you will make a decision in Government to see that the carrying out of that decision is not going to be frustrated. You have to follow these things through with the same positive determination. When we came into power there were no active plans for completing the Spring Garden Road.

There was a plan for building a 24ft highway from Fontabelle to Exmouth Corner. We have had to revolutionise that. Everybody seems to assume that the Harbour extension embraces what you see going on down there at Lands End but in fact when we came into power as far as I can judge, the Ministry of Communications and Works and the Port Division were arguing over who should build a narrow highway. Not the conception we have here at all, because we drew the Spring Garden Road as an alternative to Highway One along the bypass to Eagle Hall, and we are going to join it up with University Drive so that the centres of population in Cave Hill when they want to come to Bridgetown would go down University Drive and drive straight into Bridgetown. The journey from Cave Hill will be a matter of 10 minutes on a good highway and to do this we have to build a proper dual carriage-way road at Lands End, but you see you blame us for not getting on with things, but how can you get on with things when the previous plans and their execution were so clumsy that the Electric Company is allowed to put down big electric poles in the exact middle of where the new four-lane highway is going to be put and we cannot get on with the work because the Electric Company will not move the poles.

Under our very eyes fence is being put up in the wrong place and a road is being built along the reclaimed land in the wrong place. Now that road, and I gather there is some argument in the debate about it.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I understand the hon. member, but we have instructors who like to sign big initials ACI, and AIC, area Inspectors, and all that kind of thing and who is going to inspect the Inspectors. I am interested in the

ordinary development and industrial development and who ever takes credit for it does not really matter to me.

I wonder if the hon. member knows that a lot of bulldozing is going on down there by Pile Bay and if he can tell me if they are not going to put down some other foolishness which will obstruct the road. All the trees are being ripped up in the vicinity of the Barbados Light and Power Company and there are big bulldozers working down there day and night, so you see you cannot be so vigilant and the Town Planning is of such a nature that they go and lay down conditions telling you that you must not do this and you must not do that and nobody goes back when the house is being constructed to see if the conditions are being complied with. So all the more reason when nothing is going on you get a Company like the Barbados Light and Power Company that owns the land, who knows where it is going to be acquired, to build a big fence that we complain about. I cannot go along there everyday to see if they are putting in some more poles and pieces of pig iron and that kind of thing. It is difficult. This is one of the problems we have.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member has drawn it to our attention and we will certainly take it into account. I am also glad to see that both sides of the House agree that it is not within politicians power — always to carry their idea into effect no matter how sincere and competent they are and this is one of the difficulties which Governments have to face. Sometimes the politicians compound their mistakes but sometimes mistakes are honest.

To wind this up I would just like to deal with that little road on the southern side of the reclaimed land. The plan was wrong because it was always a mistake to try to put a road along the side of the reclaimed land that actually bears upon the Harbour since other people might wish to build a factory and it might not suit them to go over the flour mill road. The road is alright for the flour mill but if somebody builds a factory to the east of the flour mill and wants access to the loading dolphins they will have to cross the road so the plan was always wrong. But under the very eyes of Ministers, from nowhere at all, Ministers do not send out worksheets as far as I know, we are not the Inspectors. Under our very eyes the barber-green machine was sent down there, then the very people that did the work came and told us that they had put the road in the wrong place. I well remember the day when the Hon. Ministers and I were sitting down at the Planning Committee Meeting and a note came in asking for a decision on the road on which the barber green was still on, an urgent decision to move the road.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Would the Hon. Minister also like to inspect the transit shed on the new extension where they have taken the water off the eaves gutters back inside the transit shed and then put them back outside. Normally when you put down pipes you put down pipes on the outside of the building. I saw that the other day Sir and I think if the hon. member checks up on it he will find the kind of foolishness that goes on.

They have brought back the water into the building so that if you have goods in that warehouse one of these down pipes are likely to flood out, and they have put 20 down pipes back inside the building. The eaves gutters are about 8ft, 7ft along the bridge so that they conduct them into the building and then bring them back outside, so this is the kind of thing that go on. I am sure I am not going to blame the hon. member or the Minister of Works for that. I can tell you a little more because I have checked on it Sir, but I would not want to embarrass anybody but I want the Minister to check it out and he would find out the kind of things that go on.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The design of the interior drainage is another design. All it means is that the designer assumed that you are going to get spring days in Barbados where the snow will melt it, at nights it will freeze up again and the down pipes will not be able to drain. That is the reason for carrying down pipes inside the building so that they do not freeze in winter. All of that will be taken note of. Anyway, I am glad that this debate has ended in such good humour with hon. members being able to exchange experience in the development planning.

I think I can safely say that all hon. members are satisfied with the list of projects, the Opposition because they feel they gave free endorsement to most of the projects if not all, and the Government because we are conscious we have carried on all that is left of the existing projects and have introduced a few of our own, and refined some of the ideals. I therefore join with hon. members to say that I am satisfied these projects will represent a significant capital investment input, that they will produce substantial employment, and I am sure that hon. members after all the good words that have been said about the Orion Bank are satisfied that this is a straightforward loan for development and will be able to support the Resolution.

Mr. GREAVES: You said they will reduce substantial unemployment?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Substantial unemployment. I hope I will reduce unemployment and I would like to thank the two hon. members who spoke for their contributions.

The question that this Resolution do now pass was put and resolved in the affirmative.
6.50 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE USE OF \$US 2.1 MILLION

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 3 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to approve the use of the sum of \$US2.1 million, to be borrowed from the Royal Bank of Canada, as part payment for additional buses for the Transport Board.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this Resolution stands in my name since it falls on the Minister of Finance formally to move, under the Special Loans Act, Resolutions to approve appropriations of funds raised under that Act for the development of the Island, and I so do formally move. The specific purpose of the Resolution is to make part payment for additional buses for the Transport Board and the Acting Minister will deal with the substance of the development for which the loan is needed. I am sure there are hon. members who, if needed, would be able to speak from their experience and a knowledge of the Ministry.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House I want to seek leave to deal with this Resolution. This Resolution seeks to make provision for the financing of a number of units for the Transport Board. I believe that it is well known that the Transport Board at the moment is operating under a very limited number of units. At the moment the strength of the fleet is in the region of 275 and I would say that we can virtually discount that number, since in truth and in fact we can only see of that number about 245 that are road worthy. It is felt that if the Transport Board fleet is to be in proper running and working order that the fleet strength should at least be in the region of 310 units.

There is another factor which we have got to take into account and it is the question of the replacement by way of retirement of a number of units of the fleet. Many of them have passed their useful life. We have units in the fleet that are 18 years and over, and it is not for me to tell the House because they would know that when a unit has reached ten years and beyond, it has certainly reached the life-span, and in addition to the acquisition of units to bring the fleet and the strength to 310, we have got to think in terms of retirement of the old units; so it would seem to me as though for some time yet the Government will have to finance the purchasing of a number of units on a yearly basis in order to keep the services which we now provide up to strength.

I have been hearing from time to time a few complaints, certainly not many, but I hope not to hear any complaints at all, that a few people are here and there left, and sometimes you get a few routes being fouled up. I want to give the public the assurance that it is the intention of the Government that the bus service which we seek to provide for them will be, we hope, not only the best in the West Indies which it now is, but certainly one of the best services in the world.

Quite recently during a brief visit to London I had discussions with the British Government in seeking technical assistance by way of getting a Traffic Manager to assist with the routing of the units here as well as a Traffic Engineer, and also a Financial Controller. I am happy to announce that a promise was made to us that these services will be provided, and I hope very shortly to be able to say that the people whom we asked for will be coming to us.

This money that we seek to provide for this service is certainly money spent in a very wise direction, and as a friend of mine in London said to me about a year and a half ago, the best thing any Government can do for a people is to provide them with good and cheap transportation, good and cheap housing and good and cheap food. It has been my privilege for the past two years to work towards the provision of good and cheap transportation. I believe to some extent I have succeeded in that direction, and hopefully in my new field I hope also to succeed in the provision of plenty and cheap food, and I have no doubt whatever in my mind as well that the Minister responsible for housing will also make a provision equally in that field.

With those few remarks, I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall not have very many words to say on this Resolution as the Minister has indicated that they are borrowing money to buy buses, and there is not much one can do if they are borrowing money to buy buses. Since we are on the question of transportation, I hope the Minister will take account of something that has begun to happen. Since the introduction by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central of new and different bus routes in Barbados, and I say that to indicate that the policy has been carried on and expanded by the Transport Board, what we have now is a number of relatively heavy vehicles going through a number of roads that were not originally designed to carry that kind of load.

Now, Sir, I am not quarrelling, but I am drawing it to attention because what has begun to happen is

that these roads have begun to take a very serious beating, and if we are not careful to coordinate the road maintenance programme with the expansion of the bus routes, we are going to find in the medium term that the cost is extraordinarily high. I think this is something which almost anyone who has lived in an area of Barbados can observe. One of the things which I would hope to see happen at the same time is that now the economy of Barbados according to what we are hearing from the other side has shown a turn for the better, the Minister of Finance will find it possible to return the bus fares to a more palatable 25 cents or 30 cents. (*Asides*)

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order. The hon. member is going to invite the Minister to send buses to Boscobelle, St. Peter, past the 18 mile stone where the people are suffering; so give him a chance.

Mr. TAITT: I was just coming to that, Sir. Having gone myself through Boscobelle recently, I discovered that the roads in that area, and I am sure you will support me on this, Mr. Speaker, can do with some fixing, and the buses no doubt will go to Boscobelle as all good people from the North would wish. I was speaking to a lady from that area who also indicated that she would like to see the buses come in, but quite seriously, in that Boscobelle area the roads are not only shifting, I have made that trip on two occasions recently which comes right through and you come out into St. Andrew, the real coast road, and there is a whole area — and the hon. member for St. Andrew must know about this, there is a whole area where the road has actually disappeared. I believe that it is as a result of heavy vehicular traffic on some of these roads where they existed before, that we now have this destruction of the roads.

6.50 p.m.

I am very serious about this, because in the area of St. Michael West — the hon. member for St. Michael West, I am sure, will not mind my saying this while I am on my feet, it is the constituency in which I vote, Sir. I do not see my representative as often as I would like, I see him every Tuesday in here, but that is neither here nor there — the roads in St. Michael West seem to have deteriorated suddenly and swiftly in a period of about three years. There is a road at the corner of Wavell Avenue and Seclusion as it extends which is now permanently under water, because the holes in the road as a result of the heavy vehicular traffic ...

Mr. SPEAKER: All bus routes.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. The other thing I would like to draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister is this. The last time ...

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to bring to the hon. member's attention that the speech he is making on behalf of the residents of St. Michael West has already been made by me in this House on a previous occasion.

Mr. TAITT: But, Mr. Speaker, certainly not so eloquently. As I was saying, Sir, a point that I made before, and at that time the Government had just taken over and perhaps they were less knowledgeable about some of the problems than they are now. I hope that the Minister will tell us the number of vehicles which it is intended to purchase, and I hope that there will be no repetition of the building of bus bodies outside of Barbados. I take it that this loan is for the purchase of chassis which will come into Barbados and for which there will be construction in this country to help to relieve the unemployment problem which we have so obviously in Barbados.

I want to make another point. The Government has said on more than one occasion, except on one famous occasion, it has been preaching that it is working for the people of Barbados without fear or favour, and on more than one occasion persons in my constituency or in the area where I live have made application to the Transport Board for work and they have been told that there are no vacancies; however if you know the right person who can give you a recommendation maybe something can be worked out. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not about to raise the whole question of patronage, that is not my intention, I really had hoped that the new Minister of Communications and Works would have been here. I would say quite bluntly that I hope that he is not quite the same in the Ministry of Communications and Works as he was in the Ministry of Agriculture. I will leave it at that for the time being, I would not wish to speak while he is not here, but I believe it is not in keeping with what is desirable in this country for ordinary people to go seeking employment and be told that unless they come with a recommendation of a certain kind they will not be able to get employment. If we are going to be expanding the bus fleet, it seems to me that some of those persons who have been working with the other bus companies, some of those people who have been on the waiting list, some of those persons who have taken the examination or whatever it is, who have not yet found employment, ought to be given priority when there are new employment opportunities arising out of the purchase of new buses, irrespective of their political allegiance.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I did not have many things to say about the way the Transport Board is functioning, I think that everybody accepts that the Transport Board has been fulfilling its needs and continuing in the path laid out by the member for St.

Michael North Central when he took over that Ministry of Communications and Works, and I hope that they will continue. I would like to recommend to the Minister, indeed to the Government, now that they are about to purchase new units, and in the context of the first point I made, to give very serious consideration to using an entirely different kind of unit in precisely those areas that I talked about which are being broken up by the heavy vehicular traffic. It would seem to me that we can operate the feeder system to some extent in the country areas like Boscobelle, but in those areas such as Codrington, Bush Hall, Fairfield and Deacons Road it is totally unnecessary to have a big heavy diesel turning the corner in Westbury Road at 35 miles an hour, or coming through the Harbour Road where one of these days unless the Minister of Communications and Works takes the advice which I have given before and puts some zebra crossings on President Kennedy Drive, and get some kind of assistance for those children crossing the street every day that school is out, Mr. Speaker, it will not be long before one of the buses and one of the children go into firm collision. The bus is bound to win in that situation.

Mr. Speaker, if we have smaller vehicles they will be easier to manoeuvre, the wear and tear on the vehicles and on the roads will be less, and the cost therefore must be more economical. I offer these suggestions for what they are worth and will leave any other remarks I wish to make about that particular Ministry until the new Minister takes his rightful place in this House.

7.00 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in complimenting the Minister of Communications and Works and the Transport Board especially, and the quality of the service now being provided, I wish to draw attention to four or five areas which I think must be considered in the immediate and long term planning of the Transport Board's activities. I agree first of all with the hon. member who has just sat down, that it does appear, since the advent of a number of these coaches on roads hitherto unused by this type of vehicle, that some of our roads, even if the basic surface is good, are too narrow to allow the free passage which one would expect. I will give an example. About six weeks ago I was coming from a dance at the St. Catherines Club in Bayfield about midnight. There was a bus which was going to the Mangrove depot. I picked up this bus at the top of Thickets Hill. It is true I was driving a car which some people might say is almost the size of a bus, but it was impossible to pass that bus until the bus turned at the church corner at Church Village. I had to drive behind the bus all the way along Thickets, Parish Land, Oughterson, right down to Church Village. And to further emphasise my point, subsequent to that event I believe a Transport Board bus ran off the road one

morning when the road was wet, through going too close to the verge. This seems to illustrate the point that roads like that were not designed to accommodate that type of vehicle, and the Ministry must give urgent attention to the widening of this road.

As a result of the nationalization of the bus service and the take over of certain units from the Elite and Rocklyn Bus Companies, I have noted that there is some incongruity in the system. The old buses from Elite and Rocklyn have been painted, but some of these are the open type buses with the canvas canopy. So you have two types of buses, the coach and the old time bus. And you have the conductresses on these older buses having to conduct on the running board and span the rear wheel to get to the back seat. I do not believe that it is the intention of the Transport Board to maintain this type of bus for the future. If it is a stop gap measure it might be tolerated, but if it is part of your policy to let this type of bus remain in service for any long period of time it could result in harm to employee relationships, because some conductors will have the opportunity of working inside the bus away from rain and danger of colliding with other vehicles, while others will not. So I want to know from the Minister what plans there are to have uniformity in the type of vehicles to be used, so as to prevent the eruption of problems which will not make for industrial peace within the Transport Board.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is 7 p.m., and this Sitting stands suspended until 8. p.m.

7. 05 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, when we took the adjournment I was drawing the hon. Minister's attention to certain areas of activity within the Transport Board which I think are in need of a closer look, and I mentioned the situation which has developed since the take over of units from the Rocklyn and Elite Bus Companies, and the fact that some of these units are not as commodious as those coaches run by the Transport Board. I hope this will not lead to problems.

A specific point that I wish to draw to the Minister's attention concerns the congestion that is caused in the early morning and in the afternoon by having school children riding on buses when adults are trying to get to work or to get home. I think the Board must consider tying off a number of units for school children so that adults will be able to get to work on time on mornings or from their travails in the evening without having to compete with the children. This has caused some difficulty in my constituency.

There is another area that I have not seen attended to by this Government since it has been in power. As I understand it, at the moment there is one category of pensioners who can ride free on the Transport Board buses but the other category has to pay. I am not sure whether the National Insurance pensioners travel free — I am somewhat confused — but it seems to me that in the wake of an improved economy as enunciated by the Prime Minister it would be a worthwhile gesture to standardize the system and let all pensioners ride free so long as the country's finances can sustain it. And I am calling on the Government when it sees that it is in a financial position to do so, and I hope that will be soon rather than later, to standardize the situation on buses with respect to pensioners. I do not think what revenue the Transport Board may allege they will lose would be very significant, and I think that the country would be performing a social service for those unfortunate people.

On the question of pension it may be argued that employees of the Transport Board have to pay national insurance contributions and that in the long term may amount to pension; but I would like to see the Transport Board giving attention to the operation of a pensions scheme within the structure of the Transport Board. I say this because, for example, at the National Housing Corporation we contribute our share. Admittedly, during the last administration the pension contribution to the Accountant General virtually lapsed, because I think that for two years the National Housing Corporation did not pay its share on behalf of its employees. I want this House to know that this is a situation I will not have remaining to the possible detriment of the employees, and I am happy to say that we have paid up all our contributions to date, I believe.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not know what is the ultimate goal that the Transport Board has in terms of maximizing its fleet, but the addition of thirty buses by this Resolution will I think, go a substantial way towards relieving some of the problems now attendant upon the Transport Board. And one of these problems is in the area of conducting. I have been virtually inundated over the last three months with persons coming for recommendations from all parts of the country for jobs as conductors and conductresses, and it is my opinion that Barbados cannot absorb any more conductors and conductresses at this time but will probably need more of them on the acquisition of these thirty units.

8.10 p.m.

I believe that the member for St. Michael South West will appreciate that when a place like the Transport Board perhaps says that there are no vacancies, and at the same time appears to be willing to

accommodate persons who may have recommendations from some persons of assumed influence, that because the demand for the jobs far exceeds the quantum of jobs within the Transport Board, they have to use some kind of shield to say that there are no vacancies. It may be the odd vacancy; but if you have 3,000 people filing applications, and perhaps only 30 jobs, in terms of efficient administration you cannot go on letting the public assume that you have these vacancies when in fact, as I said, you do not have the quantum to satisfy their needs.

I do not think that the hon. member intended in this debate or at this stage to ascribe any motives or ascribe patronage or even as they are wont to say especially in times of by-election, accuse of victimisation. I think that it has been the practice in Barbados that people come to politicians especially — and the hon. member for St. Michael South West would have experienced this when he was in Government, and people assumed that he could probably produce more at the time in terms of finding employment at the time. So they will come to politicians for a letter; but it does not mean that because you give a letter in support of an application, that that person necessarily gets the job. The final decision still has to be made by the department to whom the letter is addressed.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. If the hon. member would give way. I was not particularly swatting the point about the letter. What I was concerned about, and perhaps did not say clearly for precisely the reasons the hon. member is now saying that I did not ascribe any patronage, that it is all right to say that the person who gets a letter does not necessarily get the job. I think that it is dangerous, however, that it is certain that the persons will not get the job if he carries a letter from somebody on this side. That is the problem, Sir — that there is a 50-50 chance that we can survive; but when it is certain that that they will not "get a pick" if they bring a letter from this side, that is a bit frightening, Sir.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, unfortunately the hon. member has fallen for the bait. He is now trying to amplify what I did not assume he was aiming at in his first speech, to ascribe motives to persons sent by members on that side who do not get jobs. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can give a personal experience which I have told members of this Parliament about, Sir. Last year, January, there were 11 members from St. Philip North who made applications on the forms for the Transport Board. Eleven gentlemen came to my house and I helped them fill up the forms. I spoke to a gentleman who was then an employee at the Transport Board about this, and he said send a letter covering these 11 applications. I sent this letter, and not one got a job at the Transport Board. Not one. I do not know

for what reason. Probably they did not like my head, Sir, or the fact that I won a by-election in St. Philip caused a lot of confusion among supporters of the Democratic Labour Party in this country; but it works both ways. I was able to get these gentlemen places elsewhere. I will not quarrel with that. When the whole of St. Andrew was working with the National Housing Corporation I did not hear these complaints, Sir.

Nobody would complain with the hon. member if some of his supporters worked in various factories when he was Minister of Trade, Sir. That is how life operates in the small communities that we have in the Caribbean, Sir. So, Mr. Speaker, in winding up I wish to compliment the Transport Board and the Ministry, and especially the former Minister of Communications and Works; and I am sure that his successor will carry on the good work started by the hon. member for St. Andrew; but I only wish to draw attention to those areas which the Board and the Ministry in their long term planning should look at — and that is the question of what some people refer to as the “board and shingle” buses as against the coaches, the question of congestion which I think is very real, the question of the standardisation of pensioner’s travelling rights and the question of an internal pension scheme for present employees of the Transport Board.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, it looks as though we are on, and will continue to be on a borrowing spree in order to run this country over the next few years; and it looks very much as though by 1981 the indebtedness of this country will be somewhere in the region of a half billion dollars, if not more. However, I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of borrowing for X or Y purpose at this time of the evening, although I was somewhat surprised to hear the Hon. Prime Minister today extolling the merits of borrowing for capital projects. (*Asides*) I said the present Prime Minister. I do not think that the former Prime Minister at any time has said that that was not a useful form of borrowing.

However, I would like to make one or two comments on the deployment of buses and hopefully some of these new buses that we will be getting. It is a matter of grave concern to the people in the Belleville, George Street, Collymore Rock and Quaker’s Road area that at present they do not have a bus service — a bus service which was temporarily withdrawn for lack of equipment; but since we are now borrowing to this extent, and since all Barbadians will have their futures mortgaged to the various debts being contracted, I think that it is only fair that the Minister of Communications and Works should give some consideration to the restoration of the bus service in this area.

8.20 p.m.

I would like to point out that there is a very serious problem here. Many of the people living in this area are by no means wealthy, as is often assumed. The concept has been given further clarity by the remarks made by the Hon. Prime Minister when he ran away from the counting station to CBC on the by-election night. However, there are many elderly people in this area who cannot drive, many if they can afford a motor car cannot drive, and many of them cannot walk.

There are many Nursing Homes in that area and the only physical contact that such people have with other persons of their age group would be those people who come to visit them and very often the visitors themselves cannot walk, they cannot drive and they cannot afford to travel by taxi into the area.

It has been said that buses pass in Collymore Rock and Belmont, but this is a serious problem because by the time the buses pass in that area they are already full and many of these people cannot afford to wait for such long periods in the hope of getting a bus. So I hope that this earnest plea on behalf of the disadvantaged residents of Belleville, Quakers and the related areas should not fall on deaf ears.

I would also like to re-enforce the call by the member on this side earlier this evening for restoration of the 25 cents fare. It is important to recognise that when that fare was introduced it was not as it was labelled conveniently an election gimmick. It was a recognition of the kind of principles which I have heard emanating from both sides of this House, a gradual move towards a more comprehensive welfare state in Barbados and one of the important areas is transportation which not only performs a social function in that it represents a social service, but also unlike some of the other services is directly related to productivity and it is a mixed kind of service in that it has social benefit aspects but it also has a very important effect on productivity within any society, not only Barbadian society, and one of those social benefits was a standardised bus fare based on the principle that no member of the society should be disadvantaged in terms of the transportation services available to him or her.

Indeed, this is the same kind of thinking which would have induced the hon. member for St. Philip North to ask for free bus passes for all pensioners and I think that some consideration can be given at this stage to the question of the restoration of a lower fare structure because it must be borne in mind that 35 cents differs very significantly from 25 cents or 10 cents, but 10 cents may not be important to you, Sir, but it is important to a man who is taking home \$40.00 or \$60.00 a week.

Another matter I would like to bring to the attention of this honourable House is that there is some element of dissatisfaction of the taking over arrangements from the bus concessionaires. I myself do not know all the details but I would certainly like to pose the question, a question which was answered because it was one of the problems which arose, for example, in the take-over of the British Rail when the British Government certainly accepted the principal that when you cost what you are taking over, it is important to recognise that such persons did produce, or did provide a social service to the society over a number of years and very often it is difficult to quantitate that. Nevertheless, I think some sympathy should be extended in that direction.

One other problem that has arisen, and several people have contacted me in this regard, I certainly have not given them letters because that would sort of seal their fate, is the question of the many people employed by the concessionaires who have not been taken on by the Transport Board. I believe that here again a greater element of humanity should be seen and even more important, these people have been involved in a particular job for many years and indeed, there is no question looking at the people who have been coming to me and so on, there is no question of lack of fitness for the job. I would think that some consideration should be given to such persons in respect of further employment.

I do recognise there are several problems in respect of these people, for example, severance payments, etc., etc., but I do think that the Transport Board should be taking a more positive step towards employing them and certainly not continue with what has been done in the past to look at party affiliation etc. and determine who will be taken on and who will not be taken on because it is very significant that a very large number of those who have not been taken on have been known to be supporters of the Democratic Labour Party.

I think the time has come when such considerations must take second place towards the ultimate goal of providing the best that we can as a country for all our citizens and I think that that is a matter that should occupy the urgent attention of the Minister of Communications and Works. I think it is a very pressing problem because many of these people are going through serious difficulties in that they cannot find another job because many of them have never had any other job; many of them know nothing else than working on buses. This has been their life and when they apply for another job, the only kind of background experience they have is in the transportation service of this country.

8.30 p.m.

Many of them have worked for many years at very low salaries, exposed to the kind of dangers, to hazards of the weather, dangers of accidents etc. as outlined by the hon. member for St. Philip North, and surely they cannot be discarded at this stage. Surely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there must be a case for some humane consideration of those many persons who in our society today cannot get a job, whilst at the same time I think Government should have exercised much greater responsibility in the selection of them for work, and indeed I would have thought that they would have constituted a priority category for employment in the Transport Board whether they are D.L.P. or B.L.P. members.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not intend to join the debate, but as I was saying to hon. members on this side of the House, if I claimed any authority to speak in this debate, it is on the firm foundation that I think I am the only member in this House who has had an opportunity to have run a bus company and did it when I was at school. The hon. member for St. Michael South West represents the constituency in which the buses ran, and he probably would not recall it at this moment, but I can assure him that at the age of.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I assure him that I am really too young; I am as young as I look and I really do not recall the name of the bus company which the hon. member, who is much older than he looks obviously, ran.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member would not remember, but let me say this: I intervened in this debate to make a couple of points about the transport system. It is an undoubted fact that within two years the Barbados Labour Party has been able to improve the transport system in this country to the large satisfaction of the majority of people in this country who will look at the matter objectively. I believe that one has to give to the former Minister of Transport, the present Minister of Agriculture, a tremendous amount of praise for this. He had to take tough decisions in his Ministry, he took them with conviction and with a great deal of success.

Now, obviously, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only way that you can do part of this was to get new buses, and you either will have to borrow money or you would have to finance them out of surplus if the economy had not been in deficit for so many years. I do not want to refer hon. members to the historical date, but I believe in the last ten years it is only on two occasions that the economy of Barbados had shown any surplus on current account. That is a fact. The hon. member must look at this; that almost every capital

project in Barbados that has been carried out in the last ten years has been financed not out of current account taxation as such, except in so far as capital repayments and interest payments are concerned, but has been financed out of borrowing. So that when the hon. member says we are on a borrowing spree, I think he would be more correct to say that we have been borrowing for the last ten years in order to develop Barbados.

When we are dealing with public expenditure one must remember that if today a capital project is built, the cost of that project to be fair to present day taxpayers should be spread over a certain number of years. (A VOICE: Nobody is quarrelling with that.) I am only making it quite clear that if the Government was borrowing and spending and wasting money either on projects which merely had a high visibility quotient and nothing else or that was never developmental in nature.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. member for Christ Church West is simply repeating exactly what I said. All I have said is that the Hon. Prime Minister did not quite understand the nature of borrowing for capital projects prior to becoming Prime Minister, or if he understood he took a completely different position on that matter when he was in Opposition.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am glad to hear that the hon. member is beginning to understand the basic principles of public finance, and I am sure he must have read Prest by now; if he has not I can assure him from my knowledge of the Hon. Prime Minister that he did public finance as part of his course in BPE. Those of us who had some knowledge of economics at the University will remember these basic things. They are obviously very easy. (Asides) Well you call it a smattering. Those of us who did economics at the University would understand the basic courses; so I really do not understand what the hon. member is saying. I do not know if the hon. member is impliedly criticising the Government for the fact that it is doing the obviously sensible thing of borrowing for capital projects which have a repayment value and an investment value in the future for Barbados.

Now it is true that transport is one of those projects that you may *prima facie* consider of social impact and significance, but it is so alive to the total economic development of the country that it is developmental in character also. Therefore the Government ought to be congratulated, not criticised, for the manner in which the Government through the Minister in particular, the former Minister of Communications and Works, has been tackling this problem of the transport system. The people of St.

George North, and I am sure the hon. member for St. Michael South Central still remembers the people of St. George North, can praise this Minister now for the relief that he has brought to them, and I think that if there is one thing the Democratic Labour Party should objectively get up and tell the people on the platform, it is that the Barbados Labour Party has done a good job for them in transport. Perhaps politics will get to that. But we have, and I believe we will continue to do a good job in the transport field. I want therefore although I am on the front bench to tell the Minister now that he is no longer the Minister that he has set a very high standard that those of us who come behind will find it difficult to follow. He has set a very high standard in his Ministry, and those who may come behind will try to follow it, and because he has done a difficult job, people have hurled insults on him because he has been tough, but he has done his job honestly and efficiently, and he deserves to be returned in 1981 even on that record alone for his outstanding record.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Deputy Speaker, you know I really was sitting here wondering whether I should participate in this debate or not, but hearing the Hon. Attorney General and member for Christ Church West putting in such a stirring plea for the former Minister of Communications and Works, one must get the impression that he feels very strongly that the Minister of Communications and Works is in trouble and he has got to start his campaign right at this point from the floor of the House of Assembly. Be that as it may, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think that we have to realise that public transportation is of tremendous political importance inasmuch as it involves a large number of people in this community, and any attempt which is going to be made in the area of public transportation has got to be done in such a way as to bring the greatest benefit to the largest number of people in the society.

We at this moment are considering voting this money for the purpose at least of enabling the Transport Board to acquire additional buses. In the acquisition of additional buses, I think it is important for those of us who represent rural constituencies to have a look at the system which is operating in that area and certainly to point out some of the difficulties and problems.
8.40 p.m.

We have already heard here this evening the member for St. Philip North, who represents a rural constituency, indicating some of the difficulties which people experience, and I would want to say that I would hope that with the acquisition of new buses that we could see a little more order in what could very well be described as a somewhat chaotic situation, and I am saying that in all sincerity, and I would invite the Minister in his reply to indicate, for example, the position in the Speightstown area, where at the peak hours in particular you will find

that to all intents and purposes chaos raises its head, and if you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were within hearing distance this evening you would have heard the representative for St. Peter indicating very clearly the problems the people in Boscobelle, for example, face as far as transportation is concerned, and I think it is a problem which has got to be looked at, and I would really hope that when the new buses are acquired that we could see some order being brought to the system in that part of the island, and particularly, obviously, in St. Lucy.

The other point I want to raise, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is this. I think if we are talking in terms of having a well run and properly organised transport system that we must look very seriously at establishing a proper terminal in the Speightstown area, because in the first instance what is being used at present was not at all designed for this particular purpose and obviously there are a lot of bottle necks and difficulties which arise there, and I would hope that in looking at the overall transportation plan that some proper arrangement is made for having a decent terminal with all the ancillary services which you would expect to find in a terminal operating there.

The other difficulty, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has to do with the transfer ticket system, and a number of people have been complaining that this has ceased with the consequential difficulties which would operate. There was a system operating before where if let us say you were travelling by a bus from St. Michael over to St. Lucy, if you took a bus to Speightstown when you got to Speightstown you could get a transfer and move on to another bus and go right through, and as I understand it this system is no longer operating and some difficulties are being created there. I would hope, therefore, that with the acquisition of these additional buses that we can see some improvement and some attention being paid to this particular area, because, I mean after all I think I owe it as a responsibility to the constituency which I represent to ventilate these difficulties and problems here in spite of the fact that I might be called a parochial politician. I do not in any event regard it as a bad thing, because after all those are the people who sent me here and I did not walk in here, so I have got to come and ventilate their wishes and their difficulties in this particular area, as you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, would realise, so I hope that the Minister would be able to address his mind to some of these problems which even although they affect particular areas have in my view implications for the entire country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to rise first of all to wind up the parish pump like the hon. speaker who has just saw down. I hope that the Minister of Communications and Works and the Transport Board will take account of the transport needs of the people of Sturges, St. Thomas, who, even if there has

been no outcry from them about the 35 cents bus fare, indeed many of them express gratification that it was not more, when it was raised to that level, certainly are having some outcry about the difficulty of getting buses since Sturges was made more of an intermediate point on the route to Belleplaine than it has been before, and I hope that the Acting Minister will take due note of that fact.

I am not replying, Sir, I am not making any point on reply, but I would wish to answer, since I am the Minister responsible, one point that was made by the hon. member for St. Philip North. He referred to the question of pensioners travelling on buses, and he may be informed — and the public may be informed — that the Government has under consideration arrangements for all persons over the age of 65 who are pensioners to travel free on the buses. As is known, the Government is reviewing the entire position of persons over the age of 65 — I put it as neutrally as possible — but as a first step I anticipate that very soon a plan will be announced that national insurance pensioners over the age of 65, as well as ordinary old age pensioners, will be granted free travel on the buses. This concession of free travel may be limited to certain hours, like after 10 o'clock in the morning and before 4 o'clock in the evening as the case may be, because we do not expect that many old age pensioners will wish to catch the buses in the rush hour to get to work, but subject to whatever is done we expect that this will very shortly be introduced and the principle will be introduced that all persons receiving pensions by reason of their age will also be given free travel on public transport. It goes without saying, Sir, that all persons who suffer with disabilities will also be given free travel.

In respect of pensions for employees of the Transport Board, the Government is committed to a national pension plan by which public and private pensions alike will be integrated into a common scheme. An essential corollary of this fact is that the Government must set an example by not providing pensions as a condition of service of a dual nature, therefore Government Statutory Corporations are being directed to operate pension plans if they so wish on a basis of insuring that part of the pensionable earnings not covered by national insurance, otherwise you will get situations as already exist with some private firms where a person has a financial incentive to retire. In other words, they will get a private pension plus a national insurance pension of two-thirds of whatever it may be. There are persons, Sir, working in a certain number of private firms who if they reach the retiring age now will receive pensions considerably larger than their present emoluments. Well, anybody is entitled to pay an employee what pensions they wish, and we are not going to take away from private citizens the right to do this, but as far as Government pension schemes are concerned the Statutory

Corporations will be expected to make their pension plans conform with national insurance pensions.
8.50 p.m.

I want to deal with one small matter raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. He spoke of sending out letters for jobs. I would like to assure the hon. member that if an occasion should arise where recommendations are regarded of some importance in placing persons in jobs, if the hon. member sends someone with a letter of recommendation it would be received with the same respect as the hon. member has customarily shown to Ministers of the Government in his dealings with them. I do not believe that anybody can accuse the hon. member for St. Michael South West of disrespect or of casually putting his name to documents, and I would like to assure him that he need not fear on behalf of his constituents to give them a letter of recommendation to a Minister of Government.

I am not replying to the debate but I must reply very shortly to the Hon. member for St. Michael South Central who has trenched somewhat on my portfolios. Dealing very briefly with the wealth of the people in Belleville: I believe that the first person I have ever heard in this House of Assembly referring to the wealth of persons in Belleville was the Leader of the Opposition when in the Budget earlier this year I introduced some relief for gardeners and he said in a very sneering reference to the people who live in Belleville that I was trying to help the people in Belleville. I think he also added Pine Hill. He certainly made a reference to Belleville and particularly singled out Belleville as a place where rich people live and which the Barbados Labour Party was trying to help. I am not aware that I have ever been other than realistic in my assessment of residential districts in Barbados. If the hon. member for St. Michael South Central prefers me to say that Belleville is full of poor people, I will address a political platform and say that he wants me to say that Belleville is full of poor people.

When I heard the hon. member talk about borrowing for capital projects I wish I were still a journalist, because the lines were flowing through my mind as they would flow from my pen many years ago. I can imagine myself writing a piece: "The newly elected member for St. Michael South Central betrayed his inexperience and lack of homework in his speech on the Transport Board in the House of Assembly yesterday. Rather than learn from colleagues who by now do not risk to challenge the Prime Minister unless they are sure of their facts, he jumped in with both feet and found himself on the receiving end of the Prime Minister's response." I am not going to worry about it. Sufficient that if he wants to know my views on borrowing, he must take them from the debates in the House of Assembly and not from the lips of the Leader of the

Opposition. He must look into the debates of the House of Assembly, listen to the recording of speeches made on political platforms, in which he will hear me over and over again say that borrowing for capital projects which are of use to future generations is the only form of borrowing that a Government should contemplate; and then I attacked the Democratic Labour Party for the escalation of borrowing between the years 1973 and 1976 which does not represent any improvement in the capital stock of the country. The hon. member held out the figure of what he called half billion — a singularly inelegant manner of speech — I think he means \$500 million — for the national debt by 1981. If the national debt reaches \$500 million by 1981 that will be almost exactly a 100% increase from 1976 when we took over. When I became Minister of Finance the National Debt of this country was \$245,400,000. If it doubles or a little more than doubles to \$500 million by 1981, we will have something to show for it. When the Democratic Labour Party government was elected for a third time to office in 1971, the National Debt of the country was \$101 million. In the five years between 1971 and 1976 it multiplied two and a half times — it went from \$100 million to nearly \$200 million. If we succeed in holding down the increase to 100% instead of a 250% increase, I think we will have done very well indeed. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central must take a lesson from the hon. member who sits on his left at the present time — I don't know why they kept the hon. member for St. Michael South so far down the rank; I see the hon. member for St. Michael South West in the game of opposition musical chairs has risen almost to the top of pack; I do not know what will happen when the hon. member for St. Michael North Central comes back into the running. Anyhow, that is only in passing. The hon. member for St. Michael South who undoubtedly is the greatest student of the words that have occasionally fallen from my lips, is sufficiently familiar with my speeches to have been able to warn the hon. member for St. Michael South Central not to accept what other people tell him about what I have said. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central in any case does not as yet, if he ever will, have the equipment to speak on economic subjects. He does not have the basic and fundamental knowledge or a grasp of what he is talking about to command respect from an assembly such as this which is accustomed to hearing debates in which even the hon. member for St. Michael South West finds himself at sea regularly; and what the hon. member for St. Michael South West has forgotten about economics, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has not yet acquired. I would therefore advise him if he does not wish to be humiliated in here to be careful how he contributes to debates on economic subjects.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like particularly to join with the Hon. Attorney General in paying tribute to the former Minister of Communications and Works. I

would like to say that during his period as Minister of Communications and Works he showed outstanding and exceptional ability in the office; and I do not say this because he is a member of my party; he showed ability far over and beyond that displayed by any previous Minister of Communications and Works with whom I have been in contact since my days in Parliament. His achievements at the Transport Board will always be remembered, and I expect that he will bring the same qualities of intellect and capacity to handle the affairs of the Ministry to which he is now being appointed. I really think that the whole of Barbados owes the Minister a debt of gratitude for the determined way in which he approached the problems of the Ministry of Communications and Works when he held that portfolio.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not intend to join in this debate, but there are a few questions I would like to raise. If the Minister in introducing the matter had given me information he can just indicate that and I am certain that I will get the information. But I heard the Prime Minister making a parish pump appeal for the people of Sturges, St. Thomas, and I am minded to say that if the former Minister did not deal with the transport problem of the people of Sturges when he was Minister for the Transport Board, knowing how tactful he is, it is very unlikely that being merely an acting Minister on this occasion he will really find time to deal with the problems of the people of Sturges. He will have to leave that to the new Minister who used to speak of other Ministers of Communications and Works as Minister for Tar Roads, and we will see how he will handle the tar roads by his concept of the Ministry of Communications and Works.

I am concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in reading this Addendum which is as follows: "Government proposes to borrow the sum of \$2.1 million from the Royal Bank of Canada towards part payment for additional buses for the Transport Board following the take over of the entire transport system."

9.00 p.m.

I may have missed the information given. If I have so done, the Minister can certainly inform me that he has given the information to the House already; but I would really like to get some indication of the full amount that would be required to pay for these additional buses. The \$2.1 million represents, according to the Addendum, only part payment — \$2.1 million (U.S.) — represents only part payment; and I am wondering if in his reply the Minister could tell us how many additional buses are required for this entire transport system, and what will be the additional amount that the Government would have to put and which would have to be added to the \$2.1 million (U.S.) to give the total figure that would be required. I realise that this is now outside the portfolio of the Minister, and already he may have forgotten the

information if he does not have the necessary files with him. He may be turning his attention fully.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that the moment of interruption has arrived.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Sir. You may certainly interrupt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must enquire whether or not the matter is controversial; otherwise it cannot be dealt with after 9 o'clock.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the only possible area of controversy would be the new Minister of Communications and Works. We have not seen him yet, so we do not know; but as to this interloper on this side, Sir — we know that his days on that side may be short — but

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: What you are saying is that the matter is not controversial.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to make this point. It is perhaps not surprising that the member for St. Thomas and the Prime Minister would have raised the question of his constituents at Sturges because I think that would be typical, because in spite of the fact that there have been some improvements in the transport system, we would not like the Government to be lulled into any sense of false security, or to believe that the transport problems in this country have been solved; because there is still a great deal of dissatisfaction and criticism about transport matters in this country; and when the member for St. Thomas could raise a problem regarding his constituents, there are commuters and travellers throughout this country who have problems with the transport system; and there are therefore still quite a large number of problems to be dealt with, particularly in those areas in the north and the other outlying areas of this country.

So we would not like the Government to take any comfort from the fact that the entire system has been taken over. That in itself is not the end all of transport problems in this country. There are problems to be solved; and we would take the question raised by the member for St. Thomas as one indicating that there are still some major problems to be solved in the system; but we would like to know — and I think that the public is entitled to know — if we come with an Addendum stating that \$2.1 million (U.S.) is to be borrowed for part payment, we would like to know what is the full payment that would be involved in the take-over of the entire transport system, and therefore, consequentially, what is the additional amount that the Government will have to put.

What I am saying, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that this Addendum calls for \$2.1 million (U.S) for part payment; and I am seeking information as to what amount will have to be added to this \$2.1 million to make the full payment. The Addendum speaks of part payment. We want to find out what would be the full amount that would be required following the take over of the entire transport system. That is the question. I see the member for St. Michael South East on his feet. I do not think that he was on his feet today. I do not think that he has participated in debate today; but he has placed some information before the Minister, so I would be glad if that information could be given to us. I think that the member for St. Andrew, the Minister of Agriculture, is only acting as Minister of Communications and Works today. He has not acted as often as the Member for St. Michael South East, I think. According to my last count, he is the greatest acting Minister that this country has ever known. I have heard it said that he could take up residence in Hollywood. (*Asides*)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thirty five or thirty six instruments as an acting Minister, I understand, the member for St. Michael South East has had, but I would be glad if the Minister could give us that information.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the hon. member has raised quite a large point. It must be remembered, Sir, that the Government long ago decided that they would purchase over a course of time over 100 units. I will explain the background. Hon. members will recall that we had a debate in here before as to whether we should purchase them as completed units, or as chassis to be assembled here. Now, because of the urgency of the situation, we decided that we would purchase a number of completed units; but we would purchase a number of chassis to be built locally.

Now, in all, the Government authorised 100 units. So far we have received a number of completed units; and we received a number of chassis which have been completed by Acme Engineering Works; and this amount of money that we are now voting is part of the whole scheme. So this is part payment for the chassis as opposed to — there are more to come — and we had to pay for the completed units. Now, the amount that we borrowed. In 1977, June, the best was from the Royal Bank of Canada for a Euro Dollar loan of \$2.1 million approximately; and that financed the purchase of 40 units completed and 20 chassis. Now this money is to deal with the furtherance. We passed some money in the last financial year for the completed units and part of the chassis. We have reached the stage now where we are only buying chassis. From now on we will only purchase chassis. They will be built on here. So this money is part payment for chassis. Now we have to pay local costs.

Under the terms negotiated with the British Government, they pay part and we have to finance part from the Euro Dollar loan. The British Government will finance that part of the money that would go to Leyland; but they are not going to finance what we have to pay to Acme Engineering; because we have to pay Acme Engineering in Barbadian dollars.

9.10 p.m.

They are not financing that, so we have to borrow to pay the local cost but we do not have the money to pay it so we have to borrow the equivalent in euro-dollar loan to pay the local costs and that's the simple explanation of it.

Two salient points arise that in 1977 we bought 40 chassis complete as a matter of urgency. We have gone over that already, plus 20 chassis which were assembled. Now we are talking about the additional program. I well recall speaking in that debate at that time and said that we had to have 100 units urgently. Well 40 plus 20 were financed in the last financial year and now we are talking about 35, 40, 60, 95.

Mr. TAITT: Will the Hon. Minister please give way so that he can reply on it completely. I did ask the question of the Minister whether the Government would give consideration to using similar units or different units. According to the information which is now being given, if the 100 units in fact that have been programmed, I would like to know if it is probable that there would be any consideration of this kind of system. Otherwise we are going to be locked into a programme of having a total number of buses of the same kind.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Well the former Minister of Communications and Works will reply to that, Sir, but all I can say is that these are the balance of 40 plus 20 equal 60. These are for 35 which makes 95. Remember we said last time that they were 100 we needed. The former Minister will tell you about the programme raised by the Hon. member tonight. That is a different thing altogether.

The point I want to make is that we are now only financing chassis, no more completed buses and for the amount that is stated in the Addendum which is part payment, this is the amount that will pay for the chassis from Leyland, but the local costs we have to pay for. We have a British Government aid for the chassis but we have to pay for the local cost and this is what the money is for.

In addition to this, the inner circle bus system, the Hon. Minister on the 30 units raised by him will talk about that and I want to talk about this very importantly because the same Acme has got available to it a chassis for a 30 passenger bus for the inner circle which he will deal with and that is very interesting from the point of view of tourism. Hon. members will remember that we

have given taxi associations concessions in relation to coaches, we call them that because we do not want to confuse them with mini buses, coaches that they can do island tours and bring people from the airport.

What we are trying to develop is that we would have to see the bodies of those coaches built in Barbados. The same Acme has got a quotation on a chassis and the law has been amended to permit 26 passengers and luckily the Ministry of Communications was quite wise on this in that they decided on 26. Now by law, the chassis that are built are really for 30 passengers but it had ignored one factor that you need space for people who have packages so you have to take out four seats to provide for baggage. This is a very interesting thing, because we went and visited a factory and we thought that if we put in 30 seats they would be no provision for baggage. Well that is no use to people who are coming from the airport or people who want to carry people to the airport because they have to carry baggage and you do not want to carry them on the outside so what they will be able to do is to slip in in the last four seats a division where you can put in racks and you will be able to nicely shelve the baggage.

Hon. members who have gone to the United States know that outside of Kennedy Airport they put the baggage underneath, but those vehicles are much bigger vehicles. Those vehicles can hold 50 people. Now we do not wish to encourage this because we have problems with the transport cooperatives. The cost of those vehicles are so high. One of those vehicles costs \$90,000 and although we have made a submission to the Ministry of Finance about duty free and things of that kind, nevertheless we are trying to get a device whereby we can say that we will allow the chassis in duty free and we will give local employment, and that is the conception of the whole thing.

In addition to these buses we are thinking of the inner circle bus which the Hon. Minister is more an expert than I am. I only know it from the point of view of tourism, but this basically is for the new set of vehicles for which we have to borrow to pay for the local costs. Britain is paying for the costs of the vehicles up there, but we have to find the money to cover costs here. If we had decided to buy complete buses, assembled and everything from Leyland, we would not have to pay for them, Britain would pay for them, they would extend the grant, but as they have to be assembled and the bodies have to be built here, they shut off.

It is the same thing with the United States, it is the same thing with Canada, it is the same thing with everybody. They would lend you money, it is the same thing with Trinidad. If you are going to buy from them everything, they will lend you Trinidadian dollars to pay Trinidad and they will lend you pounds to pay for

pounds but as you want to insist that part of the assembling must be done here, we have to look for our own money, and that is the hard facts of life today and you better learn to live with them.

Aid is an inducement to creation of employment and trade is the source of the aid and we better recognise it.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this debate has been very long and I think much longer than I really had expected. The last speaker, and the Prime Minister as well, have touched on many of the vital points and I am very appreciative of the action which they took because it has lessened my burden. The last speaker for the Opposition, the Hon. member for St. Michael South, asked the question of the reason for the money and what we are going to do with it and I imagine he wanted to know the amounts of units we are going to purchase.

I regret very much that he was not in his seat when I spoke because I outlined the position of the units, the amount of rolling stock we have and the question of the replacements and the amount which we will have to put into operation in order to bring us up to strength.

The question of replacement is going to be an on-going process. It is going to take us a considerable length of time and even though we are going to purchase 35 additional units we still have to think in terms of further units for the next financial year.
9.20 p.m.

The question of replacement will be a continual process until such time. As a matter of fact I do not think we will ever reach the point where we will have to stop bringing in units, because we will have to be replacing from time to time, and that is the position as it is. I can give you some more information which I think may be helpful since this is open government. The cost of the completed unit, the chassis and the body constructed here by Butcher is in the region of \$85,000, so you will understand that when you are talking in terms of 100 units how much money is involved. As a matter of fact, those we bought last year came to around \$78,000, but the price has gone up much more than what it was then, because of freight, insurance and what-have-you. All these factors have gone up.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has been for a long time having some excursion into the unknown virtually and of course still dealing with issues, as I have constantly said, of extending the campaign which he recently had still further into this Parliament, but I assure him that there is no need to do it continually. The time will come when he will have a battle again and it will not be as easy as it was last

time. As far as jobs are concerned within the Transport Board, the Board has got a criterion for the employment of people up there, and as Minister at the time responsible for transportation, I refused to involve myself in what took place there. There are many people up there who are members of the D.L.P., at the very highest level; they are the people who control things and who make sure that the interests of the D.L.P. are well protected and preserved. I am not aware that you have to give anybody in the Barbados Labour Party a letter. As a matter of fact, I would not treat with any sympathy or respect any member of my party who would give a letter to somebody to take to any Statutory Corporation. Thank God I have never done it and do not propose to do it either. I do not believe that the Hon. Prime Minister who mentioned just now that he would treat with sympathy.....(Asides) A recommendation may be all right, but in terms of writing to me to ask me to give a man a job on the basis of political consideration, do not come to me. I am not the person.

As far as a Statutory Corporation is concerned, I know how the Dems operated in the past. During my short period at MCW I took a hands off attitude towards the problem of the Board. As a matter of fact in the light of discipline I made my position abundantly clear that I was not a court of appeal. I imagine I made enemies for myself and probably enemies for my party by adopting that attitude, but in the end I believe that the party benefited as a result, because I was able to create a very good system, and I was able to instil discipline in the bodies that came under my Ministry, and I am proud that I adopted that attitude. I wish I could say that the Dems adopted that attitude during their time.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central dealt with the question also of buses in the area of Belleville and the surrounding districts. I want to assure him that my party did not take the buses off the Belleville route. We had nothing to do with it. It was his Government that took them off. Under me it never happened. What I did after I came into office and discovered that the people up there had no bus service was to ask that an investigation be carried out and research done to discover if it was worthwhile in terms of returns to have a bus service in Belleville. The answer was that it was not profitable, but I still advocated that a service be put in, and I am still of the view even if I am not in the Ministry that such a service should be given. The people in Belleville area are people like any where else, and we have sent the service all over this Island, in areas of St. John, places where you never saw buses before. I was surprised one night driving up to see buses up to 11 o'clock in the darkest spots of St. John, and roads that the former Government never thought of improving were improved under this administration. So

when it comes to the question of victimisation and using us, the people on the other side are best qualified to discuss that subject.

The hon. member for St. Lucy asked a question about confusion in the area of Speightstown and referred to the fact that the bus stand there is very crowded and wondered when the time would come when we would give improved conditions to the area of Speightstown. I want to assure him that in the new Speightstown re-development plan, a new bus stand is planned for that area and until such time there can be no question of an improved area to the bus stand. We are at the moment limited in space and we need to have physical space in order to carry out our improvement.

Now I heard much talk about a 25 cents bus fare. Now how political can we be and how hypocritical can we be?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to make it clear that my statement on the reduction of the bus fare to 25 cents was not in any way based on any hypocrisy. I genuinely believe that if I had the privilege myself, if it is a fact that the economy has taken a turn for the better as we have heard, the Government should take steps to restore the bus fares to 25 cents because it is an economic factor which should be taken into consideration. I think the hon. member should withdraw that.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said I wondered how hypocritical we can be.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is he now saying he is a hypocrite?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I said how hypocritical we can be and I am not changing that. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Barbados has the lowest fare structure in terms of transportation any part of the world, and when we increased the bus fares by ten cents the public was looking forward to even a much higher increase.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order, I really would not like the records of this House to indicate that. Since he does not have to say that I said the words as you very well know, I said those words about 25 cents as well as my colleague on this side.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that a point of order or a point of explanation?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a point of order.

Mr. TAITT: It is not your business to get up and ask that either. We understand the Rules of the House,

Mr. Deputy Speaker. Two hon. members on this side have referred to the 25 cents bus fare; no other member has so done, therefore if he refers by insinuation to what we say, whether he states specifically that we said it or not, it is unparliamentary, and I think he ought to be asked to withdraw it. I do not wish any record of this House to suggest that I was playing cheap politics or being hypocritical on the question of a 25 cents bus fare. I wish that he would withdraw it.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wonder why in the same spirit when the economy was good the Democratic Labour Party....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker....

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am not giving way.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I have just got up and I am not giving way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will both hon. members please take their seats.
9.30 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. I have asked, according to the rules of the House, that the hon. member withdraw a remark and I am asking Your Honour to rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are saying that he accused you of hypocrisy?

Mr. TAITT: Yes, I am saying that, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not my understanding.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you very much, Sir.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, when the country's economy was booming I wonder why the hon. member did not see his way, and the

person who spoke along with him during this debate, to ask his party to give free school meals rather than charge 10 cents for school meals to the children of this country. I think it would have been a better gesture to ask the poor people not to pay at all for school meals rather than to say that you should not have given....

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention that in May's, the edition which is in this Chamber now, on page 445, Appendix of unparliamentary expressions, the word "hypocrite" is an unparliamentary expression.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Is this a challenge to Your Honour's ruling.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would interpret it to be a challenge if I so think.

Mr. SANDIFORD: And any imputation that hon. members are hypocritical would be unparliamentary, and I am just drawing that to your attention. I have just had the benefit of consulting May's.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this Resolution be now agreed to.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time is now 9.30 and.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I beg to move that the House stand adjourned until 12.00 noon next Tuesday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: This sitting is now adjourned until 12 o'clock noon next Tuesday.