

---

# THE

# House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

---

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

---

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

*Tuesday, 13th February, 1979.*

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); Mr. R. St.C. WEEKES, J.P.; Hon. L. S. CRAIG, (Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment); 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. Miss B. A. MILLER, (Minister of Health and National Insurance); 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. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW; Mr. L. L. SISNETT; and His Honour E. E. ALLEYNE, LL.M., (Deputy Speaker).

Prayers were read.

*Dr. CADDLE, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and took their seats.*

Mr. SPEAKER: The Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, 23rd January, 1979.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, these Minutes have been circulated and I would like to move that they be confirmed subject to any observations or any errors by any hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no observations by any hon. members, the Minutes stand confirmed.

The Minutes of Tuesday the 30th January, 1979.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, these Minutes have been circulated and I would like to move that they be confirmed subject to any observations or errors by any hon. members.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no observations by any hon. members, these Minutes stand confirmed.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS BY YOUR HONOUR

Mr. SPEAKER: I have to announce that I have received a communication from the Other Place expressing their concurrence in the extension of time which was sought by the Joint Committee on Property Legislation from this Honourable House.

*Hon. C. L. BOLDEN entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

### PAPERS LAID

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On behalf of the Prime Minister, I beg to lay the following document :—

The Judges (Salaries) Order, 1979.

### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: On behalf of the Minister of Finance and Planning, I beg to give the following notice:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$702,100 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. 27, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to give the following notices:—

Resolution to grant the sum of \$5,345,552 from the Consolidated Fund and to place it at the disposal of the Government to supplement the Estimates 1978-79, Part II - Capital, as shown in the Supplementary Estimates 1978-79, No. 28, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

Resolution to grant the sum of \$19,700 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. 29, which form the Schedule to the Resolution.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES

Mr. SPEAKER: I have received notice of a Motion from the hon. member for St. Lucy. The Motion would amount to a censure against the Chairman of Committees of this Honourable House. *Prima facie*, the Motion seeks to represent as an existing fact that which in truth and in fact does not exist and cannot be supported by the Hansard Report of this Honourable House. Consequently I rule the Motion to be out of order.

#### NOTICES OF QUESTIONS

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central has submitted a number of questions which are presently being processed and I give him the assurance that later during the course of the day he will be allowed to table them.

Dr. CADDLE: Thank You.

#### REPORT FROM SELECT COMMITTEES

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have the honour to present the second and final Report of the Joint Select Committee on Property Legislation which was set up by this Honourable House and the Other Place.

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

#### FIRST READING OF BILLS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Bill, 1979, be read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the Bill entitled "Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries (Remuneration Allowances) Bill, 1979," be read a first time.

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

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

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should have stated that the House was told last week it was the intention of the Government to proceed with a number of measures in all their stages today, and these two measures of which I have just given notice are matters which we are seeking to do today, as well as the Resolutions dealing with the salary and allowances of the Governor General and the salaries and allowances applicable to members of the staff of Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER: Perhaps I should receive a motion for the suspension of the relevant Standing Orders.

#### REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 8 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South is ready, and the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 6 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. I also propose to lay a written reply to Parliamentary Question No. 9 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South.

#### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that week before last when we adjourned I had intimated that we could have adjourned until Tuesday last week, but hon. members felt that it would be unnecessary to do so, and I informed them that I would be prepared to adjourn for two weeks provided that hon. members understood that a number of measures planned for first reading last Tuesday would be dealt with today upon notice being circulated in good time so that hon. members would have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the topics. Accordingly it is necessary for us to proceed by suspending the Standing Orders, and I beg to move that Standing Orders Nos. 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of the day's Sitting.

*The question that the several Standing Orders be suspended was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now taken and that Order No. 1 be the first Order of the day.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 1 is the instant Order of the day.

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

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

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

#### RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE NOTE TO ITEM 2 OF HEAD 22

*The first Order was called – To move the passing of the Resolution to amend the note to Head 22 – Loans and Advances – Item 2 – Loans to Agencies – of the Estimates 1978-79.*

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution is to approve the sum of \$50,000 as a loan to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society. Perhaps I should give the background for the purpose of this loan.

The Museum was established by statute some forty-three years ago and has been operating as a private society financed largely by Government subvention and by subscriptions and donations from the public. Over the years the subvention by the Government has proved inadequate, along with the subscriptions and donations taken by the Museum, to keep the Museum open as a viable institution. We have increased the subvention to the Museum by over 25% over the past two years, but when we took a look at the cost of running the Museum as submitted to us by the Society, we realized that they were in very serious financial trouble. A request was made to Government for a massive increase in the subvention, but the Government preferred to make available to the Society the sum of \$50,000 as a loan to meet the Society's commitments to the end of April, 1979. 12.35 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we as legislators consider the importance of the Museum in the general education and cultural development of this country. We appreciate that the origins of a Museum were in the days of ancient and classical antiquity, something that was esoteric, that was almost like a shrine which recorded the art and music and things that were dear to the heart of the Muses. Over the years the museum in Barbados, as indeed the museums all over the world, has still maintained the position of a repository of specimens of natural history, of art, of music and so on, and in Barbados the Barbados Museum and Historical Society is indeed a repository to rarities of plants, fossils, coral, shells, busts and so on.

The philosophy of the Barbados Museum must obviously be reflected in changing times, and it is important that the museum play a more dynamic role in the educational and cultural life of Barbados. The museum must more closely be identified with our natural heritage, and indeed I am referring to all of our natural heritage. Just a few months ago I had occasion to give a feature address at the annual meeting of the Museum and Historical Society, and I pointed out at that stage that not enough recording was done not only in the museum but in other allied institutions, like the Department of Archives and so on, not much was done to record enough about the sugar cane industry and the plantation system. But new social conditions in this country will make it imperative that the museum must not only be accessible to the elite, it must not only be the prerogative of the elite, and indeed this is the image it has in Barbados, but it must be made more accessible to all the people so that they can understand, appreciate and enjoy the exhibits that are in the museum, and it is necessary as a general policy that the museum, indeed the Government, should publicise it, should popularise it and to integrate it into the general education system of this country.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the museum provides a visual approach to learning. It is a forum for the eureka feeling, the feeling of personal discovery and creative activity, and so on, and in this regard it is a necessary supplement to our existing education system.

Now, the museum requires large sums of money in the immediate future for a number of goals. For instance, they are badly in need of a taxidermist to built up the natural history section of the museum. We have tried two approaches, I believe the Ministry of Finance has tried two approaches to CESO, that is, the Canadian Executive Services Overseas, for the provision of a taxidermist who would come to Barbados and assist with the work that is required to be done there. For instance, there is the question of recording the migratory bird movement, the number of migratory birds in Barbados at a certain time of the year, and we feel it is necessary for a taxidermist to do some work in that regard. Also in the area of reptiles, I realised only recently that in the museum there are no replicas of a number of reptiles like the mongoose and a number of species like the lizard in Barbados, and it is in that area that the museum requires the assistance of a taxidermist and the large cost that it involves.

I understand, too, Mr. Chairman, that CESO, the Canadian agency has offered the services of a taxidermist but in the period of six weeks between February and March. It just so happens, however, that the migratory birds are not in Barbados during that period, and although we appreciate the need or the desire of people from the agency to spend the cold winter months in Barbados, we would rather have assistance in that area during the summer when the birds are around. We are therefore making feelers out

to other international agencies, and particularly through UNESCO, for guidance in that area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the museum has found that the subvention that has been given it by Government is barely enough to pay its ancillary staff – the watchman, the security people and that sort of thing – and we hope that, I certainly hope, that this loan of \$50,000 to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society is only scratching the surface and that Government would find it possible in the near future to make even more generous allowances for the type of work the museum is doing and will be required to do in the future in the preservation, collection and presentation of works of art and aspects of the natural history of this country.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should bring to the attention of the hon. members that Government is now playing a more active role in the administration and running of the museum and has recently appointed a representative on the Board of the Society. I will expect that Government will be playing an increasingly important and active role in the Barbados Museum and Historical Society.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to make the point that we on the Opposition have no quarrel with the loan which is being made to the Barbados Museum. Certainly, like the Hon. Minister who presented this Resolution, we would like to see the day come when greater financial input will be forthcoming from the Government to the Barbados Museum and Historical Society.

There is no doubt that this Society is extremely important for us in terms of our history and our cultural heritage, and I think that when one examines the very important role which this Society can play in our whole educational and cultural development that we have to come to a point in time where the financial contribution which will be forthcoming from the Government will be even greater, because it has to be regarded as an integral part of our national heritage. Sir, as I said, as far as the Opposition is concerned we have no quarrel with that. What, however, we would like to raise relates to the explanation in the Addendum. The Resolution seeks to change, or indeed to alter what is written in the original item and to replace it by "Provision for loans and advances to Statutory Bodies, Government-controlled Corporations and any other Organisation subject to the approval of Cabinet."

12.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to draw the attention of the House for a few moments on the latter part of that note which says "and any other organisation subject

to the approval of the Cabinet". This seems to me and the Opposition to be a rather open ended kind of operation and I wonder if the Minister would be in a position to inform this Chamber whether or not the Government will or has established any criteria which would enable us to see the basis on which grants to these other organisations would be made, because I think that in any arrangement like this there must be some basic criteria, as for example, the organisation must be of some national interest or concern, and one has got to take into consideration the contribution which the organisation would be making and of course the way in which it functions. I would hope that we would be able to get some indication about the kind of criteria which the Government would be establishing on this.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, you would realise that this Resolution seeks to get a specific sum of money, and it seeks at the same time to change the note in the Estimates, and what I want to find out is whether or not this change is going to be a continuing one or if it is just being changed for this specific purpose, and whether or not, as I said, it will be a further policy of the Government to utilise this Head in the Estimates for grants of this nature, because as you would appreciate there are other parts of the Estimates which sometimes cover this, and I think we should try to get some clear indication of this from the Government side. I just want to repeat that we have no quarrel with this and are in agreement with any attempt which is being made to ensure that the Barbados Museum and Historical Society plays its meaningful role in the life of Barbados.

I think I would finally like to say, Mr. Chairman that a lot of it will have to do with the way in which teachers and schools view the Museum and the role which it can play in the educational process as well, and whereas I agree with the Hon. Minister of Education that in the past the Museum has more or less been operating up in the clouds, I believe an attempt is now being made to put it on its true course as it were, but I think that the kind of utilisation which can be made of the Museum to a large extent will depend on a proper educational programme and the integration of it into the educational system which we have in Barbados, and we hope that opportunities would be provided for children to visit there; but as I said, a lot will have to do with the appreciation of teachers of the role that the Museum and Historical Society can play in this country.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may briefly answer the question that has been raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy who wants to know

what criteria would be used for the making of grants under this particular Head in the Estimates, I find the hon. member's question passing strange, because when we are making a loan to the Museum of \$50,000, we come to the House by way of Resolution and inform the House of the loan and tell the House why we are making the loan. I would have thought that during my introduction of the Resolution all that was made crystal clear, but the hon. member well knows and it is a historical fact that the previous administration of which he was a member would under a vote for several million dollars for special projects or whatever the title they had in those days, the then Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. John would spend millions of the people's money without coming to Parliament. Not only would he not come here by Resolution and explain to the people why he was spending money on the North Point, Carib West, Bath Plantation or the rest of them, he did not even tell his Cabinet when he was spending millions of dollars of the people's money. This Government comes in here with a Resolution and explains to the House exactly why we are lending, not giving the modest sum of \$50,000 to the Museum, which is an important and integral tool in the educational system of this country, and the hon. member for St. Lucy has got the nerve to get up and ask what criteria there is. One assumes that when we put these figures in the Estimates under "Subventions for various Public Institutions" that if any hon. member in this House wants to query it that he does it in March at the time of the Annual Estimates. It is in the Estimates that are in the hands of the hon. member for St. Lucy at this very minute, and if he wanted to know at the time what was going to happen with this money, he should have asked at that time, or more importantly, he should have asked at the time when he was a member of the Other government why were subventions made to the identical agencies that appeared in the Estimates and what criteria were being used at the time for granting them.

I think the second point that was made in relation to the role of the teachers in the schools to make the Museum and its exhibits more relevant to the classroom experience is a very valid point, and he would have served himself and his side better by developing that point instead of making the rather specious point about what criteria is used for the granting of subventions by Government.

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

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

1978-79 No. 26

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, this Resolution which is brought before the House will increase the amount voted in the Annexed Estimates for the Post Office in respect of maintenance of vehicles. The sum of \$22,000 was voted in the Annual Estimates and our repairs to date amount to \$10,412. There is a shortage based on the frequency of breakdowns of the vans, and it is estimated that we will need \$12,320 to carry us through until the end of the year.

It may be mentioned that since 1977 the Post Office has ordered two replacement units. These units have not yet arrived and we are hoping they will arrive some time this month or by the end of the financial year, which means that our repairs in the next financial year will not be as high as for this year.

The second item is in the sum of \$265, and this has come about because there was a safe which had been ordered at the time when provision of \$1,325 was included in the Estimates for its purchase. Now that the bill has been received the amount is \$1,590 and there is a difference of \$265.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

*The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*  
12.55 p.m.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 25

*Item No. 1(b) was called—to move the passing of the Resolution to grant the sum of \$24,123 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. 25 which form the Schedule to the Resolution.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Under Head 3(2), Sir, which is Establishments, the Addendum very fully describes the purpose for which the Supplementary is sought and I beg to move that Head 3(2) stand part.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Are both 3(2) and 4(1) being dealt with?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with 3(2) only.

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

#### HEAD 4(1) CABINET OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In Head 4(1) again the amounts are small and the Addendum very fully sets out the purpose for which the Supplementary is sought. There is nothing I can add to it. Perhaps at Item 6, I can mention that we have made some savings under this Vote and therefore we do not need a Supplementary for the full amount that the increase and allowance would imply, but that is a minor point, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 4(1) stand part.

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

*Mr. SANDIFORD entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one or two comments at this point. During the recent by-election in St. Michael South Central, I was very surprised to see that over a two or three months period that the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister could be roaming around St. Michael South Central at all hours during the day. I must congratulate him for the kind of assiduous efforts that he made.

Now my understanding of the role of the Personal Assistant to the Prime Minister is to assist him in his duties as Prime Minister of this country. I would hope that we are not being asked here today to vote an additional sum of money for the Personal Assistant of the Prime Minister to roam around this country as a functionary of the Barbados Labour Party because I do not think that public funds should be used for that kind of purpose.

The second point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, is in relation to the appointment of the Minister of Constitutional Affairs and I would like to ask the hon. member for St. Thomas to read his own Party's 1976 Manifesto and see what their position was as to the number of Ministers which the Barbados Labour Party Government would entertain.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I never intended getting into this debate but hearing what I considered absolute parliamentary garbage by the member for St. Michael South Central about the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister going through St. Michael South Central during the by-election, the first thing I would ask is this. He drew Government funds, the Prime Minister's Personal Aide, and he was around St. Michael South Central, and so did I. I was drawing Government

funds also because I am politically appointed. I do not know what sort of rubbish he comes in here talking.

The second point is this. I wonder if he knows a civil servant who was his canvasser and was working in my Ministry, and I believe he may be in the House today, and he got the nerve to come and ask what was the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister doing walking through St. Michael South Central. I wonder if he checked to find out if the Prime Minister's Personal Aide was on vacation at the time and if he had decided during his vacation to take part in a political by-election in St. Michael South Central.

How about Warwick Franklin. You ever heard those names? How about Glasgow. All of these sorts of people were politically appointed civil servants taking part in an election and he comes in here asking about the Prime Minister's Personal Aide who was walking about. I do not know why you do not sit down and really pick your subjects instead of getting up talking garbage all the time, every Tuesday after Tuesday.

Talking about the Manifesto of 1976, I was involved in helping in the input in the Manifesto and we decided to reduce the number of Ministers. We found it necessary after a number of months or years. After two years we discovered that we would have to increase our Ministerial force. That was a Manifesto promise. Did you remember that in 1966 you promised the people of this country that you would come back after the first three years — in 1961 — and that you were going to build houses on the beach for the workers. You remember these things or you do not remember them. A shoe factory to make shoes at 10¢ a pair; all these things you were going to do. I am going to build the beach houses and let you see how they should be built for the workers in Barbados. That is what I am going to do. I have the plans in my office now.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You mean look at the Chair or address the Chair, which? I addressed it, Mr. Chairman, earlier so I started from there. You mean look at the Chair.

I do not know why Tuesday after Tuesday he has to be on stage. He is a parliamentary stage monkey now. Every Tuesday getting up in here and talking what is irrelevant all the time. Mr. Chairman, I am going to run the member for St. Michael South Central. Just as I stop your leader from coming in here, I am going to

stop you from coming in here. Whenever I get up you will have to get up and go out. Completely irrelevant. What was the Prime Minister's Personal Aide, in a political appointment was doing walking through St. Michael South Central during a by-election? Is he a criminal that he could not walk about in St. Michael South Central? I cannot understand what sort of nonsense I am hearing every Tuesday.

However, Sir, I hope and I know during the course of the day you will get up and talk some other thing which you do not understand. I hear you have your audited account on the \$7,000 acre of land. I hear you went to the Accountant. I hope you produce it. Talking about being a smart businessman, I would call you a rip off.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, that comment must be regarded as unparliamentary. We do not mind sitting down here listening to the malodorous mouthings of the member for St. James week after week but that remark is certainly unparliamentary and it should be withdrawn and struck from the records.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The fact is that he is a copy-cat. Errol Blackman used the word so he is using it all the time now. Copy-cat.  
1.05 p.m.

I am in full support of the Resolution.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I drew to attention an unparliamentary remark made by the hon. member.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am supporting the Resolution that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister get whatever coppers are coming to him.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I never thought my time to speak on this matter would come at so early an hour, but I cannot sit down and witness any onesided behaviour in this House. If one is going to have the gump-tion to speak of the fact that the Prime Minister's Personal Assistant may have been in the constituency of St. Michael South Central during daylight or night hours doing whatever he was doing — and it may have coincided with a bye-election in the constituency — I think it is but fair for me to get into the record of this House for all time that during my bye-election in early 1976 and prior to the bye-election several persons who then held positions as Civil Servants — not as political appointees — in this country joined with the then Government in daily campaigns against my candidature. I will say without fear of contradiction that when one particular Price Control Officer should have been at her duties seeing that the prices of goods in the shops of this

country were kept within reasonable limits, she who happened to be the sister of the Democratic Labour Party candidate was up and down St. Philip every day campaigning against me, going so far as to present herself at Skeete's Bay on afternoons to buy fish and distribute the said fish to constituents in St. Philip North, for what purpose I can't say; I only have my suspicions as to why she was buying fish at Skeete's Bay. This refers to Mrs. Barbara Marshall.

I have nothing to say beyond the fact that Mr. Earl Glasgow was daily up and down the length and breadth of St. Philip canvassing against me. He was the Personal Assistant to the then Prime Minister — a position similar to the one now held by Howard Roberts. I have nothing to say about the fact that Mr. Byron Gittens who functioned at the polling booth at Summervale, an ex-policeman then holding a job in the Government, was canvassing and impersonating the Crown Solicitor because he went into Chapel Land and told the people that he was Carol Fields, the Crown Solicitor, and they must not vote for David Simmons. Any hon. member on the other side can check with Mr. Fields, because I myself asked him about it. What happened is that Byron Gittens left his car P-220, the number of which he got from the former Speaker of this House, Mr. Neville Maxwell, and he left it parked and borrowed a bicycle and rode around canvassing against me. Mr. Gittens tried to allow a man from Moncrieffe called Chris to vote twice on the day of the bye-election, and when I drew it to his attention that Chris had voted at 7 o'clock in the morning and was back there again to vote at 10.30, he appeared very embarrassed.

I speak now on the canvassing done by Mr. Melvin Sarjeant, an ex-sergeant who was then working as a Price Control Officer. He too was canvassing against me in Government's time. I won't call all the others, but I just want it to be clearly understood that not political opponents alone, but Civil Servants who should have been devoting the time to the running of their respective Government offices used that time to openly canvass against me politically. I have never mentioned this on a platform, and it would have died were it not for the presumption of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the hon. member would give way, I draw attention to Standing Order 28(1) which states that no reference must be made in debate on the character or conduct on any person except in his official or public capacity. It is my understanding that if the names of Civil Servants or Public Officers are to be called, the Presiding Officer should have been given some indication. I am sure the hon. member may not have remembered this Standing Order at the time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point is taken.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing the Standing Order to my atten-

tion and I give him the assurance, as I indicated, that I would not call anymore names. He should have intervened a lot earlier, for I am finished now.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, it is strange that the hon. member should seek to raise an issue of this nature when dealing with the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister, because I believe the same gentleman used to be very closely attached to the Democratic Labour Party since about 1970. I well remember in 1970 when I was a candidate in a bye-election in St. Joseph the same gentleman organized a campaign for the Democratic Labour Party. He also organised a campaign in 1971, and I remember when the rock stones came through the crowd at Todds Corner. Earl Glasgow was seen in the crowd and the very gentleman was seen in the crowd. He was not pelting rock stones for the Barbados Labour Party. Earl Glasgow broke up every political meeting that was held in St. John even when he was the Personal Aide to the Prime Minister. I could not walk through Massiah Street where I was born, and Earl Glasgow cut the microphone wires, cut the van tyres and pelt rock stones at me. And he was then Personal Aide to the then Prime Minister who is now the Leader of the Opposition. But I never heard anybody come in here and say that he should be up at Government Headquarters carrying out Government's business. Rather he was considered right to be doing it then but he is wrong to do it now. What is the difference?

1.15 p.m.

He was the then Personal Aide of the now Leader of the Opposition, who was Prime Minister, and I never heard anybody come in here and say that he should be at Government House or at Government Headquarters helping the then Prime Minister carry out other duties. He was well and right to be doing it then, but as soon as he is in the Labour Party he is wrong to go up there now. What is the difference? I can tell you something. The Headmaster at the new Lammings School in St. Joseph, Mr. Banfield, who was Chief Returning Officer, never went to school in the bye-election in 1970, he went from house to house canvassing against the Barbados Labour Party candidate, and I never heard anybody say anything about him. Earl Glasgow went up when they were setting up the booths and he was dictating how the booths should be set up when it came to polling, and in St. Ann's School they did not even put a light, and when I complained and called the Chief Returning Officer, Earl Glasgow told me I must go out of the school. This was high daytime, the evening before. (ASIDES). I do not know anything about Mr. Standford, but I do not see why you are raising these petty things now, if it is good for the DLP, isn't it good for the BLP? You must tie Mr. Roberts in Bay Street, tie him by his hands and by his feet and he must only be transported from there to his home when there is a bye-election now in this particular

period. Well, if the former Personal Aide could roam about the island of Barbados freely, let this one roam about freely too. He learnt it from your party and he brought it over to ours, do not worry about it.

*The question that Head 4(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*

#### MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND LANDS

#### HEAD 18(1) — DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This Head really concerns the Hon. Minister of Housing, Sir. We are setting up a Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing. For years the Ministry of Housing existed only as an administrative unit for the National Housing Corporation; it never made any effort to take the total housing needs of the country into consideration, it never made any effort to see how those needs were being satisfied other than by the National Housing Corporation, we are now having a Planning Unit which will analyse the entire spectrum of the demand for housing in Barbados, relate house construction to availability of funds in terms of the position of the economy to stand a certain level of house construction and relate it to availability of labour, that is, to other construction projects which may be going on in the country at large. It is a very necessary purpose, when the hon. member for St. James was appointed to the position in Housing at the same time I gave directions that the scope of the Ministry of Housing should be expanded. This is the first fruit of the expansion, Sir, to have a proper Planning Unit which can deal with the remaining infrastructural deficiency in Barbados.

We are within sight of completing our educational needs, electricity is enjoyed by between 85 and 90 percent of the population, water by a similar percentage, there are 40,000 television sets in the country, there are between 25 and 30 thousand private motor cars — I could not give you the exact figure — but we are still a country where there is a lot of substandard housing and it is the determination of this Government to put an end to it, and a Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing is one of the first essentials, this is something it never had before, and this vote reflects the establishment of such a Unit and the requirement that it will have for furniture in its early stages.

I beg to move that Head 18(1) stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to make any contentious points on this particular Resolution, we are told that this is the first fruit that will be picked from the tree of Lionel Seymour Craig as Minister responsible for housing, and we are certainly looking forward to the functioning of this Planning Unit in the terms that the Prime Minister has spoken of them. I think the people of this country have come to realise now that nothing was done in any area of Government at all until the Barbados Labour Party appeared on the scene. Nothing was done for housing in terms of total national needs, nothing was done in housing, so we will start from virgin soil in this particular regard.

What I would like to comment on, however, is that in addition to the many housing developments initiated by the Democratic Labour Party, a much vaster programme than the first Labour Party administration ever implemented in this country, and I dare say much vaster than this present second Labour Party administration will ever implement in spite of all the plans we hear of on the drawing board, we will await those, I would like to know from the Minister whether this Planning Unit will be advising the Minister and indeed the Housing Corporation on the needs of the people of this country for additional housing, and I would like to make the point that there is no need to say that we are in sight of meeting our total educational needs. That is a pipe dream, and I dare say so, because the needs in education are very great, and when this Labour Party leaves office in 1981 there will still be needs for the Democratic Labour Party administration, led by the stalwarts over here.....(ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That Ministry will not fade away, there will be a lot of work to be done, not only in the corrective field, but also in the creative field. I would like to know from the Minister whether, as far as the programme of his Ministry is concerned, in the housing estates he has carried out any renovations to houses recently, and whether this has been limited to a coat of paint on the houses or whether there have been repairs in those houses. I was visiting my constituency recently and I was in a Barbados Labour Party stronghold in that constituency — I know where the areas are — and I noted that some coats of paint, whether it was Berger or Harris I do not know, but the paint was put on to these houses and it was merely covering up the need for repairs to door jambs, to windows and to the wooden fabric flooring of the houses, and I would like to know when there would be a repair programme to those houses in Field Place and to other places in this country.

I would like to know, too, because there are rumours going around — I believe I have heard the Minister in one of his effusive moments talking about giving people top and bottom in some of these units. I am talking about Field Place, I believe in the Pine certain changes either were made or are proposed to be made.

1.25 p.m.

I believe that in the Pine certain changes either were made or are proposed, and there is some concern from the residents as to exactly how these houses will be allocated. If you have one person living in an upstairs unit and another family living downstairs and you intend to make upstairs and downstairs into one unit, what principle or method would be used in the allocation of these houses, how will you determine which family would be called upon to vacate that particular unit? And secondly, I would like to know what arrangements will be made for providing alternative accommodation for any family which may be called upon to leave these units.

Mr. Chairman, while on this matter I would like to indicate that the National Housing Corporation I believe should pay a little greater attention to the maintenance not only of the buildings but of the surroundings, the roads and the other amenities in some of the housing estates. My constituency is one which seems to be getting a fair measure of benign neglect, and I do hope that this particular situation could be corrected shortly.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I welcome the decision to set up this Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing. I think it would go a long way in solving one of the fundamental problems in this country. One has to admit that in spite of what has been done over the years for housing in this country both by Government and by individual enterprises, a lot still remains to be done. You only have to travel around Barbados and see the state of many of the houses in this country where unfortunate people are forced to live. I do believe that housing is one of the areas in which all national effort should be directed to get a ready improvement or solution to the state of housing. I say "national effort" because it is felt especially by under-privileged people that it is the sole responsibility of Government, but it is my belief that all sectors of the community should participate in resolving this problem. When I say all sectors of the community, I pay special attention to the insurance companies operating in Barbados, because for a very long time we have had them operating, collecting money much of which they sought to invest outside of Barbados, and sometimes making loans to their policy holders for the purpose of building houses or some other effort. I think

that a major thrust could be made by the insurance companies in Barbados in assisting the nation in solving this problem of housing. It is up to them to come together and either through national housing bonds or in some definite organisation specifically designed for the purpose, build houses and rent or lease them or sell to the people of this country who require them.

In addition, I am a bit heartened also by reports that there is an effort now by the Government to invite some concern from outside our shores to put up cheap houses. At the same time I hope the Minister will find an opportunity during this debate to expand further on this and also to tell us if this was the only company that came in here for this purpose of setting up houses, because my information is that there has been a German concern in this country who were equally interested in the construction of cheap houses, but so far has not been able to get near the Minister. I wonder if the Minister has been made aware of that.

Furthermore I would also like to point out that in Barbados there is in existence in some areas the expertise for the setting up of cheap houses, and why this expertise has not been made use of up to the moment is a matter which needs to be looked into. While we are concerned with the building of houses, I am also concerned with the actual state of affairs in some of the older housing estates in this country, namely, the Pine, St. Barnabas and Grazettes, where not only the appearance of the houses leaves something to be desired, but the actual condition of the roads along which you find these houses. If you go to some of these older housing estates you will find that the roads have actually deteriorated very badly over the course of years, and I think that something needs to be done about the roads in the housing estates. There seems to be some conflict as to whether the responsibility for the repairs and maintenance of these roads is the responsibility of the Ministry of Communications and Works or the responsibility of the Housing Corporation, and I think it is left to the Minister responsible for Housing to clarify this point and let the people in these areas know exactly where the responsibility lies.

Sir, I am particularly concerned as a representative with the housing conditions in St. Barnabas. The roads up there need repairing and I would like to invite the Hon. Minister to come around at some time and see the condition of the roads up there and see if he can get something done to these roads.

I am also drawing to the attention of the Minister that there is a problem in Barbados with finding adequate lots on which to put houses. This has been a problem for many years and we are finding that this problem is becoming more and more acute as time goes by. People are being given notice to quit spots which

they now rent and very often they go to Court and the owners of these spots are being given judgment and people are being made to move. Not very long ago when the Democratic Labour Party was in power it was a frequent thing to see houses taken down and put by the wayside. At the moment we are still finding people being asked by the Court to vacate spots but they are finding it extremely difficult to get alternative sites and I wonder what proposals or plans the Hon. Minister responsible for Housing has for ameliorating this plight. I would like to suggest to him that it is not easy to find land available especially in easy reach of Bridgetown to put into land schemes where people can rent a spot, and I would suggest to him that off Bridge Road is an area of land which he should explore the possibility of making available to people who require land for renting purposes. Unless this is done you will find more and more problems coming about with people who have houses but nowhere to put them, and you may very well have more and more of these houses lining the streets and highways of Barbados as time goes by, and I hope that the Minister will be in a position to do something about that.

Another point I would like to raise is something which the Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing can do, and that is to make in conjunction with the Town and Country Planning Office a survey of the spots already improved in the development schemes of this country, but not yet occupied by houses, because you will find that over the years land has been permitted to be sub-divided and sold out, and there are a number of vacant spots all over the country in the various land development schemes, but you will still find people coming and asking for land to be sub-divided with the same consequence that over a period of time some of the spots are sold, houses are put up, and a large number of the spots in that particular estate would remain vacant. I think that in a Planning Unit some attempt could be made to gain some knowledge of how many such spots exist in these estates and what are the plans for using these vacant spots in the very near future.

One other problem which you have from many of these vacant spots lying around is an abundant growth of bush, and then among that bush you find rats, and many other things, and people dump rubbish or refuse on these open spots, and I think that if some effort is made to get these spots pressed into use, the Ministry of Health especially the environmental section would be spared the problems of finding out who are the owners and be able to get around this disposal of refuse and other environmental, insanitary conditions.

1.35 p.m.

I agree with the setting up of a Planning Unit in the Ministry of Housing. I have seen a need for it for

long time and I hope that some of the aspirations which they have as regards housing in this country will bear fruit. It is a very urgent need in this country especially among the under-privileged people, people who cannot get adequate finance to build their own houses and it is from this point of view that Government has to come to the rescue of those people and I hope that the Minister in his reply will give some information as regard his attempt to set up pre-fabricated houses and also of the plans he has about the roads in some of the older housing estates in this country.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am the most surprised person in this Honourable Chamber today. I do not believe that the member for St. Michael South and the member who just sat down, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, could get up and make such a contribution. It is a very unworthy contribution of two hon. members who were Ministers of Health. Note, Ministers of Health. Both of them alluded to the conditions of the houses in the housing estates.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as former Ministers of Health, they should have been aware of the conditions that people who were renting in the Government houses were made to live in and if either one of them had to travel along Princess Royal Avenue and see the conditions in which people have to live, then Mr. Chairman, they would not have come in here today and talked about the unsanitary or even the dilapidated conditions of the houses.

Mr. Chairman, the position is this. In Princess Royal the houses that were built some 20 or 25 years ago, people were made to live upstairs and downstairs and then again reports were made to the Ministry of Health and to the Ministry of Housing about the conditions under which people were made to live. Water from the top floors was made to seep through floor interfering and causing unsanitary conditions for the people living in that sort of house. Mr. Chairman, absolutely nothing was done under the DLP regime. I challenge either one of the members on that side to get up and say that they did anything at all to rectify the horrible situation in the Pineland and other areas of Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, what do we have? Former Ministers of Housing could condone and allow such living conditions to exist, getting in here today and calling upon the Government to do something about those unsanitary conditions. I have news for them. I would tell them what the needs of the Barbados Government are. We know that the people have been complaining about the unsanitary conditions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Last year in 1978 this Government started a programme to rectify the situation

and we have got in Princess Royal two of the houses nearing completion and this Government's intention is to make all those similar houses that are now being housed by people on top and down bottom, we intend to have them rectified and make them more habitable for the people so we do not want them to come in here and tell us that they are in unsanitary conditions and asking questions about them.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that the member for St. Michael South has made. He wants to know whether there is a programme of putting on or splashing on coats of paint. Now I have news for him because even as a member and a Minister of the former Government, he should have known about the programme which was carried out in his regime just before the Elections of 1971 and 1976. I can go on to say that the then Minister of Housing gave the people gallons of paint to do their own houses. Most of the paint was stolen and he should have known that the paint was splashed on any old how, but what we have done is to make it possible for the appropriate painters to do the job. We are not giving people paint. We are not allowing people to carry away the paint.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: On what do you rise?

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation, Sir. In my address I was not talking about painting of the houses alone. I was talking about putting on paint when there is need for repairs to the houses. That is what I was talking about and I hope that you will address yourself to that particular point, not about putting on paint or who put on paint or things like that but that paint was put on to the houses and redecorated and there is need for repairs to the houses and I would have thought that repairs would have come before the paint is put on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member does not seem to understand is that we have voted money and that is exactly what this Government is doing. We are first repairing the houses and then painting.

*Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW entered the Chamber and took his seat.*

Mr. SANDIFORD: But I am seeing the houses with fresh coats of paint and the repairs are not done. That is what I am drawing attention to.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, what I am pointing out to the hon. member is this. We have found a situation in the housing estates in particular where most of the paint has been dumped on the houses without first carrying out repairs and we have got a programme whereby carpenters and masons are doing the repair work and then the paint is being put on. If the hon. member is not aware of this, then it is not my fault. He might have visited a home.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, Continue.

Mr. BRADSHAW: He could have visited a home. I do not know what home he has visited but beyond a question of a doubt the programme of the National Housing Corporation is such that the carpentry and masonry repairs are done to the houses first before the paint is put on the houses, so let us get it straight. We have found a situation that the houses were allowed to deteriorate.

In St. Andrew there is a horrible situation in the housing area. We have seen this in the Pinelands where doors were dropping off, literally dropping off and no amount of requests under the Democratic Labour Party were heeded. They did nothing, absolutely nothing and then they have the gall to come in here and allude to houses and repairs in the housing area.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, let me talk about the question of roads and the lighting system in these housing areas. It is one that needs mention. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central was Minister of Communications and Works. His office is situated near the Pinelands where it is said, and it is an established fact that the roads in that area are the worst of all in the housing areas. It is a fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

Mr. BRADSHAW: It is a fact and I have asked the former Minister of Communications and Works to visit the area this week, which he did.  
1.45 p.m.

And I hope that the people in Pine Lands and Wildey will see that money is included in the next year's Estimates to carry out the badly needed repairs.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, it was not a situation that was there in 1976 alone; it is a situation which has been there for the past twenty years and it is going to take some time to have it rectified. What is significant is that during the short two years that I was privileged to be a representative of the people I have seen tangible work done in my constituency, much to the pride of the people of St. Michael South. So I do not want the hon. member for St. Michael North Central to get in here and

tell anyone about roads in the Housing area. We are well aware of that and will be doing everything to rectify the situation which they, the Democratic Labour Party, failed to rectify during their fifteen years in office.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to deal with any of the detail of the individual complaints to the hon. Minister or to encroach upon the sphere of activity of the Chairman of the National Housing Corporation; but I think it is important that when we discuss the question of Housing we attempt to try on both sides of this House to bring to bear our respective experiences upon a problem which I believe is a problem for all political parties in Barbados, namely, what mechanisms we can use to ensure that we have a speedy resolution to the Housing problem in Barbados. The Government is very clear in its mind that it is false thinking for anyone to believe that the central government and its subsidiary corporations can have at their disposal enough funds to cater to the diverse needs of housing in Barbados. One only has to analyse the annual Estimates over the course of the last ten years and one would discover that the amount of receipts by way of rents and other revenue of the National Housing Corporation are not enough even to pay for the regular annual maintenance of the buildings, far less make a contribution to the acquisition of new physical assets and a contribution to overhead.

Now it is for that reason that this Government decided that we have to devise additional incentives to ensure that private enterprise come within the purview of a programme to increase the number of housing units, and we started. The first step that we made in that direction was to acquire all of the shares of the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company and making it an integrated part of the Barbados National Bank. Secondly, the National Insurance Corporation of Barbados has been requested to direct some of its funds into the National Mortgage Finance Corporation. Thirdly, and most importantly, the Barbados National Bank has been authorized to issue a series of bonds carrying with them certain tax-exempt privileges on the interest in order to induce a further flow of funds into the Barbados National Bank, because one of the key problems into the provision of housing is the necessity for a regular flow of funds to cater to people who want to borrow money. Fourthly, we have repeatedly requested all financial institutions in Barbados to look at housing as an area for lending, not just short term lending for five or seven years but lending for periods as long as twenty five or thirty years. We go further — the Government is now looking at additional incentives by way of ensuring whether, for people who deliver a total product in the form of a subdivision with a ready built house on it together with the coordination of the mortgage financing and things of that kind, there cannot be some incentive similar to the incentives given

to people who have industries in this Island, because housing is a big industry.

Now this Resolution is another step forward in ensuring that the Ministry of Housing will play that coordinating role between the public sector and the private sector in housing. In addition to that we have transferred the Town Planning Department into the Ministry of Housing so that the matter of the Housing Corporation and private developers not being able to get title at an early period of time after completion of the house would be removed. And there is one other area on which we are working. One of the indirect benefits of the modernization of the Land Law system that we have introduced ought to be a speed-up and shortening of the conveyancing documents and the reduction of fees. And we go further still: Very soon an amendment to the Housing Corporation Act or the Mortgage Insurance Act will be introduced whereby a statutory guarantee of title will be delivered upon a conveyance from the Housing Corporation or from approved developers; again this is an attempt to ensure that this bottleneck between the completion of a house and the completion of the legal formalities can be drastically reduced, because every time that you hold up money in already built stock it means that the developer or the Housing Authority is deprived of that money to be able to continue building. We have identified these constraints and also the constraints which result from a misunderstanding by many people in the housing industry in Barbados, that is, the need for a certificate of completion of development. I have made a careful study of this, and there is no law in Barbados that calls for any certificate of completion of any project. There is a law which says you cannot commence building without notifying the Town and Country Planning Officer, and if developers, including the National Housing Corporation, had made it a condition of a building contract that they would not give the first payment to any contractor until they provided evidence that they have notified the Town Planning Officer and that there has been an inspection they would get it beforehand and then there could not be any question of not building in accordance with Town Planning conditions, because an inspector would have visited and he would have got confirmation from the Town Planning Office; and I would defy anyone to say then that you have not got a good title.

1.55 p.m.

The inspector would have come, and on the laying down of the foundation, you would have got confirmation from the Town Planning Office that they had inspected, you would have satisfied the planning conditions, and I defy any obstructionist lawyer to say then that you have not got a good title. There is a lot of misunderstanding about the law here, people who have been trained in it by way of the apprenticeship system have never understood the fundamental philosophy

behind the regulations, but if you do a careful analysis of it I would defy anybody here to show me anywhere in the law which states that you must have a certificate of completion from a Town Planner.

I am sure that when we get the Planning Unit established, as the Minister will say, a series of seminars will be continuously held among the bankers and the providers of finance for housing, among the builders, among the Town Planning people, and among the lawyers, and if we approach the question of housing not on any narrow, petty, partisan basis — because both of these political parties have been in power and both of these political parties have tried to grapple with the question of housing in Barbados — and there cannot be any politics in housing, what politics do you have in housing? The truth of the matter is that there is an outstanding list of 10,000 people in the Housing Authority's books since 1972, so what politics you want to make out of something? Let us recognise and understand that we have got to educate the public of Barbados into the view that if they want decent housing they must pay rent, because houses like anything else have wear and tear, and if all the Housing Authority gets is enough just to maintain the buildings, tell me how can they possibly buy land, have administrative overhead, pay builders and pay interest.

I do not know about the hon. member, but I know the hon. member for St. Lucy has now got experience because the hon. member is a member of an organisation that has gone into house building and this question of housing economics seems to have befuddled them for some period of time, because his rate of productivity in relation to the delivery of houses is very disappointing and I know he is disappointed too, and I believe that he has come up against all of these problems that many people in Barbados bought houses they cannot afford but they believe that the community must give them houses for nothing. That is because the politicians tell them that, but that is foolishness. The Manifesto is very clear on it, that we will ensure that a minimum of 800 houses is built per year. There is a distinction of course between genuine welfare cases, which is the responsibility of the Ministry of Welfare and Community Development. There will always be a proportion of people in Barbados who will not be able to pay rent and will have to have some kind of rent subsidy. That is so, it is not the Housing Authority to do that, it is the Ministry of Community Development, because you earmark a specific amount of your revenue annually by way of subventions for subsidies and you subsidise people who are genuinely in need. (ASIDE). I remember that Manifesto very well, read it well and you will see that everything I say here now is consistent with that. The welfare aspect is a different thing, but I am talking about people who are working, people who are earning a good wage — there are some people who work at the Port, work for thousands of dollars, more money than us, and who want to live in a Housing Authority house — there are some people who

want to have their real home and a woman in a Housing Authority house subsidised by you and me. It is well known that nowadays a man cannot afford to have two women unless he has a lot of money. I do not see why we in here should sit down..... (ASIDES)..... Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is providing he supports them. We must not sit down in here and give people the impression that this question of housing is a partisan political matter and that the Housing Authority and the Government can do the impossible, build houses at modern day costs and charge a sum for them that cannot even pay for the cost of repairs. If they do not pay for the cost of repairs they cannot be repaired.

*On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 2.50, Sir.

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

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

*On resumption:*

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

#### QUESTION TIME

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the Standing Orders have been suspended, and I beg to move that Question Time be now taken until 3.15 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: There being no objection, it is now Question Time.

Parliamentary Question No. 8 stands in the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

#### QUESTION RE RECRUITMENT TO PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Question reads as follows:— To ask the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and Planning: 1. How many persons were recruited into the public service of Barbados, including the Statutory Boards which operate on government subventions, during the years 1975 and 1976, and during the period January — March 1977? 2. Would the Minister supply the information requested in terms of the

following age categories: (1) under 50, (2) 50–54, (3) 55–59, and (4) 60 and over?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 8 is as follows:—

The numbers of persons recruited during the period 1975 to March, 1977 in the age categories specified were as follows:—

|                                  | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|------|
| (a) <i>to the Public Service</i> |      |      |      |
| Under 50 years ..                | 309  | 300  | 55   |
| Between 50–54 ..                 | 4    | 13   | 4    |
| Between 55–59 ..                 | 2    | 4    | 1    |
| 60 years and over ..             | —    | 1    | 2    |
| (b) <i>to Statutory Boards</i>   |      |      |      |
| Under 50 years ..                | 430  | 751  | 266  |
| Between 50–54 ..                 | 5    | 21   | 10   |
| Between 55–59 ..                 | —    | 2    | 3    |
| 60 years and over ..             | 2    | 4    | 1    |

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, would the Minister state and at dictation speed at least to assist the shorthand writers if not to assist me, the numbers again — I am really asking for a repetition — of sixty years and over who were recruited into the public service, not the Statutory Boards?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: One was recruited in 1976 and two in 1977.

Mr. SANDIFORD: As a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister indicate in what areas or into what Ministries or to perform what duties were these people recruited?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think the Hon. member would have to ask a specific question because in dealing with these particulars you could not expect to have on the file the information as to all this. But I do recall that one of the sixty year olds who was recruited was a retired Chief Public Health Inspector whose expertise continued to be needed. I am trying hard to remember the others. A specific question would no doubt elicit the answer. I am just trying to see if I can find anything. There are no names on the file, but if I see the areas where they are recruited, I may be able to remember the instance. The Ministry of Trade and Industry recruited somebody over sixty in 1976, but I do not think that was after September, I think if the hon. member talks to his colleague on his immediate left, he might be able to find out who that was who was recruited by the Ministry of Trade before September during their regime.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member can promise to supply the information.

Mr. SANDIFORD: My third supplementary is, will the Minister give the numbers for persons recruited into the School Meals Service in the categories stated here?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I can regard it as practically nigh impossible that anybody over the age of 60 was recruited into the School Meals Service.  
3.00 p.m.

I do not think that the hon. member has asked for that information. The hon. member asked who was recruited in the Public Service. I wonder if that includes casual and temporary staff, although I must say, Sir, that some Ministries have excluded the persons who are not within the constitutional definition of public servants. They have completed the figures for the Statutory Board but you will not have figures at that level for persons of the School Meals. You can get it at CBC or somewhere else, Sir. I think the questions have been answered precisely in the terms to which the hon. member has asked them.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: On a point of order on what?

Mr. TAITT: With regard to the supplementary question.

Mr. SPEAKER: You can only ask a supplementary.

Mr. TAITT: Alright, a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister indicate whether persons recruiting into the Public Service would not include persons recruited temporarily or otherwise? Recruited into the Public Service is not necessary a public servant.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am trying to find the section of the Constitution to which I can refer the hon. member, if I can find it. I cannot help the hon. member if he asks a question which does not in itself contain every detail for the answer which he wants. I think that I can say outside the terms of reference of the question that nobody over the age of 60, so far as I know, has been recruited. So far it has been a positive policy not to do so in the School Meals Service. It would have to be somebody with a fraudulent Birth Certificate, or something like that.

In any case I would not be able to give the hon. member the answer to that question. I do not have it broken down in that form. I would have the Ministry of Education in general which would include Teachers, School Meals, and the whole lot. I do not have it broken down as between the different categories. I think the hon.

member, bearing in mind that the answers to these questions are prepared by civil servants with precise definable references and framework, may be able to assume precisely what answers he would use.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of a supplementary. Since the hon. member in the definable terms of the Civil Service does not know what is in the Public Service, could the hon. member say how many persons were recruited into the Transport Board over the age of 60?

Mr. SPEAKER: I would urge hon. members to table specific questions. I would not want to be goaded by the Opposition bench and they would elicit the information they seek.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: One person was employed over the age of 60 at the Transport Board in 1975, and one in 1976 and none since according to the information supplied to the Chief Personnel Officer by the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Communications and Works, signed by Mr. Dash, dated the 30th October, 1978.

Mr. TAITT: Further to Government's announced policy, will the Minister tell us what was the special qualifications for the ability or circumstances under which the one person was recruited to the Transport Board between 1975 and 1976?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not even know who he is. He may have been recruited by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central during the regime of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central. Perhaps the hon. member for St. Michael South West could direct his question to his colleague. I do not even know who he is, Sir. I only observed that under the age of 50, one hundred and seventy seven people were recruited, between 50 and 54 one was recruited, between 55 and 60 none and 60 plus one was recruited over the age of 60. Whether it was before September, 1976, or since September, 1976, the file does not afford me the means of discovery. Ask Mr. Dash, the Treasurer of the St. John Branch of your Party.

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member, the hon. member for St. Michael South, his question respecting the number of persons who resigned, etc.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Question No. 9.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would have to lay the answers. It is not required to be written.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael North Central his question to the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment.  
3.10 p.m.

# QUESTION RE PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK ON EAST COAST

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister of Housing, Lands and the Environment: (a) Is the Minister aware that Government's intention to set up a National Park along the eastern coast between Archer's Bay, St. Lucy and Bath, St. John is an inhibition on the development of land in that area and specifically at Archer's Bay, Choyce and Morgan Lewis? (b) What is Government's policy on the development of land in the area proposed for the National Park? (c) What assistance will Government give towards development in that area? (d) What directions have been given to the Chief Town Planner in relation to applications for development of land in the area proposed for the National Park?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, the reply to Question No. 16 is as follows:

- (a) The establishment of a National Park along the north eastern coast of the island or in any other area would undoubtedly place some restriction on the possible development of the land. This derives from the land use planning and control which by act of Parliament is the responsibility of the Chief Town Planner, who also has the right to refuse, or inhibit certain types of development in any area, in the best of interest of the island as a whole.
- (b) The policy on the development of land in the area proposed for the National Park will be contained within the Order which will designate the area as such. This policy can only be elaborated after a survey and an analysis of the area's potential has been undertaken. It may be noted that the designation of an area as a National Park does not mean total prohibition of all building activity, but it may mean a much closer control of those aspects of building which are likely to have an adverse impact on the character of the area.
- (c) It is not possible at this stage to state specifically what assistance Government will give toward development in the area. If the future policy for the area should create any undue hardships, Government would look sympathetically at these.
- (d) The Chief Town Planner has been directed in relation to the area in and around Archer's Bay that pending the finalisation of plans for this part of area, no planning permission should be granted. This directive will also

hold good for other sites falling within the area proposed for the National Park.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary Question: Will the hon. Minister state whether the Government has investigated any specific area in the wide area under consideration for a National Park and taken any steps towards the acquisition of such an area?

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a proper supplementary. This brings us to the end of Question Time. Government Business is now the instant Order of the day. When the Sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

## SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1978-79 No. 25

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I share the view of the Deputy Prime Minister that to a large extent the problem of Housing in Barbados should be outside the cut and thrust of partisan politics. There are politics involved in housing of course, but if we can at this stage abandon the attitude of looking back too much and criticising everything that was done in the past and accept among ourselves a united position on the future housing development of this country, I believe that from this perspective we may be able to share a common goal for the housing development of this country.

The problem in the past, and even now, which has militated against a greater thrust in housing has been that of finance. Allied to this is the categorization of Barbados among international lending agencies which places us very often outside the ambit of international assistance. In short, what I am saying is that several international organisations believe that the quality of housing in Barbados far outstrips the quality of housing in many other areas, contemporary and in some instances contiguous to Barbados. We do not qualify for certain loans because of what is considered by international agencies the high standard of our existing housing; so that has been an inhibition upon our ability to draw funds from various lending agencies. At the same time there has been an attitude which still exist even among journalists in this country that all the housing needs in Barbados should be provided by the Government. No attempt has been made in people's minds to analyse the fact that there are two sectors of housing development, the private sector and the public sector.

Now as the mechanical arm of Government, as the vehicle for the implementation of Government's policy, the National Housing Corporation is charged with a variety of functions. Obviously the most important of these functions is to build houses; the provision of

house spots is also a vital aspect of our operation. Public housing, be it for rent or for sale, entails a subvention from the Government's general revenue. To that extent it can become a drain on the resources of the Central Government, and that is why perhaps in the past in the Estimates the National Housing Corporation was allocated \$4 million or \$4.5 million — last year it was \$5.3 million. That is what the Government can afford to put into public housing. Now how much can you get out of that in terms of actual unit construction? The record shows that in 1975 when we were not yet in power and the year of the record sugar prices, 195 houses were built. Between 1976 and 1978 a total of 529 houses were built as at September, 1978. There were also 62 terrace houses at Wotton which had been started — these have just been completed — and I think that as recently as Monday 58 keys were turned in and the subcommittee which deals with that will be allocating these 58 houses, if they have not already done so. In addition to the provision of the 529 units in the period mentioned above, 68 houses were resited at Clapham because residents of Emmerton Lane had to be resited as a result of the sewerage project presently underway.

3.20 p.m.

There were another 68 houses which were resited at Clapham in pursuance of the sewerage project the people from Emmerton Lane had to be resited at Clapham. What people must understand, Sir, is that when there is a resiting programme on some of the existing housing stock has to be used for the purpose of providing temporary shelter for those people who are being relocated or dislocated, so that for some period of time last year especially — early last year and certainly towards the end of 1977 — the Corporation was not able to deliver the same number of houses with the same degree of speed, even though houses were available. Take, for example, Wildey. There were 95 houses built in the block which is now called Norman Close, but some of those houses had to be reserved to resite people from Emmerton Lane to Clapham. That temporary dislocation meant that if we reserved, let us say, 25 units, that was 25 units which were not available for occupiers who had a long term rental in view. At the same time, Sir, the Housing Corporation not falling behind the standard set by the Government in 1975 but rather improving the number of houses built, created 131 new jobs, and to this extent I would only wish to refer historically to the Ministry of Housing just to state that I believe the other side will accept that we found a Ministry in which there was little planning, and in some cases no planning.

That was exemplified by the Oxnards project in 1976 when the day that ground was to be broken at Ferniehurst the instructions were countermanded and the Housing Corporation was told merely to put up houses

at Oxnards because of the high visibility content arising from putting up a lot of buildings, people would feel that you are building houses, you are doing things. The development at Oxnards was not planned, and as a matter of fact, the development at Oxnards even though it is part of the commercial side of the Corporation's business has turned out to be a loss, for several reasons, but I do not want to look back. Perhaps when we come to the Estimates, and Housing is debated some of these things can be gone into, but that is not my function, my function is only to point out that the planning in the Ministry of Housing prior to our taking over was not the best, and in some cases did not exist.

I said on the floor of this House time and time again, Sir, that what was required in Barbados to get housing on a sound footing was to build up a land bank, and I can report to the House that the Ministry has taken active steps to have available areas of land for future development. We believe too that in addition to the land identified by the Ministry itself several areas presently owned by the Agricultural Development Corporation will be handed over to the Ministry of Housing and Lands for the express purpose of housing development, so that one does not anticipate in the future a problem with having a land bank. People may think that I am just speaking of getting a whole host of land and letting it lie idle. The importance of the land bank is not only to have land available, but to enable you to do your forward planning effectively, to enable you to ensure a continuity of employment so that, for example, at Haynesville where we have men working on a phase now, the next phase will carry — we thought it would carry 75 houses — in fact we will get in 104 houses. At Haynesville there is a continuity because we have the five acres of land available, there will be no incentive, to the men currently working on phase one to prolong and spin out the work in the hope that they can drag their feet as long as possible and we will keep paying them because they do not know where they are going next time, those men at Haynesville know that when they are finished phase one they are going to phase two, and that land is being acquired at Six Roads and at Bonnetts. The Section 3 notice, I believe, has been published already in respect of Bonnetts, and at Wotton and at Free Hill, and we are trying to get the services of an engineer to do the West Terrace project; and, as I say, as soon as we have a meeting with the ADC, which I believe is some time early next week, we will know where additional land would be made available by the Agricultural Development Corporation.

But it is important, as I say, from the point of view of continuity of employment and from the point of view of forward planning. You see, if we can put in roads, for example, at Six Roads later on this year and at Bonnetts, and if we get land at Husbands and perhaps start putting in roads at Husbands so that as

soon as the new financial year starts next year you have your roads in, you have your water and you have your light, and you put down the houses. This was never done before. Now it has taken two and a half years, but those members of the Opposition, especially those who were in Cabinet, know that long term planning, detailed planning, careful planning and planning with the help of foreign assistance such as we have had from the United Nations, cannot get a project off in two weeks. There are a number of channels and a number of ramifications to be gone into and gone through before you can come up with something which makes sense and is acceptable.

The National Housing Corporation itself has already written its development plan for 1978-82 and that is now to be printed and will soon be published, so that we hope that we will give the public a better idea and perhaps a more comprehensive statement of our plans for the next four years.

The member for St. Michael South did advert to the question of repairs to the existing housing estates. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been my view since I have been Chairman of the National Housing Corporation that as many of the services as possible should be decentralised and taken to the people. For example, I do not believe that people from Clinketts, or Six Roads, or Gall Hill, for example, should all have to traipse down to Country Road to pay their rents. I believe that if you had sub-offices set up at focal points around the country or on some of the large estates that the people would more readily go and pay their rents there. It would be less cumbersome for them to go and pay the rents there rather than having to come all the way down to Country Road.

3.30 p.m.

I believe that the trouble, I put it no higher, is that some tenants may consider in traipsing down to National Housing Corporation to pay the rent irksome and one of the reasons why they fall into arrears, so we are trying this year to establish on some of the estates, not everyone of course, accommodation with the proper facilities and the ability for people to do a daily balance and do a central return to Country Road. We hope in that way to improve the question of collection of arrears.

In the area of maintenance it is surprising, since I have stated in here more than once and I am going to say it for the last time, that in the area of maintenance we have been centralised since 1977, and the U.N. expert who was here and whose report has been

published, Mr. Henderson, complimented the Corporation for the decentralisation of its operations. I think there are two new people that we took on, and whereas formerly just like with rents somebody in the parks would have a leak in the plumbing or there might be a window broken in St. Philip, they would have to ring down to Country Road. It may take days to get them on the telephone, and then it takes a long time for them to send somebody up to St. Philip to do the repairs. All that was time consuming and wasteful. What I did was to get two new people, split the number of units roughly into 600 per man, and the maintenance officer or assistant maintenance officer has a team of artisans made up of plumbers, some carpenters, a mason, electrician, labourers and so on. They are responsible for the maintenance of 600 units. The principle for maintenance is as the hon. member for St. Michael South East said. You do not just splash on paint. A survey is done by one of the qualified inspectors who is assigned to the housing maintenance section to see whether you need, as he suggested, for instance, to take out a door jamb and replace it. He makes a report, places an order with the Pine workshop, and the assistant maintenance officers then execute the maintenance from among the team of men who are assigned for a particular designated area. We have found that in the decentralisation of maintenance, not only have we been able to affect costs, but we have been able to more speedily maintain the houses.

One of the problems which people do not appreciate is that as soon as somebody leaves a rented unit, we cannot just put another in there. That unit has to be cleaned out and repaired, and if there are any renovations to be done, the renovations will have to be done before we can rehouse or re-allocate. That is done not only for good housing management standards, but also as a question of hygiene. I will concede that it is an area which has caused me a little concern and we are taking steps to rectify it. The area of concern is this, Mr. Chairman. The time lost between the date when a person leaves a unit and that unit is re-tenanted at the moment to my mind seems too long. We are trying to shorten that as quickly as possible so that we can deliver to somebody who is in genuine need of housing in a short space of time. I think if hon. members question me about June, I will be able to give a positive statement to the House as to what time we expect that a house, subject to the ramifications or the details of repairs can be re-tenanted; but the odd house only wants refurbishing, repainting and perhaps the replacement of louvres. We can give you a time frame within which that house can be re-tenanted after maintenance, but that at the moment is one area where I think it is in need of speed and we are working with a view to effecting greater speed in that area.

I wish to assure the hon. member for St. Michael South that renovations have always taken place and are

still taking place. It is unfortunate that he does not represent the Silver Hill/Gall Hill area, otherwise he would be able to speak with authority on the work done in that area and the renovations done up there. The Corporation has I think about 21 estates with houses dotted all over the country, some in bigger groupings than others. It is a question of priorities as to which estate you attempt to maintain before the other. We cannot do all at the same time. (*A Voice: Simultaneously!*) I am being corrected on my English. I am being told to say "simultaneously". I am not aware of the malodorous effluvia.

Mr. Chairman, what I am submitting is that we have to look first of all in my view in terms of priority at the oldest estates. Many of these have been going since 1955. For instance Farm Gardens at Six Cross Roads was built around 1955 just as those at Belleplaine were. Princess Royal Avenue is perhaps the oldest, and the conditions there were shabby. If anybody cares to drive through Princess Royal Avenue he will see that we have started to change the whole structure of the former units, and the re-development of Princess Royal Avenue should be completed shortly.

At Six Cross Roads, in the constituency of the hon. member for St. Philip South, and that is why I say that in housing there should not be partisan politics, the hon. member for St. Philip South when he was in Government was unable to get the roads in the Six Cross Roads Housing area done. Check it out now. One of Mr. Rayside's companies was awarded a contract recently, the roads have started, the drains are going in and it should be completed in about three weeks. I have gone through there up to last Saturday. It is not even my constituency, but I have overall responsibility. The point I am making is that they are old estates and we have to tackle the oldest in my view first.

The Bay Land has a very serious problem in terms of surveying. That has already cost us over \$240,000 and the survey is not completed. The money was voted by the last Government for the Surveyors' Association and the surveying work has not been completed and there is difficulty in the Bayville area with people to buy their own lot of land and to get their conveyances, and these are problems we are tackling. I have tried to increase the force in the surveying section. You have an additional surveyor and we can do with another one. We have tried to streamline the operations of the Housing Corporation. Anyone passing on Highway 1 coming from St. James, just before you turn to go up to the University will now see a refurbished and re-decorated building which has been lying down there for years unused. It was the house formerly owned by Mr. Walcott, Clyde Walcott's father. It was government property for years and it had been becoming derelict. It has taken \$35,000 to repair that and have it in a

proper state, and I would like you to see what \$35,000 have done down there, admittedly with our own labour force. But we have now moved the technical wing from Country Road and transferred it there. The whole technical staff is now at Clarendon, Black Rock, and we believe it is going to lend to greater efficiency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will refrain from answering the comment made by the hon. member for St. Michael South about benign neglect. I do not know what he was referring to but I made a note at the time. The hon. member for St. Michael North Central made, as is his wont, some good points. Unfortunately some of the points came straight from the Barbados Labour Party manifesto, hence the reason that they are there.

3.40 p.m.

He was saying that we should get the Banks and Insurance Companies and so on to mobilise their savings for local investments. What does the Manifesto say? You have to read page 77, I believe it is, in the Manifesto on Housing. (*Asides*). About 800 houses. You have to read that carefully, but then you also have to understand it too, Sir, and you have to have some ability to understand housing finance.

I have dealt with the public sector side, and now I will deal with the private sector of finance because Government cannot be the all-provider of housing in this country but the Government could create a social and economic climate within which (*Asides* — like the price of cement). Mr. Chairman, I am not getting into the cement business at all.

We have to create a climate in which people who have funds will wish to invest in housing development. The Hon. Deputy Prime Minister spoke on housing development bonds but this is what we said in the Manifesto. "We believe that every Barbadian has the right to a reasonable House at a reasonable cost and we promised that we would embark on a programme for the building of at least 800 houses per year." No. 1, Sir, We did not say that the Government would build or that the National Housing Corporation would build. We said that we would embark on a programme. I go further. I have to explain.

It said "necessary steps would therefore be taken to direct finance towards mortgages for owner occupied buildings and in this way provide a badly needed stimulus for privately financed housing." Now when the two statements are taken together in my submission, Mr. Chairman, it is abundantly clear that the 800 houses promised would not be built solely by the technical arm of the Ministry but they would be a mix between the public sector houses and private sector housing and what has happened this year — I might soon have to wind up.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member would give way. I wonder whether the hon. member is aware that between 1966 and 1972 over 2,000 houses per year were built in Barbados if you take the private and public sector.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to say, as he has asked if I was aware. I am not aware but would like to know the source and definitely I do not believe the figures. I do not know the figures and anyhow I am not getting into that now, Sir. I would have to discuss that with him privately, Sir. It was a severe decline when in 1975 they could only build 195 through the National Housing Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, before I finish I just want to explain that our programme this year is aimed at 500 units in the estates as well as in filling the existing estates. That is to say, take for example Bagatelle in the Prime Minister's constituency. There are 12 additional units being put up there. They are at roof level already. They have been built between November and now and they will soon be ready for occupancy. These are additional ones because there was an open lot of land, nothing was being done with it so we decided to fill it in with houses.

Similarly, we are examining Deacon's Farm and the other existing areas. These will be backed up further as to what is planned in respect of Wotton, Haynesville, Stage II, Free Hill, Six Cross Roads, Bonnetts and St. Cecilia. Now that is 500 under public housing rented and units. There is another 40 to be built at Free Hill. Those would be low income for sale. I am not going to set the final figure but in the range between \$18,000 and \$20,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When will they arrive at St. George?

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will like to give the assurance that we have been looking at The Glebe up to yesterday. At a meeting at the Ministry discussions went on with the technical side of the Department, myself, the Minister and his Permanent Secretary concerning some land up on a ridge which I do not know myself and the land at the bottom and I do not know how we are going to do it, but there is already a plan. We may have to reshape that plan in the light of certain lands that would be made available, so St. George would be taken care of and we want to take care of you this year, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, before I finish, we have had an approach from a Canadian Company, the Kaufus people who have a Joint-Venture with the Barbados Foundry and Home Centre to provide a pre-fabricated type house. It is really a chattel house with a wall-like finish. It is really a

spread of coral dust using local aggregate to give the appearance to what we call a wall house. It looks very good. The plans that they have are very exciting to us in housing because there is an export factor involved in the package that Kaufus is offering which is very productive.

I am not in a position to commit the Government but I would like to assure the hon. member for St. Michael North Central that I have received letters and brochures in my office but I have never received any from anybody in Germany. I have never met anybody from Germany who is interested in setting up this. We have met one or two local people. We have met endless people. Up to last week we met a Mr. Julius Thomas from National Home Builders in New York. We keep meeting people who are offering various pre-fabricated systems which will enable us to get houses quickly but, Mr. Chairman, what we cannot do, and I have tried to impress this on my Minister, we cannot meet people, give them a piece of land to build something and make no decisions. We have got to decide that we like one system, Sir, and let all the others know that we have limited funds and we can only deal with this particular entrepreneur and we can only deal with him.

As far as I am concerned, I like the Kaufus houses but it is a policy decision that will have to be made by the Ministry and Cabinet and I cannot say any more than that but Kaufus is going to put in 140 houses at Wildey with the Community Centre and there is a plan which they have which is there in the Ministry and any member of Parliament is free to go and inspect it in the Ministry and see. (*Asides*). The Minister will determine that, Sir, but there is a plan we have for a village, a nice village in Wildey. If that goes that will add 140 to the 500. It would be over 500. That would be 640 so you might very well reach the 800 this year. That is just with Kaufus. We are not even taking into account Parravicino and J. B. Corbin and those people, so we will reach the 800 by co-operative effort between Government and private enterprise but Government must make money available to the Barbados Mortgage Finance Company. The Barbados Mortgage Finance Company must also understand. I think they do understand. They must understand first of all that the lawyers' expenses have to be reduced a little bit and ways and means will be found to deal with that because it is the poor people who will be buying the houses.

Secondly, they must be prepared to re-institute the system of the chattel mortgage and give people money over a 20-year period at least, up to 90 percent. They do not like to do that. We need that so the Mortgage Finance Companies will have to agree.

3.50 p.m.

He cannot raise the money, and the Mortgage Finance Company will not lend him because they say the longevity of the house is in doubt and he would have to resolve payment too quickly. So there will have to be a rethinking of this. This is where the Planning Unit will come in. In the Planning Unit we envisage representatives from the Ministry of Communications and Works, the Ministry of Health, Town Planning, the National Housing Corporation, the Ministry of Finance and perhaps the Barbados National Bank. And we must co-ordinate all the functions so that when we plan a development we do not have the problem we had at Free Hill recently. There we wanted to put in some mains and it was suggested to us by the Waterworks Department to experiment with PVC pipe. When we looked at the cost of the PVC pipe we had to bed it in sand and the cost was prohibitive. At the same time the cost of 4-inch cast iron pipe had escalated by 400%. If you have a Planning Unit, they can sit down and decide where housing development is going. They will do the initial work — get Town Planning permission, see who is going to dig the roads and at what cost, see about water and light and whether there is any sewerage problem etc. We will then be able in these circumstances to have a more co-ordinated approach to housing than hitherto.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have been able to clarify some of the points raised by hon. members and have given some idea of where we are going in housing and how we can expect to achieve 800 houses per year in Barbados in the private and public sectors.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say will certainly not take as long as the hon. member who has just sat down. We indicated some time ago that there would be some problem relating to the policy decision to have members of Parliament as Chairmen of Statutory Boards, and we are seeing one aspect of this in the problem of having the Government's policy put, when on one hand we have certain statements coming from the Chairman of a Board and on the other hand a Minister putting forward what one must regard as policy. That is a matter we will have to watch and see how it goes.

This Resolution has to do with the establishment of a Planning Unit within the Ministry of Housing. I do not believe that anyone can quarrel with any attempt to improve the concept of the planned development of projects. I would have hoped that in presenting the case hon. members on the other side would not endeavour or otherwise seek to suggest that there was no planning at all on housing estates in the past, because on the face of it that would be nonsense. If you have 21 housing estates in the community, some element of planning would have had to go into the exercise. But what is beginning to happen with hon. members of this House

is that they are discovering that the whole business of running a Government is one which requires time, and movement back and forth among a number of persons who are professionals and who know how things should be done; and the example given by the hon. member about the advice on PVC pipe vis-a-vis the use of cast iron pipe is only one example of the kind of problem that crops up on a daily basis in Government.

Mr. Chairman, the development of public housing in Barbados has been nothing short of spectacular. Anyone who looks at the Farm, Eden Lodge, Rock Dundo Park, Husbands, Oxnards, Silver Hill, Gall Hill, Wanstead — anyone who went away from Barbados for a while and came back and observed these developments must conclude that for a country the size of Barbados housing development in general has been nothing short of spectacular, especially when compared with what has been the case in a number of other countries. I do not believe that anyone can observe these areas and not feel some measure of pride that Barbados has been able to make this kind of progress. But the matter of housing in the public sector is fraught with problems, and the inability of the country to make supply match demand is something which is likely to be found in every country in the world. There is not a single country known to man, whether developed or developing, where supply of houses has ever matched demand, and therefore I find no reason why we in Barbados should attempt to blunt the aspirations of Barbadians in their quest for a higher standard of housing or quality of life. It seems to me that once it has been put to the people of Barbados that the pace at which you can develop housing is dependent of the pace at which the economy is developing, the people will understand this as well. The problem arises when out of abundance of political enthusiasm one side criticises the other for not having done well and then makes promises that they would do better, only to discover that it is easier to promise than to perform. That is the problem...

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We promised to do better than the Opposition in housing. In 1975 they built 195 houses and between 1976 and 1978 we built 529. We promised to do better and we did better.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not get into any contention. What is he talking about, 195 houses in 1975 when he himself just a few moments ago said that plans for housing take about two years to come to fruition, and he must know that the years 1973 to 1974 were the time we had the energy crisis and he must know that the number of houses built in 1975 would bear some relationship to the condition of the economy in 1973 and 1974? That is what I was saying, Mr. Chairman.  
4.00 p.m.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is misleading the House and misquoting me, because I pointed out that on the same subvention given by this House to the Housing Corporation we built more houses than they in 1976 and 1977, on the same money they were getting in 1974 and 1975. I gave the figures, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am as impressed by any figures which he gives or writes down as I was by the argument which he just put forward. Mr. Chairman, the point I was going on to make is a very simple point. If he talks about 195 houses in 1975 and then he talks about 500 houses between 1975 and 1978, we could do a simple division. *(Aside)*. In 1976, he says but who was in power in 1976? They came into power at the bottom of 1976 and started talking about houses they built in 1976. I am not going to get involved in discussing numbers, because if we start to discuss numbers I would agree with him that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was wrong when he said 2,000 houses; I would tell him now that taking the private sector and the public sector there were 2,489 houses, so all he has to do now, Mr. Chairman, is to deal with that, the hon. member was wrong when he said 2,000.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is trying to manufacture figures to sound better.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member is sitting in the back seat where he will soon be. He is a little confused, but there were 2,489 houses and I challenge them to go out and count them as we have done. 2,489.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. It looks as if we are now reducing this Parliament to no more than the tree outside of Parliament where certain people used to meet. I would have thought that the hon. member who is now President of the Democratic Labour Party would be a little bit more careful in giving out these figures. I see no mango tree in this room, he picks a figure out of the sky as if he is outside picking mangoes, and I hope when it is recorded in Hansard that he said that there were 2,489 houses built in a particular year, and it is published in due course by the Town Planner or some other person that that figure is not the right one, that he will be man enough to admit that at the time he was trying to score a political point. I do not really see why he should pick this particular figure, he is trying to correct an hon. member. I wonder where they were looking for these figures.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, so that he will know it is not a figure pulled out of a hat, let me explain to him again. In the context of what the hon. member and

what they had been saying about adding the private sector housing with the public sector housing, I am saying that the figure of housing starts — and he can go and check them as we have checked them — was 2,489. Mr. Chairman, I may be off, it might have been 2,487 or 2,491, but that is the figure. I have no quarrel with them.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. I am very glad to hear the hon. member say it is possible for us to check the number of housing starts, because I have been asking the Town Planner for two years now for that information and he has been giving me the roundabout and proving to me that the number cannot be ascertained and that we will have to establish new machinery for it. Is the hon. member saying that the Town Planner has given him information which he has refused to give to the Prime Minister?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how the Prime Minister who has been languishing in this House of Assembly for as long as he has been can get up in here and make that a point of order. Tell him to look at 1969 to start; just look at 1969. Any published information from 1969 would show him that if he adds the private housing to the public housing it will come out to a figure that will surprise him. They come talking about private sector housing with public sector housing instead of admitting like men that they said 800 and for a number of reasons they cannot make 100, and they are sticking with this business they included the private sector. To any normal, ordinary, reasonable man that statement in the Manifesto could only have meant that Government would build 800 houses, and even if we take the houses which they have been putting up they should have really got 800 houses. Look at 1969, pick any year.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Will the hon. member now admit, since he is quoting 1969, that the figure he has given includes hotel rooms? He thinks we are all idiots in here?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there is only one, and he sits right at the top of the Government side. There is only one who has been masquerading as being clever for so long, that is the only idiot we have in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think we are getting too personal now.

Mr. TAITT: Tell him, Sir. I do not wish to be personal, but any time he wishes to be personal, in or out, I am ready for him. *(ASIDES)*. That is true, that might be so, but I am a President, unlike you who only got 12 votes.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Hon. members, there is too much cross talk.

Mr. TAITT:.....which caused you to write one of the few letters you ever write.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Leave out the cross talk, please.

Mr. TAITT: We do not usually interfere with each other, but he knows how you managed to get those 11 votes and that is why he got on like that. I know on your own steam you would carry it long, if the hand had not been brought in to out-manoeuvre you you would have carried it because I know basically that the rank and file are with you.

Mr. WARD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not understand how speaking about the chairmanship of the party got involved in this, if he wants to speak of anything let him speak about what is going on in his own party. Speak about having Gonsalves as a mouthpiece to try to get rid of Skipper, the Dipper. That is what they are doing, trying to get rid of Barrow. That is what you want to speak about.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Will you please continue the debate and refrain from the personalities and the cross talk.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, or I could speak about the number of trips which he made, Sir.

Mr. WARD: And also the number of tourists that come as a result of it. (ASIDES).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I must have order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, the number of trips made by the hon. member as Chairman of the Tourist Board could never in any year match up to the trips made by the gentleman who held the post before him, Mr. Peter Morgan, because I am sure the hon. member has never gone to Bequia or any of those off-shore islands to deposit money for other people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us carry on. Let us get this debate finished, please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it seems as though the points of order are going to get closer and closer to revelation of where the one-arm bandits' money goes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not in this debate.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will not speak about the one-arm bandits, am going right on now, Sir, about housing. As I was saying, Sir, I really believe that what we have to do in Barbados is to start looking now towards the new decades. It is undesirable that we should be looking backward and trying to score political

points on who did what and who did not do what. What we wish to hear is what kind of environmental atmosphere will the young people of Barbados have in the 1990's. The hon. member for Christ Church East is always joining me in these questions. What will the young people have to look forward to in the way of housing? What kind of quality housing? Where will it be situated? What kind of planning will we do for the movement of people to and from work? What kind of arrangements will we make for the quality of schools in the housing areas and near the housing areas up to the required level?

4.10 p.m.

We wish to know, for example, if it is still their policy that they intend to have high-rise apartments, if they have examined this in some detail.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are dealing with policy.

Mr. TAITT: You say we are not dealing with policy! Mr. Chairman, I apologise to the Chair. In a moment of temper I moved away. Mr. Chairman, what one wishes to know is what kind of quality we are going to have in housing. They have been talking about these people who have come from overseas to talk to us about housing. The Government has every right to explore all possibilities of getting houses constructed quickly and effectively, but Mr. Chairman, Government should be warned that these people who always know how to put up certain projects in developing countries have been singularly unsuccessful in their own countries and in other countries, and all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we have to be extremely careful least we go off half-cocked because someone has suggested that he can produce a particular house and accept that as a project only to discover that whereas the projected cost of the house is say, \$20,000 to \$25,000, by the time you have committed yourself, as you very well know, Mr. Chairman, the cost of the house is more in the vicinity of \$30,000 to \$35,000. In many of these places where the company produces houses, with mass production houses they have factories which turn out these components for the houses at a very rapid rate.

I am still satisfied that in an economy like Barbados where the people who actually work in the construction of houses form part of the total economy that we have to be extremely careful not to exclude artisans and general workers in our policy of housing development.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Philip North spoke about housing in St. Philip. I would merely point out before I sit down that when I look at the area which I have the honour to represent, it borders on either side of Westbury Road, Upper Goodland, Eagle Hall, Rock Gap, and places like that. I am not

complaining that these are not houses that people live in, but I am concerned that over the next twenty years we have to be concerned with how are we going to replace these houses, what are we going to replace them with. Perhaps the kind of planning which goes into the Town and Country operations around the world would have to be modified to take account of places like Barbados. When we take in the Hanschell Tenantry for example, it is now some four or five years since there has been contention on the question of how the land is going to be divided. The hon. member says eleven years. Even if it is eleven years, it means that it behoves us to move with even greater speed to see that decisions regarding distribution of land in tenancies are not held up on technical considerations which might have nothing whatever to do with life in a society like Barbados.

Mr. Chairman, in the particular area I myself know that one of the problems which the owner of the land has had is getting the Town Planning authorities to agree with his way of distributing the land, and in fact, Mr. Chairman, as few as five spots might have created the problem of a decision in that area by the authorities. I feel that in situations like that we might be required to isolate areas where there is difficulty and allow development in the other areas to continue, because I cannot say that the housing in my constituency and the surrounding areas is housing that would stand the test of time 20 or 30 years from now, and I hope that when the Minister gets up to put the cellophane on the housing policy that he will give some indication of the kind of thinking which is going on on the Government side for this kind of development outside of the new development which the hon. member for St. Philip North spoke about.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief. I am intervening in the debate only because my friend the hon. member for St. Michael South West brought something which may look extremely fanciful and obviously one which should be subject to serious scrutiny, because if his figures were correct and if we were providing housing at the level of 2,489 in this country per annum either in the private or public sector, I reckon we would have something like 64,000 new housing units in Barbados between the period 1961 and 1976, and we would have provided more than half of all the housing units in this country.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, what the hon. member obviously would be doing is suggesting that on each occasion each year that that quantity of houses was produced. Clearly the mathematics must be wrong. He is trying to suggest that 2,489 were produced every year. What I said, Mr. Chairman, is that taking what they have said about private housing and public housing, they can choose for themselves any year and they would find at least one year there would be 2,489 houses.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member is now saying in one particular year in the fifteen year period of the Democratic Labour Party rule. I cannot understand the hon. member's case. I would like to argue on the cases. If I understand the hon. member's case now that in one year of D.L.P. rule you will find that 2,489 houses were produced in Barbados, I am challenging the hon. member. I am saying the hon. member is not correct and that his figures are fully open to debate. There is no accuracy in them at all, and I am going to tell the hon. member that on 28th November, 1976, I laid in this House the Physical Development Plan for Barbados which had been initially produced in 1970 and it took the then Government some six years and they went out of power without bringing the Development Plan to this House.

It is significant that if you read that Plan you will see that in 1960 the problems of housing were identified and some of the solutions for dealing with housing were suggested to the Government. They were aware of the problems; they were the then Government. They were given some of the ways of dealing with the problem, but they proved completely incapable of managing that problem. One must say it because this country is getting to the stage that within two years you will find the Government being harried from the platform with lies and rumours, and people are quickly forgetting in this country the factual situation that has existed. I am going to take the then Government's own document. I am reading from the Physical Development Plan for Barbados which was presented and laid in Parliament on 28th November, 1976, and I am looking particularly at the pages starting from Chapter VII, page 42. I do not want to be misrepresented. I am giving the source. The Government were told they had a very serious problem in housing and that they had then over 11,700 cases that they had to provide as a question of great priority. 4.20 p.m.

If my friend's figures are true we should not have a housing problem now, we might have a housing renewal in some areas but not a housing problem at all but if you look at the areas in which it was suggested that some of the problems which were confronting the Government then, you will find that they did nothing.

Emmerton was Priority No. 1, San Domingo, St. Leonard's Village, Golden Square, Dukes Alley, Bachelor's Lane, Suttle Street, Man's Gap, Greenfield's Village, New Orleans, Queen's Street, Church Village, Waterloo and Wellington's Streets and King William Henry Street.

Priority No. 3: Hunt Street, Deane Village, Henry's Lane, Halls Road, Dunlow Lane, Beckles Hill,

Ellis Village, King's Village, Cat's Castle, Nurse Land, Phillip's Tenantry, Oldburn.

*Priority No. 4: Passage Road and Gardens, Barbarees Hill, Bannister's Land, Manning's and Peterkin's, Hindsbury, Hanschell's and Albins, are areas familiar to my friend, Grassfield, Richmond, Garden Land, Barbarees, Upper Hindsbury and so too the other areas in the rural areas were identified.*

None of these problems have been tackled up to now. Let us face facts in this country. Anybody who can look at Cat's Castle and be satisfied with what has gone on with housing in this country really is not a genuine Barbadian. Do not let us mess around the bush here. The housing policy was not properly executed by the past Government and hence we need now to go into proper planning and I am making no apologies for it.

They had the Abraham's Report which told them that they did not have a land bank and they would have to create a land bank. Nothing was done between 1970 and 1976 to create a land bank. Let us talk facts now. The only mass land area that was acquired by the Government was the area on Cave Hill which was acquired by Mr. Ronald Mapp when he was Minister. Let us talk facts. People do not give the Labour Party its due in this country. It took them a long time to recognise the 15 years to put us in power and they are listening to a series of rumours. They do not analyse the factual situation and they are being fooled by people and according to the hon. Senator, just have malodorous effluvia every night coming out of their mouths on the platforms in this country.

At that time they were producing 130 houses a year. That was their record. In 1964 to 1965 the Housing Authority under the Democratic Labour Party produced 130 houses per year, that was the average. They stepped it up and between 1971 and 1976 they managed to get 300 houses. On one occasion I remember the then hon. member, Mr. Philip Greaves, boasting that that year they had gone up to 300 houses and if you read the Debates between 1971 and 1976, the Labour Party — I remember myself making a speech about national housing bonds in this country and to give tax incentives and to bring in new methods of constructing houses. It is all in the Debates of Parliament. Barbadians have short memories. Barbadians do not remember. They forget so easily these things.

I do not make any bones about it. I do not believe that this country has a proper record of housing in the last 15 years at all and it is one of the most serious problems confronting the country. I think it is perhaps the second most serious problem confronting this country today. It needs to be dealt with. Not only are there not enough houses, but there are too many

substandard housing in Barbados and we have made no attempt to deal with slum areas in Barbados in any concerted and serious manner that we ought to in the country up to now and we are glad to see that the Minister is grabbling with the problems having got some of the preliminary work done by the Minister Mapp who moved out from the Ministry after a period of two years. I am glad to see him grabbling with the problems.

This problem is pathetic although some of the Ministers in the past Government were my personal friends. It is not a question now of friendship, Sir. They do not believe that we can feel happy about the situation. How could anybody feel happy about a situation where you go into units and you find that in the units of less than 400 square feet you probably have a family of 10 people to 400 square feet doing everything within that square footage area. How could you feel happy when you look at the condition.

Sir, I had a spectacle a couple of Sundays ago on going to my constituency where a poor man was thrown off the land. His house was physically taken down and thrown along the road, he and his wife and a blind lady. Now that has been the pattern that has been happening too frequently in Barbados, but even the house that was taken down was better than what he was left with. He constructed a temporary one, Sir. The house that was taken down was really not a house for anybody to live in with three children ranging from 5 to 10, with a wife and a blind old lady living under very poor conditions, very, very bad conditions. That is in Worthing View, Sir. It is not even down in the City area which was given priority there or in Bonnetts which the Minister was talking about.

About five years ago I came in here and tried to move a Resolution for the then Government to acquire Bonnetts pasture in order to set up a model housing area very near to a constituency now that is being given great day-to-day care, Sir. I hope I do not hear any hon. member talking against Bonnetts. I have firing power across the road, Sir. The Government ignored Bonnetts. They did not see it right under their noses there. Twelve and a half acres of some of the best building land.

Let me tell you worst than that. My researchers show that Mr. Patsy Springer when he first came into the House tried to persuade his own Government to do something about housing in the Bonnetts area and they ignored him. The Resolution was passed and they never got back to the Resolution. I do not like to run down Governments, Sir. If there is one area of our national life to which we have not given priority it is in the area of housing. We have not given priority to that. We will have to give priority to it now because Barbadians are

becoming more house conscious. They are becoming more house proud. They want to be part of the ownership system in the country and I believe that in getting our priorities right that it is more important to have a roof over our heads than to be going on pretty holidays overseas.

It is more important than anything else at all at this stage and I make bold to say that the 1970 Physical Development Plan which outlines the priorities has never been implemented. I cannot find any reason why the City has remained in certain areas as it is without housing being adequate when we know that the greatest pressure in housing existed in the City and the environs close around the City and that was never tackled at all.

4.30 p.m.

Maybe it was the politics of the situation. The City then had the great father figure of the late E. D. Mottley, and would that his sons would remember now they are running with the barrows and hunting with the wheels, or whatever it is; would that they would remember how he was treated. The City had to be moved out from him; nothing was done for the City people because it was in the wrong political hands at the time. It moved from E. D. Mottley to the Democratic Labour Party and still nothing was done. What am I hearing now, that all of a sudden we have converts to this model housing policy? If the Minister of Finance had provided enough money at the time he could have had a good housing policy. He could have spent more money rather than spend the time running down people on political platforms and attacking them savagely. I was in the "Under Forties" and I was savagely attacked in this House. If he had spent more energy thinking of the people than of power, he would have solved the housing problems of Barbados in ten years, but he had no proper approach to the problem. He accomplished some things, but housing was not one of them, and I make bold to say that this Government and future governments have to attack more seriously the whole problem of housing.

Another point, some of the people who have suffered from a lack of housing in this country are people in the rural areas, and a lot of the Sugar Welfare Funds were used for public housing, and I have heard Mr. Frank Walcott say — and I agree with him — that the sugar workers have fared badly out of the funds available for housing. And he was right, because the Sugar Welfare Funds were used and yet if you go through the rural areas you will find that they never got the concentration they deserve. The original part, I think, was done under the Barbados Labour Party, and I believe in the hon. member's constituency there was some development a little later on. When you go into St. Philip, that was done by the Barbados Labour Party;

and if you look at almost all of the housing areas in the rural districts you will find the housing was done under the Barbados Labour Party Government; Silver Hill Land was started under the last Labour Party Government. But I believe we need proper planning in these matters. We recognize that we still have problems with us but let us see if we can produce ideas to solve the problems. I do not want the hon. member for St. Michael West to tell us that if we look at a certain year we will find 2489 houses, because I do not think he is fair to his arguments. He has a melodious voice and he speaks very well; he is a good public relations man trying to pour oil all over the place, kissing babies and ladies in order to get back into power, but he will only succeed with that if he builds on facts; and certainly when he comes to an examination of his position in housing, he must admit that our problem was that none of the basic problems laid out in the physical development plan was seriously tackled. There needs to be proper planning; we cannot go on with a series of *ad hocisms*; we must stop treating housing as a Cinderella to get a few dollars out of the Welfare Fund. And we must stop believing that we must wait for an election year and press the panic button and waste money by giving half million dollars to be spent in three months when we know we will only be taken for a ride by a few people who want to make quick cash and provide nothing of lasting value. That is another criticism of the last Government, that in a limited period over half million dollars was given to be spent on housing in three months, in circumstances where the money went into people's pockets, who in my view did not produce the quality of housing that was necessary or the work to back up the money. That happened because of the lack of planning, and I support the serious approach which the Minister is bringing to these matters. We must not go on with *ad hocism*; we cannot go on talking about this figure of 2489 houses. (*Asides*) It is not the figure; if the hon. member wants me to get the updated figures we will try to show him what has happened with housing stock. As a matter of fact, the UN housing expert who produced two reports so far for the Ministry since we came into power has gone through a detailed statistical programme of the Housing stock, the state and condition, how many were built, the applications before the government, and has suggested some ways of reorganizing the department in order to deal with the problems. I do not believe that the job can be done by the Government alone. I do not believe the Government is structured to build the number of houses we need. I believe we must recognize that there is a role for private enterprise in this field and there is need for a cooperative effort. I see very little done to encourage building societies and to conserve national savings from the small man himself — outside of the Labour Welfare Fund — except perhaps I am going to be told about the National Insurance Fund, some of which is to be used in the field of housing. But one

must also use the small man so that he with his own "sou-sou" or meeting-turn can maximize the opportunity coming from the culture of the people in order to build on and turn these savings into a system for proper housing for the country. The ideas are there; it is for the planners to get on and deal with them.

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I see the hon. member for St. Michael South West apparently drawing my attention to a source of information. If he would like to send it over I might see who wrote it in order to tell them they are wrong if it is going to justify any suggestion that there were 2,400 housing starts in 1969. It is the sort of statistics which to people who have a little grasp of figures has a wrong sound. I do not believe that it is the hon. member for St. Michael South West behind it; I believe another hon. member perhaps is, I think, unconsciously misleading the House. They have never been 2,400 houses started in Barbados in any one year, even if a document laid by this Government says so. If an error has appeared, it is an error approximately of the Order of 10; the number would be more like 240, not 2,400. 4.40 p.m.

There have never in this island been as many as 20,000 people engaged in construction — the hon. member should know that — including all the people at MCW, all the people building hotels during the period under review, Cave Shepherd, and everything else, the most number of people who have ever worked in construction in this island, it only ever once went over 10,000, and that was in the year 1970. There are not enough workmen in Barbados to build that number of houses.

I have made some investigations while the cross talk is going on, I am told that some young lady who was working temporarily in the Ministry of Housing apparently went to the Town Planning Office — I do not know if that has anything to do with the hon. member's information — to collect certain statistics, and that 1969 was one of the years she was collecting statistics for. The Chief Town Planner can only think that an error was made and that what has happened is that you have added together all the applications for one year, added them with all the approvals, and even then it would not come to 2,400, because all the applications for any type of Town Planning activity in Barbados, including putting up a wall, opening a shop, anything at all, is only 1,300 a year, that is this year. In 1969 it was only around 1,000, so this figure which will no doubt be picked up by the Press.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. The hon. member will obviously be misleading the House, because he is suggesting that houses will only start in the year when the applications are made. It is possible for a

thousand to be made every year for three years, and those houses do not have to begin that same year. His line of argument sounds very plausible but it is not carrying us anywhere. If he will look in the Development Plan for 1973-77 he will see that of the 59,000 houses in Barbados 45,000 were timber houses. Now, let him address himself to that and let us deal with these six men he has working every day at the same time to build a timber house.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member spoke about housing starts which referred to a specific matter. For what it is worth, the number of private housing starts in 1977 was 260, the number up to September 1978 was 189. If the hon. member thinks for a minute he may reflect that he has multiplied a figure of perhaps 248 by 10 to get the 2,489. That is all I am saying, I am not even being contentious. The hon. member is out of scale, you do not in this country build anything like 2,500 houses a year, it would mean that our entire housing stock would be renewed every 20 years, which we all know is nonsense — timber or otherwise — we all know it is nonsense. The hon. member has perhaps unconsciously misread a figure or may have been misled by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. There is no real point, I just want to correct the situation, because I would not like it to get into circulation, when you are fighting with an international agency to do a sights and services scheme for 100 people, to hear that this is a country in which you can afford to renew your housing stock every 20 years by building 2,400 houses, timber or stone, in a year.

Again, for what it is worth, he talks about the applications; not all the applications are for housing. Suppose no houses were built in 1966, none in 1967 and none in 1968 you still would not reach a total of 2,400 approvals waiting to be built in 1969. The hon. member's figures are almost, I would think or surmise, ten times too high.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, I am sure the hon. member himself will agree that in a housing project, say Eden Lodge, if there is going to be an application for a series of units there would be a single application, it would not shown up as an application for building a house. Presumably when one talks of houses one is talking about units in which people live. If he means that there has got to be a single unit, then clearly he would be on the right track, but if you take an apartment building that is one application, so checking the number of applications at Town and Country Planning will not give you information on housing starts, and I will agree with the hon. member that we have no machinery in Barbados that can give you an accurate figure of housing starts, and therefore one has to use crude information,

including what private sector people say they have built, what the public sector say they have built, you have to put them together and you can come up with information that may be crude but it is plausible.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member perhaps now realises that to build a house you have to apply for Town Planning permission and have the plans approved. The hon. member may not realise that, and that whether Eden Lodge was one application or one hundred, the houses built thereon require planning permission, but I will pass that because what he said may be true of apartment houses. Nonetheless, we are in the fortunate position of being able to deal with the year 1969 through the same Physical Development Plan which was laid. All the applications granted up to 1969 for house spots from the time the Town Planning Office came into being, all the applications in Bridgetown, west and south coasts over that 14 years, all, amounted to 4,393 house spots. Seven were for house spots of less than 1,300 square feet, 886 were for house spots between 1,300 and 3,000 square feet, 1,788 were for house spots between 3,000 and 7,000 and 1,712 over that size, and that included wooden houses as well as stone houses, and at that time the number which had been built on was 1,800 and the rest were outstanding.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Will the hon. member tell us whether he can find in the information he is reading an application for a house spot for the Farm Housing Area?

Mr. WARD: On a point of order. Mr. Chairman, what has amazed me in this House today is that we all know that hon. member. He has not been misled, when you hear the Prime Minister talking about his reading wrong information, this is a deliberate attempt to confuse the issue when he talks about 2,400 houses.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will say on a point of order that the hon. member cannot get up on a bogus point of order and say that I made a deliberate attempt; he has to withdraw it, Sir. I ask that the hon. member withdraw that, Sir, I object to what he has said.

Mr. WARD: What would he like withdrawn?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The reference to "deliberate", and "bogus".

Mr. WARD: I remove the word "bogus", it is a deliberate attempt to confuse the issue in here today by naming 2,400 when he knows no 2,400 houses were built in a year.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot have two hon. members on their feet. You have to withdraw the offending remark.

Mr. WARD: I withdraw "deliberate". In no year in Barbados' history was ever 2,400 houses built.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have withdrawn the offending remarks. Take your seat, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not mind whether it is deliberate or whether it is out of ignorance, Sir, that is the truth. I would be charitable and say it was deliberate, but you would ask me to withdraw that, so I would just have to assume it is just out of ignorance. But the very same survey in 1970 analysed the population growth, the persons living in substandard housing, and rehousing arising from expansion of the central business district, and they found that over ten years Barbados would require 3,040 dwellings in Housing Areas and another 2,400 dwellings outside the Housing Areas, and they said particularly that the number of houses required was 300 houses a year. I mean, effort can do no more.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I do not know whether his people came from Timbuctoo, the U.N. or where. This is a document that has been laid in this House, the Barbados Development Plan 1973-77, and on page 10-47, when obviously Barbadians who live here had been carrying out the survey, they said: "The census of 1970 indicates that out of a total of over 59,000 houses about 45,000 are constructed of timber." Then they go over on the other side, Sir, on pages 10-48 and 10-49, and outline what is required and how they propose to get to it. I do not wish to waste your time.

4.50 p.m.

They say there would be a need for 3,000 new dwellings. In that same one they say the annual programme for the lower and lower middle income groups would provide approximately 600 new houses. In addition, and they go on to talk about loans, it says "the main programme of middle and upper income housing is related to the development of the Cave Hill area where some 400 houses have been erected or are in the course of construction."

Now, Sir, if the hon. member would read that, he would get to see that talking about 300 houses required for a year has nothing to do with the area during which Barbados was going from a position of almost no housing to a rapid housing development which occurred between the period 1966 and 1972.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I suppose the hon. member read that page for the sake of reading something, because it really has no relevance to the figure of 2,400. I think that the Leader of the Opposition was very unkind to draw that to his attention. I looked at him carefully to see the amusement in his eyes as it was read out. I would not worry with that. I am absolutely sure that the hon. member for St. Michael South West cannot now believe that there were 2,487 houses built in 1969.

Dr. HAYNES: If the hon. member would give way for a minute on a point of elucidation, for some years I had been intimately associated with housing development in this country in the capacity, I think, as Deputy Chairman of the Urban Development Corporation, and I do recall that in 1968 or 1969 a survey carried out by the U.D.C. at that time showed that there were about 2,000 housing units under construction in Barbados and that was the figure that I stated. I am pretty sure that is the case, and this was just during the period of the housing boom. I cannot say what it was before or subsequently but I was associated with it and when I was actively involved in exploring the kind of construction techniques as outlined by the hon. member for St. Philip North, techniques that would never be successful unless there was a cement plant in Barbados on a meaningful scale, I can assure the hon. member for St. Thomas that that was the situation in 1969 where over 2,000 units were under construction in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If they are the figures which the U.D.C. produced to confuse its Deputy Chairman, I can only congratulate the previous government on winding up the U.D.C. and putting an end to its activities. Whether the hon. member remembers those figures — and I cannot say with the greatest respect to him that I would regard his memory as the most accurate source of something that happened in 1969, something that happened in 1979, February 12 far less something that happened in 1969 of which he had no direct knowledge — whether he remembers that or not, I assure him that whether he was told that or not, it was wrong. It simply is not so. This is not a country where that number of houses has ever been built no matter what the hon. member says he remembers, says he was told or perhaps indeed he was told. If that is the way U.D.C. went about its business, well the U.D.C. was properly laid in its grave in 1973 or 1974 whenever it was eventually wound up. It is just that figures get pulled out of hats or out of the dark recesses of ill-remembered deeds and they go into circulation, and they certainly debase the currency of accurate figures and of truth.

We have set a target of around 800 houses a year. All of a sudden some figure comes from nowhere. It started out at 2,400, then it was put up by the hon. member for St. Michael South West to 2,487, but it

might have been 2,489 and now it has come down to over 2,000, and when this is properly examined.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the hon. member has got his sequence wrong. The hon. member had said 2,000 and then the hon. member for St. Philip North corrected it and said he was wrong, and I said that he might have been wrong because my recollection is that it was 2,489 and I might have been off by two to the left or right. It is something like the unemployment statistics which we get from the Government from week to week.

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of elucidation, I never said that the figure given by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was wrong. I said I did not believe it. It could not be right.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It is a pity really that we have to detain the House with things like this. I sincerely hope the initiative which the Government is taking to identify housing starts to have a planning unit in the Ministry of Housing would stop people from inventing figures out of the top of their heads and giving them to the Deputy Chairman of the U.D.C., and in future we will be able to look at published information. But for what it is worth in my opinion, the combination of timber houses, bungalows, and Housing Authority houses did not even reach 800 last year. That is my information. I do not believe it reached 800 in 1977. The Barclay Homes, the Pine Homes, the Joy Homes and the Mrs. Rock Homes plus the houses in Cave Hill and so on and the others people built I do not believe would reach 800. Let us get right away from any belief that 10,000 people had ever been rehoused in one year in this country, in 1969. If the hon. member for St. Michael South Central reads the Physical Development Plan, he will see that the total housing we had for ten years was reckoned at 15,000, not houses, people. That was over ten years, the ten year period 1965 to 1975 when he was in U.D.C.; so the question of over 2,000 houses which would house over 8,000 people being built in one year is not in it. It is either a miss-recall figure or a deliberate misinformation given to the hon. member.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak in this debate, but I would like to say quite clearly that the Government is in a bit of a bind in relation to its manifesto promises of 800 houses per year which the general public would like to believe would have been provided by government agencies, and the present position being taken is that what they intended was to provide the facilities for the building of 800 houses a year. That would be a matter for the electorate who heard them in 1976 and who would hear them in whatever year to judge how that was taken by the public. But I would like to say this: it is important that members of this Honourable House understand that housing is one of the most fundamental developments in this society and

in most societies. When you build a house it is not merely bricks and mortar and the provision of employment. By providing adequate accommodation, adequate lighting, adequate leisure facilities as well as adequate toiletry within a house, the spin-off contributions that you are making to that society in terms of education, in terms of health, in terms of national development cannot be over-emphasised, and it would be my feeling, and I share the view previously expressed by several speakers, that the question of housing is such an important priority as far as Barbados is concerned that it is the kind of area where national goals can be supported by both sides of this House, and it is most important that people should not try to enter into the area of extreme partisan politics on the question of housing.

5.00 p.m.

Now if you take the matter of health, for example, Mr. Chairman, if you spend \$50 million a year in dealing with health problems after the point of breakdown by paying \$10 million in housing you would probably find that you would save \$25 million in respect to health that you might spend in that particular year because there are tremendous spin-offs from the whole question of housing. It is my feeling that we can devise a housing plan in Barbados that could maximise the utilisation of the available labour force, that could maximise local materials as far as possible and in this regard, when you think of the industrialisation of the production of housing that the cement plant is not already operational because that is always a pre-condition for effective industrialisation of any housing programme.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Chairman, is this, that all housing programmes must be related to our local raw materials in order to substantially reduce the imported content that goes into the house to maximise employment. Also we have to mechanise in order to increase the rate of production and also take a longer view of housing and to recognise that when you provide a house for a man you will not only be providing four walls but you are in fact contributing to the psychological, social, economic and emotional development of that individual and his dependants therefore it is not a matter that can in anyway be under-estimated and I would urge again that the kind of debate that I have heard today, that that kind of debate is not strictly relative to the fundamental problems in this society when it is seen in its very broadest context because it is not purely a matter of putting people in houses, it is looking at the spin off effects within the society and indeed it is interesting that the economic situation of this country can largely be hampered by what is happening in the building industry.

It is not by chance that that has been the case and will continue to be the case for sometime because of the multiple related factors that relate to housing. Housing is not housing as a single word. Housing is a word that we

should think of encompassing a significant part of the total environmental development of this country in physical terms, under economic terms, under human terms, under educational terms and any kind of terms you think you may wish.

Giving a house to every single family in this country must be achieved at some point in our development and it is only at that point in time that we can really start thinking in terms of building a developed country.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, when this debate started the hon. member for St. Michael South Central inquired about the roads in the housing area. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been in the Ministry of Communications and Works since October and it was during the rainy season that my office has been inundated with calls, not only by people living in Government housing development areas, but from persons living in private developments. One of the most disturbing factors about roads in Barbados generally is that it appears (*Asides*). I am not fixing anything that you are connected with so you can go and tell the public that, the public in the gallery can hear that.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member saying that he is not fixing anything in St. Michael South Central?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. Will you please continue.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, that gentleman has never been able to talk anything straight. Where he and I are concerned he knows the position. I am not ready yet. I am taking things cool for the time being. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you look at Oxnards, it was constructed under the last administration. There is serious flooding in Oxnards. The residents complain about the roads but the major problem with the roads in housing developments is that through some miraculous manner Housing Authority has been building the houses.

In some cases it conveyed the house to the purchaser and has retained the road, the curves and the wells in those areas. Housing Authority has never had the capacity to fix roads to a standard acceptable to the engineers at the Ministry of Communications and Works. The same goes for the Pine. When you go in Wildey you find that some roads are under the administration of the Ministry of Communications and Works, other roads are retained by the Housing Authority and technically the Ministry of Communications and Works cannot enter upon the roads that are still in the possession of Housing Authority. It is a strange situation as I said when a landlord or a development is developing an estate, he sells off all the houses, he retains no land, but he retains the wells, the kerbs and the roads.

Another problem that this country has been faced with, and I think the public ought to know, that the quality of the material that is being received by the Ministry of Communications and Works has been deteriorating since about 1974. The Ministry's files are loaded with complaints from Mobil Oil and Plantations Limited and as one Technical Officer has put it to me he said, Mr. Minister, the materials, the emulsion we are receiving to fix the roads run for shelter as soon as the rain sets up. That is the phrase he used. Every day you get calls. You just fix the roads and all the marl is in the gutter, all the gravel is up on my doorstep, come and move it.

5.10 p.m.

Up to this morning I arrived late at Parliament because I was involved in a meeting with certain suppliers in Bridgetown complaining about the quality of the material supplied to Government for fixing the roads in this country. You see the newspapers — and I am talking now about the Nation newspaper — talking about rebuilding roads and that we must not talk about a patching programme. At this time this Government is struggling under the arch of an international agency when the technical officers are telling you it is costing \$1.2 million to rebuild the roads in this country; yet you hear the newspapers telling you to rebuild whole stretches of roads. Where will we get the money from? We have to do the best with the amount of money available. So when the hon. member talks about road and housing development, we have to do the best we can. As you yourself have seen, Mr. Chairman, we put the emulsion down on the road and half of it comes up on your motor car and the stones leave the road as soon as the workmen leave. If the last administration had gone into the poor quality of material going to MCW from 1974 when the technicians were complaining, perhaps the situation would have been different. I have asked my fellow Ministers to sit down with me as soon as possible and work out a comprehensive programme for the roads of this country. The last Cabinet looked at the problem when it was forced to by the Chief Technical Director at MCW. They worked out a programme for the roads of this country but it was never put into operation; it was in the development plan which the hon. Attorney General spoke about. It is not that they did not get advice; they ignored the advice given. And I am hoping this week to sit down with the Minister responsible for Housing and work out a programme where either MCW will do all the roads or we will know exactly what roads we are to do. We will lay down a programme of road building so that even if private developers have developed roads, it can be shown that the roads have been developed to the standards laid down by the Ministry of Communications and Works. But I want to warn the public that all the roads cannot be done within the next two or three years. The situation has existed too long to be pulled back overnight. A lot of

people in this country seem to think that the members of the present Government are magicians who can just wave a wand and everything can be done. It cannot be done like that. Take for example the new developments of Regency Park and Elizabeth Park — less than ten years old — and in the last rains large portions of the roads were washed away. People are phoning me every day complaining that the Government refused to do the road, but when I called the Technical Officers they tell me the roads have not been properly laid down. So you must have a policy of what needs to be done.

There is another problem with street lamps. People complain about the lack of street lamps. But what is happening? I have called the Barbados Light and Power and they have said that the last Public Utilities hearing did not give them the capital they needed, so they have not ordered street lamps. So there are no street lamps available in the country for installation although there is money in the vote. The money will lapse because there are no street lamps available for installation. At the Harbour people are complaining that half of the lights are out. I understand that from the time that section was opened there were problems with the lights down there. They tell me the poles were put down wrong, that the wires had to be spliced, and that now there is some subterranean termite eating out the cable and that the whole area will have to be renewed. But there are no street lamps in Barbados either for Government or private enterprise, so the public should know now that it is not that the Government does not want to do these things. There are two problems: one, the quality of the material we are getting, and we will have to import proper material to bring the roads up to standard; and the costs for road repairs are escalating every day. Secondly there are no street lamps available. So please understand the situation because I do not want the public to say that the Government will not do these things; I want the public at large to understand the situation where roads are concerned.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, fellow Parliamentarians have spoken on this matter for something like two hours and forty minutes, ranging from forty votes, twelve votes, Roebuck Street, back down to the Barbados Light and Power Company. I believe that come Estimates time is when we should have a full dress debate on housing in this country; therefore I am not prepared to say much on this occasion, but I will have to say a little and I have made a couple of notes.

First of all the hon. member for St. Michael South said that we on this side try to make people believe that they did nothing during their fifteen years. I have said publicly, and will say so now, that any party that was in power for even five years would have to do

something, furthermore a party in power for fifteen years; so that is only cheap talk. At least, if you are going to deal with housing, your colleague said it was nothing less than spectacular. I am going to say it was nothing less than disgraceful and I will show you how it was nothing less than disgraceful. I could not speak in the City bye-election nor in the last general election in the City for my colleague because I could not speak with any conviction. When I walked through Church Village and saw the conditions under which people lived I said to her I cannot speak with any conviction because the place was in the same condition that the conservatives had left it; and I am putting the blame on the last administration of the Barbados Labour Party. But we tried with what little money we have to start making the City look like a city Barbadians can be proud of. And I believe that the Prime Minister had a dream, because when he invited me to join his Cabinet he first said he wanted me to be Minister of Housing. I say this for this reason, that no statement I made in here on July 26 resulted in any shuffling of the Cabinet, because the Prime Minister knew all along my feelings about the people who lived in the City, the most deprived area in this country.

5.20 p.m.

Now, in 1979, there are people living in Cats Castle on dirt floors with a toilet tacked on to the kitchen. That is the disgraceful aspect of housing in this country, and I am committed to seeing that housing in Bridgetown is worthwhile as long as I am in here, and I want to say this at this stage. I have taken it by the horns, and this is a report which I have just received from the planners to revamp the whole of the Cats Castle, Emmerton Lane, Farnum's Land and that entire area, and then I will be tackling the Greenfield and bringing a new lease on life to those people who live in the City. That is what I am going to do. When you talk about spectacular, it is spectacular when you go into Elizabeth Park, Sandy Lane, Sunset Ridge, Sunset Crest, because the people in that area are in the higher income bracket and the ones who look better in housing, while it is the poor people in the country who have suffered.

I want to say something now since my time is limited. When I took office in October in Housing, my predecessor was on the correct path in making Housing an arm of Government of which one can be justly proud. We were saddled with something like \$2 million, the contractors and business houses in Bridgetown to whom we had owed money, and it even went further. So ridiculous was the administration in the Ministry of Housing during your regime that you did not even pay \$746,000 into the Accountant General's Office for the people's pension scheme. Even that we had to pay. There were about 15,000 applications when we took office, and you are getting them at the rate of 90 per week, but we are committed to this. But then I heard my colleague, the member for St. Michael South — and I am going to deal with him in particular — the others did not say anything. He asked about houses being painted and all of that jazz;

he said that we had not painted the houses, but they painted some of them, they paid \$1.5 million to repair 540 houses in 1976. That is what you did, and you asked about Princess Royal Avenue.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr Chairman, for the purpose of the record, I never asked anything about Princess Royal Avenue nor about the Pine, and if there is a problem up there I will be glad to ask about it, if I knew what the problem was.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will tell you what the problem is now. You wanted to find out about landscaping and so on. This is what we have done. We have asked Parks and Beaches to go into the National Housing Corporation because the housing estates, to my mind, look very depressed because of a garbage problem, there is the problem of bush all around them, and I have asked Parks and Beaches to go into the various housing areas and landscape them to bring a new lease of life to the people who live in those areas. That is one aspect of the clean-up programme.

Then you talked about your constituency. What constituency do you have? With seven votes? Do you have a constituency too? What constituency do you have? You were a Minister and won a seat by "nay nay" votes out of the St. Michael District Hospital? You were too low keyed, that was your problem. Well, let me tell you what I am doing for you. Let me inform the House that there is a sights and services programme which we are working on. I am hoping to have the tenancies properly laid out where people will have water, light — this is the infrastructure — put in for them. There is a problem, for example, at Hanschell Land which the member for St. Michael South West spoke about, which was going on for eleven years, not four, which we are also tackling.

Mr. Chairman, we had the problem when we came into office of arrears, and there are arrears today — this is disgraceful — in the National Housing Corporation to the figure of \$2.5 million in rents owing to the National Housing Corporation because of your bad administration. No proper system of collecting; one woman, we discovered, had a house for herself and another one next to it — she was renting both of them but not paying the rents — and she had a band in it. Barbara and the Rhythmaires was the name of the band, and she had two houses, one to practise her band in and the other for her to live in. That is how you administered the National Housing Corporation, and the survey which is being done is revealing all of this now. A sum of \$2.5 million in arrears is outstanding, and in spite of all of that we were still able, under my predecessor's jurisdiction, to build a number of houses during our two years in office.

I would also, for the benefit of my colleague, the Attorney General, let him know that the Physical

Development Plan has moved into Bonnetts, or is moving into Bonnetts some time this week where you failed for years to be able, even on the recommendation of one of your colleagues over here, to acquire Bonnetts, and we are now moving into Bonnetts and our Physical Development Planner is either in today or will be going in tomorrow. Therefore Bonnetts is going to be a model of a housing development, we are going to show you what is meant by not only building houses, but also improving the quality of life for the people therein.

At Haynesville we are hoping to build 104 houses, as an extension of Haynesville. I am putting a Craig stamp on housing, so that when you look around you will be able to see that this is Craig's endeavours, starting with the City. Wotton is an old disease of theirs again; that was another thieving thing up there again, but I do not want to touch on that aspect of it since there is a report which I hope to bring some time during the year which I am sure will "catspraddle" you once and for all. They went, Sir, in Apes Hill — I am only showing you how badly they used to plan — they built a road in a place called Apes Hill to sell the land, and in the middle of the road is a utility pole, and that was done because Mr. Joy Edwards at the time was trying to court Orange Hill, so he built a road and the utility pole is still in the road. Well, we are moving the people from Deane's Town over to Sion Hill, they are now working on the roads and we are hoping to resite the people to bring a new lease on life for the people out of Deane's Town in the St. Andrew constituency into Apes Hill where they will have a quarter acre of land to till the soil and help reduce their own cost of living. That is how we set about it. You only have to pass down Sion Hill, so I am giving everybody a taste, including the member for St. Michael South, because I am doing the constituency for somebody, and you know that person very well. You are drawing up under Senator Field today, but you are drawing up under the wrong bird, you take it from me.

However, Sir, I think my time is up, since I should finish at 5.30, and I beg to move that this Resolution in the sum of \$11,353, Head 18(1) do now pass.

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

*The question that Head 18(1) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division. 5.30 p.m.*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report the passing of three Resolutions in Committee of Supply.

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

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

*On separate motions of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Resolutions were read a first time and agreed to.*

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, earlier today we laid a Report of the Joint Select Committee of the Legislature, and I beg to move the adoption of that Report so that next week we would be able to circulate and debate them.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION TO FIX THE SALARIES OF STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the next item stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we have to move an amendment to this Resolution resulting from, I believe, a matter that was raised at the Debates Committee. It was submitted to Establishments to alter one of the emoluments in the printed copy and I would ask that this matter be deferred for a short time so that the necessary amendment can be worked out, the correspondence can be obtained and the matter completed.

I beg to move that Item 5 be the next Order.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE SALARY AND DUTY ALLOWANCE OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 5 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister, to move the passing of a Resolution to revise the salary and duty allowances applicable to the Governor-General with effect from 1st April, 1978.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If you please, Sir, the Governor-General has not had an increase since 1973. His present salary is less than that of a number of public officers, well at least one public officer, and of persons in quasi public employment. It may be thought to be a large salary, but I would just mention that I had to handle an immigration file for someone seeking to take up a job in this Island, not at a bank, Sir, and not in the top position either, and I took note that the salary which he was going to draw was \$111,000 a year. I do not think that if that

kind of salary is being paid to persons not even in top position and not in banks in Barbados, that we should grudge the Governor-General the emolument mentioned in the Resolution.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

I should mention that it is anticipated that there may be amendments to the Governor-General's Act other than this to make one or two other adjustments that have been indicated by experience since 1966.

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

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

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
(REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES OF  
MEMBERS) ACT, 1979

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 7 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the Second Reading of the Senate and House of Assembly (Remuneration and Allowances of Members) Bill, 1979.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this matter has met with abundant debate over the last few months at all levels in and out of the House. It does no more than confirm the agreement reached at the Select Committee, and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. H. deB. FORDE; Hon. L. R. TULL; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. SIMMONS; Mr. ALLEYNE; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. ODLE and Mr. WARD — 13.

NOES: Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. CADDLE and Dr. HAYNES — 4.  
5.40 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am glad to see that we have enough tolerance in this country not to include the provisions in the recent Western Samoa Members' Bill that all those who voted against the increases will not get them. Never mind that, Sir. It is the privilege of the Opposition to hold their hands out and put their voices the other way, Sir. You read the last debate.

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

*Clauses 1 to 11 were called and passed.*  
5.50 p.m.

*The Schedule was called and passed.*

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*

*On the separate motions of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG, the Bill was read a third time and passed, the House dividing as follows:*

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. L. R. TULL, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ALLEYNE, Mr. ODLE and Mr. WARD — 14.

Noes: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

BILL TO PROVIDE FOR REVISED ALLOWANCES  
AND SALARIES FOR MINISTERS AND PAR-  
LIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, the same consideration applies to this Bill as to the previous Bill. No doubt some hon. members will vote against the principle of increases to the salaries of Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries. All the points have been fully dealt with in this House and elsewhere, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I should like to start off by acknowledging that any attempt on the part of the hon. Minister who introduced the Bill to coerce members on this side into taking any position will be observed by members on this side and ignored; and I would merely like to say to the remark that the Opposition members will hold out their hands, that on the floor of this House when the matter was debated before I invited the hon. Minister responsible for Finance, if he so wished, to feel free to put into this legislation a clause to the effect that anyone who votes against it should not draw. The fact is that if we must look for a precedent he need only look to the right of him, the hon. member for St. James, and he will find a number of his colleagues in this place

and in the Other Place while sitting on this side who spoke against and drew.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, this Bill has nothing to do with the Opposition. I do not know that any member of the Opposition is a Minister or a Parliamentary Secretary, so I do not know the relevance of what the hon. member is saying.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall not tarry the House with that sort of contention. It is a very simple principle we are putting forward. We believe that the intimations which have been made to the people of Barbados at certain times during the past year and the apparent fluctuation of the economy to go upward at the time when Ministers salaries are being discussed and to go down at the time of discussion with other workers in the community, we consider this fluctuation to be singularly lucky for the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries; and we find it particularly worrying that Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries should have this run of luck so far as the economy is concerned. We feel that the same abundance of enthusiasm should be seen to be operating with respect to other sectors of the community who have to work just as do Ministers.  
6.00 p.m.

We believe that the police and the school teachers and a number of other people in this community have to operate in the same economy as anybody else. No one has ever on this side said that they doubted the principle of an increase in the salaries for parliamentarians and Ministers. No one will be permitted to suggest that we have said there should be no increase, we are saying that in the context of what has happened over the last eighteen months in this country that it is immoral for anyone to take the positions which we have seen taken from time to time.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member really intends to impute against any hon. member the question of immorality in the bringing of this matter, and I would wish that you withdraw it.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as you wish, I withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Not as I wish.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I did not impute any improper motives. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER: Please withdraw and nothing more.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. In St. Vincent where the principle has been the same we have

seen an attitude which Sir, as far as I am concerned, in St. Vincent is immoral.

Mr. SPEAKER: St. Vincent is a friendly country and I must demand that you withdraw it more than urgently. The hon. member must withdraw the implications regarding St. Vincent on immorality.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to make the general point that when anyone makes a promise in the general administration of any country, when anyone goes to the community in which he lives, wherever that community is, and makes one kind of statement with one set of facts and then makes an opposite statement with the same set of facts, that is immoral. And for a number of reasons I find myself as an individual and as a person in the Democratic Labour Party, I find it impossible for me to accept what has been put forward and what would have culminated in the Bill before this Hon. House. I need not go any further, Sir, I shall wait patiently until all has been said so I and my colleagues can vote against this particular Bill.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have had some time to reflect on this Bill and there are seven fundamental and major reasons why the Democratic Labour Party cannot possibly support it. The first reason is that up to September 2, 1976 the Barbados Labour Party which now forms the Government of this country campaigned throughout Barbados and put it to the electorate that Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party Government were overpaid in respect of salaries, allowances and. . . .

Mr. SIMMONS: On a point of order, Sir, I campaigned in 1976 and I never accused any Minister of the then Government of being overpaid, nor have I heard any of my colleagues on this side or unsuccessful candidates accuse them of that. They may have accused them of other things, but not of working for too much money.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter for the electorate to judge, but I think thousands of people attended Barbados Labour Party meetings.

*Certain remarks were ordered to be expunged by the Speaker at this stage.*

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party Government being overpaid, in Chapter III of the Nicholls Report there is a clear statement where he said that ". . . for this reason alone there is justification for an increase in the present level of remuneration for parliamentarians, unless it can be claimed that their remuneration in 1973 was too generous. This has been examined in the light of salaries paid in the community at that time and there is no evidence to substantiate such a claim." Therefore, because

it was fed to the community that the previous Ministers of the Democratic Labour Party were overpaid in respect of salaries and allowances, and allowances when they were travelling, and the Nicholls Report itself came out and said that that was a false statement, that is one of the seven grounds on which I will certainly be opposing this Bill, because to vote for it I would be party to, and guilty of, a degree of political cynicism which in my view in the long term is destructive to the democratic fabric of this society.

The second reason, Mr. Speaker, is this. I feel that in principle both these salaries and the allowances are far too high, because I personally believe that as representatives of all the people our salaries and remuneration, the remuneration of Ministers, should be reflective or bear some kind of relationship not to the higher earners in the community but principally to the average wage in the community.

6.10 p.m.

The third reason, Mr. Speaker, is that I can find no moral justification of any kind for Ministers to be backpaying themselves from 1st April, 1978. I cannot find any moral justification in my own way of thinking, particularly when you bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that at that time there was a substantial number of people in this country who had their salaries reduced by being put on a four day week, and the vast majority of people have been subject in the private sector to a 5% wage restraint in the preceding months, and when a final settlement was made in the public sector, then the employees of the Government had to be satisfied with 20% at the bottom and 10% at the top.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the Nicholls Report — they too were fooled into believing there would be a permanent reduction in the Ministers — had recommended an overall increase in the amounts spent on salaries and emoluments for Parliamentarians from \$625,800 per year to \$709,044 an increase of 13%. Now under these proposals that increase, Mr. Speaker, will be from \$625,800 a year at the time when Nicholls reported, to \$1,158,360 a year or an average of 52% increase, and in respect of Ministers, that conceals an increase in the range of from 50% to somewhere in the region of 85%. There is no way how I can possibly with any satisfaction to my conscience or with any sense of dignity or with any sense of responsibility towards the people of Barbados come in here and give my support to this kind of situation.

The fifth reason, Mr. Speaker, is this: the improvements in Government's revenue over the past two

years in relation to its expenditure has been at the expense of a wide range of taxation on the poor people of this country, and also a tight policy on expenditure with its natural concomitant of unemployment in Barbados, and it is my feeling that the old age pensioners in Barbados, the police who have to protect this society and the teachers, Mr. Speaker, who have to look after our children have a prior claim in the event of any available money to be paid out long before people who are Ministers of Government.

The sixth reason, Mr. Speaker, is this, the question of salaries and allowances. Parliamentary salaries such as those proposed here for Ministers in my view are extremely generous and the pension proposals are extremely generous, and the kind of tax free allowances being proposed here, could never have my support, because when this is translated into taxable income that would apply to the average citizen in this society, it means that the Prime Minister of Barbados will be earning the equivalent of \$156,400 a year, that the Deputy Prime Minister would be earning the equivalent of \$130,000 and Ministers of Government would be earning the equivalent of \$87,600 a year.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I invite him to pass over the calculation here. I would like to check it.

Dr. HAYNES: There is no problem. I can check it out here. The Prime Minister's basic salary is \$50,400, entertainment allowance \$18,600 and housing allowance \$13,200. Add \$18,600 to \$13,200 and that is \$31,800, multiply it by 100 and divide by 30 and add it to \$50,400 and you get the equivalent there. (*Laughter*) It is a very simple calculation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Would the hon. member with his calculations say what would be the tax on the salary of the Prime Minister?

Dr. HAYNES: If the hon. member would like me to explain that, it is simple. Under the present income tax situation in Barbados, unless the Hon. Prime Minister has massive deductions, the fact is that at some point in his \$50,400 he would be paying 70%. If you then take the allowances and you convert them into what it would mean if he was paying taxes on his entire amount in order to get that net amount, it would mean \$156,400, and that arithmetic you cannot argue with.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Would the hon. member state what would be the tax under the Barbados tax scales on the \$50,000? How much would be left after that tax?

Mr. SPEAKER: On what does the Leader of the House rise?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, that is irrelevant.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order, please.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, what I would like the hon. member to do because this goes to the root of the whole tax free business, is to make a calculation as to whether I would be better off paying the tax and getting a pension or not paying the tax. Let him make that calculation, because I tell the House I would prefer to pay the tax and get the pension on the whole emoluments.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the Hon. Prime Minister is altogether fair in his assumption in that he has really not elucidated any point that he made previously.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say this: I would like to refer to the Nicholls Report, page 10 section 3.16, — and I would believe that for salaries at this level I would certainly prefer to see this kind of system of allowances and so on introduced — it says: "Having regard to the comments made by interested persons and to other indications the Commission considered that public opinion did not favour the payment of a tax-free duty allowance to parliamentarians. Further the Commission considers that if the duty allowance was intended to cover specific expenses normally incurred by parliamentarians, such expenses should be identified and specific allowances provided for them. Accordingly the Commission recommends that all duty allowances should be withdrawn and that any remuneration, apart from basic salary, should be provided for specific and identifiable purposes only."

Now further in this Report, Mr. Speaker, it was suggested that a fund could be set up from which reasonable and identifiable expenses incurred in the course of one's duty could be drawn, and this seems to me to be a very reasonable suggestion.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the seventh reason why I must vote against it is because none of the Ministers of the present Government were Ministers in 1973. They cannot claim that they had any erosion of their salaries as a consequence of any inflation since 1973. Some of them, at least one of them was not even a member of Parliament and those who were members of Parliament were sitting on the Opposition benches either carrying on their own private businesses or their professions. So that to come with this story about erosion of their salaries since 1973 in respect of posts and remuneration which they did not receive in respect of these posts is just to

my mind an argument that is totally and completely unacceptable.  
6.20 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my view that the Report of the Nicholls Commission seems to me to be reasonable and generally in accordance with what would have been acceptable to most people in Barbados.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am asking the hon. member to explain because I am trying to follow his point. Is the hon. member saying that the salary voted by Parliament is voted for a particular person or by the office held by a particular person because if the hon. member really wants to argue the case logically, it would be preferable that he be logical. I want to understand quite clearly because some of his tax computations could never be right.

Dr. HAYNES: To continue, Mr. Speaker, if you would like me to answer it, I would be very glad to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Will the hon. member please address the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I think I will continue. There is no doubt in my mind that these salaries are grossly excessive and that the allowances are outrageous in the context of the economy of Barbados. There is no doubt in my mind that the Government should think a second time before they set about voting for this Bill because fundamentally, politically and in every possible emotional feeling that I can have, I do not wish to see emerging in Barbados an elitish and aristocratic form of Government which this kind of remuneration would be lending the basis for, because in my judgment I think that Governments should never separate themselves from the communities that elected them and consequently when they give themselves salaries of this order, this is an act of separation that can only create problems in this society in the future.

I go further, Mr. Speaker, to say this. When people are receiving remunerations of this order, when pension privileges of the kind envisaged and allowances of the kind envisaged in Government, then they might well go to any lengths to make sure that they are not removed from office. I think that this is something that one should reflect on very carefully. I have read the thinking that went into producing the Report of the Select Committee and I disagree with that kind of thinking fundamentally and I want to make this fundamentally clear that I would be no part of this kind of gross departure from an understanding that has existed since the introduction of Ministerial Government in this country, that the remuneration of Parliamentarians and Ministers in particular, would bear some relationship to the general

level of earnings in the community, approximately somewhere around the middle-class type of earnings. There is no point making a comparison with the private sector because there is a fundamental difference.

Mr. speaker, if you are in the office as a lawyer, or a doctor, or you are employed by a bank in Bridgetown, it is not the taxpayers money that is being spent. That is a fundamental difference and there is no point drawing comparisons with the higher salaries around in Bridgetown. Mr. Speaker, I cannot find it acceptable that because Technical officers employed by Government might earn a salary that is at a given level that it follows that the Ministers must necessarily earn a salary higher than that because a Minister does not derive his authority from the fact that he earns a dollar more than the Permanent Secretary or the Chief Consultant in Agriculture or any particular area. He derives his authority from the constitution of Barbados and what he is paid has nothing to do with it so that kind of argument again does not appeal to me and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative but to cast a very firm vote against this particular Bill.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was a member of this Chamber on previous occasions when questions of Salary Revision arose before this Honourable House. I am well aware that politicians on these occasions, particularly those who are not in office, attempt to use the occasion in a way that they feel will enhance their prospects at voting in the future.

I remember very clearly, Sir, that I said quite openly, from the time I entered this place, that I was one of those who believed that the level of remuneration to Parliamentarians and Executives in this country should be such that anyone, whatever his financial position, should feel himself entitled to be eligible to put forward his name, submit his name to the electorate, be elected to the highest office in the land without having any feeling at all that having gained the electorate his financial position should be so lowly that he is exposing himself to temptation.

I, Sir, am very sorry that the hon. member who just spoke is leaving the chair because like the hon. member, I have done a very careful study of the recommendation of the Select Committee, but I have gone further, I have looked for a reference point with respect to salaries when they were fixed by the Democratic Labour Party in 1973 and the first point I want to get across today is this.  
6.30 p.m.

It is in my opinion palpably dishonest for anyone in an argument about these salaries not to take into account the fact that what is being done with respect to salaries for Ministers and members of Parliament is that the rate of remuneration which was fixed in 1973 and which

remained the same from 1973 is now being changed as from 1978 after a period of five years. Just let us get the facts, because the hon. member has put his side of the facts. I think that this matter should be discussed in the context of the facts. He is entitled to his opinion on the level of remuneration and I to mine, but what we should not do is take a position without getting the primary data; and the primary data are that in respect of Parliamentarians the level of remuneration has lasted since 1973, five years ago. There is no group in the whole of Barbados which has remained at the same salary over the last five years; the trade union saw to it otherwise, and rightly so.

Another member has said that the Nicholls Report says that the level of remuneration fixed in 1973 was not unreasonable. Well, let us look at the reference point. In 1973 a Minister was getting 24,000 a year and a Senior Lecturer at the University at Cave Hill was getting between \$17,300 and \$25,824; in other words, a Minister was put before the maximum of a Senior Lecturer at Cave Hill. Is the hon. member going to say that he regards the level of salary of a Senior Lecturer at Cave Hill is grossly unreasonable? Is he going to say that the level of salary of a Judge in Barbados in 1973 was grossly unreasonable? The burden of the hon. member's contention was that the salaries now being fixed are grossly unreasonable. But he said that he accepted that in 1973 they were not unreasonable. (ASIDES) All right, the Nicholls Report said so, but why not follow it to its logical conclusion? The hon. member has not learned the art of argument; he has learned the art of misleading.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has said that I have learned the art of misleading; I think this is really unparliamentary.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member will do better if he listens less to hon. members on his side.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Let us go further. The Chief Justice in Barbados in 1973 was getting \$31,320; a judge was getting \$22,680, below a Minister. Let us get to the reference point for the Prime Minister. The reference point for the Prime Minister in 1973 was that of a Professor. A professor was getting \$26,000 to \$35,744, and the Prime Minister of Barbados was fixed at \$33,600. Let us see what has happened since then because — let us remember — that the salaries of members of Parliament and Ministers have not moved in those six years. Let us see what has happened; Where is that Senior Lecturer today? Do not let us fool ourselves; they have had salary increases in the six years, and today the salary of a senior lecturer — in 1973–74 it was \$17,304 at the bottom to \$25,824 at the top; in 1975–76 that went to \$22,374 at the bottom to \$31,056 at the top; in 1977–78 the same salary scale went from \$25,827 at the bottom to \$35,901 at the top. So between 1973 and 1978 there was an increase at the bottom of 49% and of 39% at the top.

I refuse to disclose what their proposals are now because they are still the subject matter of negotiations, but I just want to show the hon. member that when he gets into the House of Assembly it is not a political platform. When you get in here and start with the premise that you accept the Nicholls Report, let us look at these proposals because at the present moment a Senior Lecturer who was way below a Prime Minister is now above that office; and that is where the confusion comes, because some hon. members do not look at salaries in relation to the office but rather to the person, and all the hon. member has to do is to try to convince the people of Barbados that he is the right person to hold the office. That is what is worrying the hon. member.

You will remember, Sir, that I told this Honourable House that in 1973 a Professor at the University at Cave Hill was getting \$33,744 when the Democratic Labour Party fixed the salary of the Prime Minister of this country at \$33,600, a slight difference from the salary of the Professor — about \$174 a year. Now in 1975-76 the Professor went from \$33,744 to \$39,354, but the Prime Minister remained at \$33,600. In 1977-78 the Professor went to \$45,000 — and that is if he was an ordinary Professor — a medical professor had a different scale. Let us look at a medical Professor: In 1973-74 a medical professor got \$35,848; in 1975 he went to \$41,709. In 1977-78 he went to \$48,294, and they are now negotiating for new salaries to be effective from August 1978. So when you do a comparison and you see that under the Democratic Labour Party the salary scales were fixed at Ministers' to Senior Lecturers' and the Prime Minister's to a Professor's, but when the university people got their salary increases between 1975 and 1978 and Ministers received no increases, the hon. member would want us to believe that it was correct for the Democratic Labour Party to fix Parliamentary salaries in relation to university lecturers and professors but it is grossly immoral for us to do so.

6.40 p.m.

I say that is the high water mark of blatant inconsistency and double argument. The truth of the matter is that the hon. member is not objecting to the scales, he is objecting to the people who are drawing the scales. As a matter of conscience, does the hon. member inveigh against his colleagues at a little two by four medical school here, in size, not in competence and things like that, a university here with 404 students? Is the hon. member going to compare the burden of office of a professor at that school with the burden of office of the Prime Minister of 250,000 people with all the manifold problems you have to be exposed to? That cannot hold any water, and let us see the movement with the Judges. There has been movement with the Judges too, but they do not have the courage to get in here and say the Judges get too much, they are frightened, but I can get in here and say the post of Prime Minister, the post of Deputy

Prime Minister and the post of Minister are in no way inferior to that of any Chief Justice, Judge or whoever you may call in this country.

Now, Sir, look at the Judges. The Judges moved from 1973 from \$22,000 to \$27,000, and at the revision of 1978 they got \$30,000, when in 1973 they were getting a little less than a Minister, they move to \$30,000 now, and the Ministers must stay put. What kind of martyrs they expect people are? Today the Order was laid, and what do you find? That the Judges go to \$37,800, and the Ministers must stay put? What kind of unreasonable people one would expect would sit down here and accept that? The Prime Minister knows that the position was very clear, that the members of Parliament on both sides voiced their complete disapproval of the fact that they had been called upon to bear a burden of five years without a salary increase, and that everybody else whose salaries were relative to theirs have moved up. This talk of martyrdom is hypocrisy, it is not talk of real martyrdom, it is real hypocrisy.

Now, let us look at the present proposals. Even under the present proposals, whatever is accepted if one assumes a 10% settlement for the people at Cave Hill, they would still be way past where they were in 1976, because at the present moment they are way past. As far as professors are concerned they are well past the proposal for the Prime Minister. I am going to deal with that because I have pointed out and I have shown that there was a reference point which was accepted by Nicholls, proposed by the Democratic Labour Party, implemented by the Democratic Labour Party in which there was a special reference between the Ministers, the Judges and the Senior Lecturers and Professors up there.

We will start dealing now with the allowances. Now this is one point on which I agree with the Leader of the Barbados Workers' Union. If you call upon a person to hold the office of Prime Minister, you have to provide him with the accountments of office. It is not for him, it is for the office. There is no Prime Minister in any country in this world that I know of that is not provided with housing, a car and entertainment, and nobody else, because if you are in the university the Vice Chancellor gets a house, a chauffeur driven car, entertainment, so why do you seek all of a sudden to say that you agree that that is good and fit and proper and befits the dignity of the office of the Vice Chancellor but deny it to the office of Prime Minister? What kind of foolishness is this? Do you expect that the Chief Justice must have a house, a chauffeur driven car, entertainment allowance, that a Judge must have the same thing, and you want to deny that — and neither one of them paid tax on it — do you mean to tell me that the scale of entertainment which arises from the fact that the Vice Chancellor or the Chief Justice could be equal or comparable to the scale which arises at an instant to the office of Prime Minister? Let us

get this straight as any little nincompoop, so and so, middle range business person in town has a company car, has allowances from his company, on which they do not pay tax because they are a deduction from the company. Why do you seek to mislead the public on this? Why do you not tell the public that arising out of the incident of office of Chief Justice there is a provision for housing, or a sum imputed to the value of the house for which no tax is paid? Why do you not seek to tell the public that too? Is he a special pariah? Is he offered the job as some special sacred cow that you cannot compare it? I can compare it, and I am doing it, because I will seek to show very clearly that this jugglery of figures that the hon. member indulged in is not a true basis of comparison because he should also point out that the Ministers and others are no special case in Barbados because it is recognised and accepted that there are certain offices which demand by their very nature that a certain level of expenditure is such that it would be grossly unreasonable to expect them to take it out of your salary.

Must I spend the money that I worked my fourteen or sixteen hours a day for to entertain somebody from the Inter American Development Bank for the benefit of Barbados? When he is entertaining me he has an allowance. What foolishness are you talking? The hon. member knows that too. It is not like in private enterprise when you entertain with a view to getting business. This is the distinction the hon. member does not make. When the hon. member used to entertain the hon. member used to pick his entertainment with a view to ensuring he preserved his clientele and he preserved the social atmosphere and things like that. That was for his own benefit. It redounded in the receipt book, that is where it redounded, and the hon. member knows that as a matter of law he was entitled to deduct a certain proportion of the cost of that as being attributable to the promotion of his business.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misleading the House in that medical practitioners are not allowed any entertainment allowance for the purpose of income tax deductions, since it would constitute advertising, which is unprofessional.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: That is not in his capacity as medical practitioner, it is in his capacity as a drug store proprietor, or in his capacity of being a company director he could get it, so there is no strange feeling, Sir. The hon. member knows that it is in his capacity as the "Limited", he put on the "Limited" but the truth of the matter is that all of us know that in the world of fact, in the hierarchy of salaries — I am not going to deal with CDB and the others, because the scale of remuneration at CDB is considerably different and far in excess of all this. You do not have to deal with that, because they get all of their money tax free.

Now, the other point I want to draw to hon. members' attention is that it is untrue to go around telling the public of Barbados that the Prime Minister, Ministers and members of Parliament do not have to pay tax. That is totally any grossly untrue. (ASIDE). Who used to tell them so?

Mr. SPEAKER: There must be no cross talking.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: The hon. member's problem is that he was not able to persuade his Prime Minister in 1975 or 1976 that the differentials had been eroded and they needed replacing to the correct bar.  
6.50 p.m.

That is what is griping the hon. member. All of these reasons I heard talked about. What are the other reasons? The tax is very simple. If you are drawing a salary of \$50,000, the average rate of tax would be somewhere around 50% because there is an escalating scale. I can say now that on the present salaries of \$24,000 that we get plus the \$9,600 allowance, whenever you finish with the tax you end up with \$2,100 per month. That is correct. That is exactly what you end up with now; so do not let us mislead the public and say they do not pay taxes.

There are a couple of nincompoops in Barbados who write letters to the newspapers under a non-de-plume and there are a few who get up and talk publicly. I am going to deal with one who holds an office at the University. He is going to get up and preach that the salaries are grossly unreasonable when his institution is an affiliate of the University of the West Indies, and I have never heard him voice one iota of criticism over the fact that the salaries of the professors and senior lecturers at the University are far in excess now and even under the proposals would be far in excess of the salaries of Ministers.

Now you see in this country, the quality of journalism we have is such that you can get away with that, because in another country immediately after he sat and wrote that, there would be others who would be writing back to the newspapers pointing out to the gentleman that he is not a scholar at all, he holds an office which demands scholarship, but he does not execute the office with any scholarship.

As to the other ex-judge, his only problem is that he has unfortunately retired. In any event he may not have reached the high post of judge in Barbados, but his problem is this; can you imagine an ex-judge is going to write a letter to the newspapers saying that he objects to the politicians not paying taxes on their salaries? What kind of nonsense that is when the very judge has pointed

out that it was established under the D.L.P.? The D.L.P. established that in respect of a proportion of the total remuneration received by certain offices in Barbados that that part would not be subject to tax, because of the fact that the nature of the office was such that is necessitated extraordinary expenditure and it would be unreasonable to tax that part, because all that would happen would be that if they paid the tax you would have to pay them higher to end up with the net. So the Income Tax Commissioner would be taking it out and Parliament would have to be voting higher.

I have been in politics for too long and I really know when I see a political issue. This is no political issue. This is only shadow boxing because the more you go into this, the more you will see that the Committee did a wonderful job. I was on the Committee and I say that constantly on the Committee we were looking at and investigating the reference points that were there and accepted the basis of Nicholls, and we went through it and found it and we knew that the recommendations that we made could be defended on the grounds that once you start off with the premise of Nicholls and you look at the movement of salaries at that time, you would see.

Now this talk about 80% increase and all that. The hon. member must not do that because that is not a fair comparison. He will see that in the Public Service in Barbados particularly in the lower rungs they have had over 100% increase since 1973; so do not let us quarrel about that. You cannot project that parliamentarians are doing an injustice. There is no increase which is 80%, because the office of Deputy Prime Minister was created for the first time and when you deduct the allowance you get as Leader of the House which is not payable now, you will see that the percentage increase is less than what you say it is, because you forgot to deduct that. When you do your calculations, you must know.

Secondly, and this is where I fundamentally disagree with the Nicholls Report. Nicholls suggested that there should be a central fund that the Ministers should be able to claim from for entertainment. Now I want to say this: I regard it as *infra dig* that I have to go and tell somebody whom I am entertaining. I regard that as *infra dig* because nobody can tell me whom I must entertain, because I may not want the very person whom I have to tell to be there because somebody may be telling me something about him. If a business person comes in from abroad as a tour operator or something, and he comes to see me at a quarter to twelve, and they are fond of coming at that time, and I want to carry him to Brown Sugar, must I ring up the Cabinet Secretary and say I want to carry out Mr. So and So? When I was in my private business, Mr. Chairman, I did not have to tell anybody that and I am not doing that now either. I regard that as lowering the dignity of the office.

The proposals that we have here bore all these things in mind. If hon. members have voted against it, let them continue to vote against it. I know that my conscience is discharged. I know that the proposals we put forward in the Select Committee have a justification by reason of the fact that they took us back to 1973 to look for a reference point and the reference point was the Senior Lecturer and the Professor. I know that the proposals we have put forward are much less than they in fact draw now and will draw under new proposals, and I know that in the interim the real injustice that has been done has been to all the Ministers who had to bear the brunt between 1973 and 1976 and between 1976 and 1978, because all of them suffered a reduction in the standard of living, and while others in the community received their increases, they were denied. So I have absolutely no qualm about rejecting any suggestions that these are immoral, that they are rip-off or any such spurious suggestion. I say that the nature of such an accusation displays that he did not do a sufficiently detailed examination of the proposals. If he had done, he would have seen that these proposals in essence carry into effect the hierarchy and a relativity to political salaries in Barbados with reference to well-known bench marks in Barbados, and I am prepared to maintain that. I do not think they are grandiose.

Mr. Speaker, I am not closing the debate, but it is now 7 o'clock.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

HON. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 7.45 p.m.

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

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

#### On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

HON. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the recess I indicated to you that I had received a Supplementary Notice of a Resolution and I wish to give notice of a Resolution and I am asking leave of the House to do so now.

Mr. SPEAKER: No objection. You can proceed.

#### GOVERNMENT NOTICES

HON. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I beg to give notice of the following Resolution.

Resolution to amend the notes to Head 4(1) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs: Direction and Policy Formulation, Item 17, and to Head 9(9) – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs: Livestock Development, Item 10, of the 1978-79 Estimates.

Mr. SPEAKER: Earlier during the day I had given an undertaking to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central that I would allow him to give notice of questions. His question re Overseas visits by Ministers.

Will the Minister state:

- (a) how many overseas visits were made by each Minister of Government for the period January 1977 to December 1978?
- (b) what was the cost to the Government of Barbados of the visits made by each Minister;
- (c) what are the allowances paid daily by the Barbados Government to each Minister when on a visit overseas;
- (d) how many wives/relatives of Ministers travelled overseas at the expense of the Barbados Government during the said period?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member his question re The Medical Aid Scheme.

Is the Medical Aid Scheme still functioning?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister further state:

- (a) how many persons applied for aid under this scheme during 1978;
- (b) how many persons received aid in the form of grants or loans;
- (c) what is the total value of such loans and grants;
- (d) what is the socio-economic position of persons so assisted;
- (e) to which countries did the persons so aided go for the medical/surgical care;
- (f) how many persons who received such care
  - (a) recovered completely
  - (b) recovered partially
  - (c) died?

Mr. SPEAKER: The same hon. member his question re Subsidiary Roads.

1. How many subsidiary roads were repaired by the Ministry during 1978?
2. Would the Minister give the names where possible and location of such subsidiary roads?
3. What is the cost of repairs to such roads?
4. What is the policy of the Government towards repairs, maintenance and improvement of subsidiary roads in St. Barnabas, Haggatt Hall, Carrington Village and Bank Hall areas?

### GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If no other hon. member wishes to speak, Sir, I would like to wind up very shortly on a contentious Bill. Sir, the House has gone through its usual process every time there is a Salary Revision and the Opposition making certain points and the Government resisting. When it comes to the point all of us had better be realists and recognise that no salary increase is popular no matter who brings it in and that whichever Government brings it in sooner or later the Opposition will have power to vote against it. Nevertheless, in this case I am telling you my honest and sincere feelings.

I believe that both in terms of the country and in terms of the Public Service and persons comparable with Ministers that the increases are reasonable increases after five years and the salaries are not unreasonable. They are related to what they were previously. They are related to what public officers were getting at the time of the last salary increase. They are not out of line *vis-a-vis* with society as a whole. We are not a country in my opinion where Ministers are expected to take salaries in the middle range. We are not that sort of a country. Political life is much more important to Barbados. It dominates the entire life of the country in a way that political lives do not dominate the lives in the United States and the lives in Great Britain or even, I daresay, the life of the Soviet Union where political salaries are generally speaking the top salaries barring a few persons in the arts and cultural activities.

We have not been unfair *vis-a-vis* with the public servants. The hon. member for Christ Church South Central and Leader of the House gave some comparison of public servants at the top. You know what I look at? I look at the fact that in 1973 a maid was getting \$42.00

per week and she is now getting \$84.80. I look at the fact that the casual labourer in the Government service was getting \$42 per week in 1973 and he now gets over \$90.00. Nobody's salary on this side has doubled. Remember that is the pre-taxed position. After tax we are much nearer to the maids and the casual workers than the hon. members on the other side were in 1973 when their salaries were fixed because we are paying a greater proportion of our salaries in tax than they ever paid. So all of this will go on.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central could say he had seven firm reasons for voting against it and he found three very shaky ones, but I am not going to be critical of anybody who has spoken in the House. We have gone through all of this before. I do not consider that the salaries are unreasonable. We had the Nicholls Commission, we used a different formula from Nicholls. We had the Select Committee, they adopted the proposals of the Government's own Chief Establishments Officer.

I think one of the mistakes which parliamentarians have made for years is the mistake made by the member for St. Michael South when he said that we should rise with the civil servants. I think that is a most important matter because if we relate our salaries to those with civil servants and the future at least let us get away from the charade that we go through at salaries time and let us have a fixed relationship. I suppose the regrading would take place from time to time. One really does not know but let us be with it on a uniform basis. As we rise into the higher levels no doubt the higher salaries will be less attractive because of tax but all of those are comparatively minor matters considering that we have to go through the exercise of a salaries increase debate in which we are pressed by the public on the one side and pressed by our consciences on the other because our consciences told us that we were not unreasonable in 1973 and we are not unreasonable now.

Nobody can tell me that in his heart he really feels that it is unreasonable for a Minister of Government in Barbados to get \$3,032 a month when in this day and age the responsibility that the public demands of us is so high. That is the whole point. We do not have any Bank Director to go to. We have expenses and we have allowances to take care of these expenses. I really wish the public understood that the allowances are there to look after what you have to do as a politician. I am sure the hon. member for St. James would repeat with me and perhaps you yourself, Sir, that we have actually reached the stage where the allowances would be more convenient to us if we could pay taxes but they are pensionable and it would be as wrong, as I said somewhere else, to tax the allowances as it would be the pension.

I heard mention of the Police and the Teachers. I am glad the point was not dwelt on at any great length,

these exactable points during delicate negotiations. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South West in his restraint now may indicate that he knows it can do more harm than good. I met this very morning with the Police and indicated that the Government is prepared to meet a part of their case and at the University I made a speech at which I think the Teachers readily recognised the indication that their case also has some merit. Now I would like to thank the Police and laterally the Teachers for the relative lack of bombast with which they have presented their case. The Teachers may have started with a little bombast when Mr. Cumberbatch indicated that he had to be satisfied with the political ideological *bona fides* of the Government before he could enter into wage negotiations, but there is a little reflect from that.

The Government's plans generally for regrading of the Police Force may, in the end over a long period of time for the re-organisation of the Police Force, go well beyond any demands which they have made at the present time but that is all in the future and is a separate matter. I believe that given the ordinary good sense of Barbadians that these matters would be settled and they will be settled without hypocrisy because whatever may be said at large about the relationship of Ministerial salaries to the negotiations of the Police and Teachers, I can tell the House that no Police negotiator or Teacher negotiator has ever raised the point. They have never at any stage made any objections to the Ministerial salaries or regarded it as an issue in the negotiations.

8.00 p.m.

It is only persons who perhaps want to make mischief who have dealt with this. I am not saying that the hon. member for St. Michael South West is in this; he was restrained in what he said; perhaps he thinks the public may feel it necessary that he comment on it.

I have every hope that the regrading exercises with the Police and the Teachers will be brought to a satisfactory conclusion with a little give and take on both sides. As far as salaries are concerned, I sincerely hope we can put the salaries matter to bed this afternoon as far as this House is concerned. I daresay in the Senate you will have persons whose earnings are twice as much as a Minister's saying that Ministers are getting too much money, but I do not imagine that persons of low income in the Senate will make any objections. Just as in this House the person with the highest income has shouted loudest against salaries, perhaps in the Senate we may also get a similar situation. I am not even going to say that it ill becomes somebody who can easily ignore a parliamentary salary to be so critical of the salaries being voted for persons who perhaps cannot ignore them so easily.

But I think we have had a debate that is not unreasonable, although I was amused by the concept that the Opposition will even vote against the principle of

increasing salaries. I believe that the country is able to afford the level of salaries. The hon. member over there talked about percentages — 52% and 89%. The country's revenue this year is going to be over \$300 million. I believe that a net increase of less than a quarter of a million dollars — net after tax — is something that can be easily afforded. It is a lesser percentage than in 1973 and it is less than many countries have to pay for their Governments. In this country we do not go in for all the refinement; Ministers do not get Parliamentary salaries as well, as in Britain; members of Parliament do not get the elaborate perks that go with parliamentary salaries in the United States of America. I wonder if hon. members are aware that the basic salary for an M.P. in West Germany is £25,000, and they do not meet any more often than we do. I had some figures of how often Parliaments meet and we think we do not meet often — about fifty days a year — but you will be surprised how few countries in fact meet more often than that (*ASIDES*). You may argue that West Germany is a rich country, but there are many poor countries that give salaries a lot more generous than we do. I even have the figures of the Israeli salaries, with a note from someone in Israel. In Barbados dollars they get \$2,750 per month, but this is regarded as more or less pocket money in view of a free house, free medical attention, telephone and all transportation. And if you live outside Jerusalem you are automatically kept in a hotel suite during the sitting of Parliament; and that hotel cost about 651 Israeli pounds a night, which is about BDS\$400 or \$500. You may say those are countries a little better able to afford this, but there is a certain level above which you do not pay people and below which you do not pay. We in Barbados seem to have a view of ourselves totally at variance with the fact as between rich and poor. The World Bank happened very recently to have done a study in which it attempted to find criteria for giving aid, and as far as Latin America is concerned, they took an amount which represents in United States dollars the money that a family would need with one bread winner to provide food, clothing, transportation, health expenses and educational expenses. And in this hemisphere the only countries with lower poverty level than Barbados as measured by that were Canada and the United States. Even Trinidad and the Bahamas have a higher poverty level than Barbados. The Leader of the Opposition when he was Prime Minister used to point out that the gap between the highest paid and the lowest paid in Barbados is among the lowest in the world, because the other measurement which has been applied is what proportion of the population earns less than half the national average; and in this entire hemisphere we are the lowest, only 26% of our population earn less than half the national average. In fact, the gap between rich and poor is narrower in Barbados than anywhere else in this hemisphere, even Cuba. So all of this talk about worrying that these salaries are too high vis-a-vis the economy — it is estimated that our revenue this year will be over \$300 million and the Estimate of expenditure is below the

Estimate of revenue. We have some very substantial expenditures to meet, and we will be coming to the House for perhaps even more expenditure. The Sewerage Scheme that hon. members on the other side signed so gleefully to borrow \$13 million for — the scheme will now cost \$20 million and we have to pay for it. The hon. member for St. Michael South without a thought had underestimated the cost of the sewerage scheme by \$12 million.

8.10 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South signed without a thought and underestimated the cost of the sewerage scheme by \$12 million, and we have to pay that, we have to look for money to pay that, but the economy fortunately may be able, not to take these things in stride, but we may be able to handle these things. But we are bewildered when we see that people to whom you entrust the management of \$310 million, that we are being chivvied and bullied for salaries of \$50,000 plus expenses, and \$36,000 and \$38,000 for the Ministers. We are being bullied about it.

I am sure, Sir, that honour has been satisfied on all sides and we can go away from here tonight secure in our hearts that a long and miserable episode of argument has now ended, and that one thing the Barbados Labour Party Government has done in this salaries negotiation is strike a blow for all future Governments so none of us will have to be exposed to the same degree to the continuous humiliation of having to argue about how much money you are going to pay yourself and how much you will get, whether Nicholls was right or whether you should have Nicholls at all, who telephoned whom at night, or who is getting too much and who is not getting enough and what the tax variations are worth. I never heard any member on the other side say in 1973 that the salary of the former Prime Minister was worth \$100,000 if it was all taxable, when \$100,000 would have been the highest salary in Barbados. There are salaries now higher than \$150,000, they now exist, but in 1973 that would have been the highest salary if tax had been paid on all, but anyhow I am not making that point. (Dr. HAYNES: It was \$76,000, not \$100,000.) You have forgotten the house, the house is included, he was pensioned on the house. The house has always been in a special position, the Prime Minister's housing allowance has always been in a special category. I am sorry, Sir, that was an Aside.

Anyway, as I say, we did not pursue that, the Nicholls Commission said he was not overpaid and I am sure no hon. member on that side is going to get up and say that he was overpaid, and nobody on this side has said it either, irrespective of the accusations that we were supposed to have said that. The issue is coming to, I think, an end and I hope that in 1980 when the salaries go up again that they will just go up at a stroke, the Civil

Service, the Police, the Teachers, the Parliamentarians, the Judges, everybody will all go up at one time, it will cost 35 or 40 million dollars no doubt in 1980 to raise all the salaries, I hope less, but no doubt it will cost that, but at least our raise will not even be \$1 million of that when it comes, and it will go by perhaps a little better understood by the public and Opposition alike.

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

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

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

*Ayes:* Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon'bles. L. S. CRAIG; H. deB. FORDE; C. L. BOLDEN; H. B. St. JOHN; L. B. BRATHWAITE and Miss B. A. MILLER; Messrs. WARD; JOHNSON; SISNETT, BRADSHAW; ALLEYNE and ODLE; and Dr. CHELTENHAM — 14.

*Noes:* Messrs. TAITT and GREAVES and Dr. HAYNES and CADDLE — 4.

*On the motion of Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. Adams, seconded by Hon. C. L. Bolden, Mr. Speaker left the Chair and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Odle in the Chair.*

*Clause 1 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Clause 1 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on Clause 1, I am just standing to make the point that we on this side out of courtesy to the other hon. members do not propose to divide the House on each clause, but I take it it is understood that on a matter of principle we are opposed to all the clauses. We just do not wish to detain the House by going through the charade of ..... (*Asides*) If we are going to be heckled from the back, Sir we are perfectly willing to do what is normally done, but I just thought I would make the point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point taken.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have no desire to heckle the hon. member, but it would not worry me if hon. members wish to vote against any payment to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, because if you vote against Clause 1 you mean you will not have Ministers' and Parliamentary Secretaries' salaries, if you vote against Clause 2 it will mean we are not to get paid. If you vote for Clause 3, well, Clause 3 is a different

matter. If you do not vote for Clause 4 — well, let them vote against every clause and I will make it retroactive to the 1st April, 1971 and let them pay back all theirs. 8.20 p.m.

*The question that Clause 1 stand part, was put and resolved in the affirmative the House dividing as follows:*

*Ayes:* Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW; and Mr. ALLEYNE — 11

*Noes:* Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Abstention:* Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS — 1.

*Clause 2 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 2 stand part.

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

*The question 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. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ALLEYNE — 12.

*Noes:* Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 3 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part.

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

*The question 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. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ALLEYNE — 12.

*Noes:* Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 4 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 4 stand part.

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

*The question 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. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ALLEYNE — 12.

*Noes:* Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 5 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 5 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this Clause gives power for the Minister of Finance to be able by the stroke of the pen to implement salaries increases and then it will have to come subject to affirmative resolution. I am sure there must be some new and magnificent reason for that obvious departure. I am not quite sure I understand why it is necessary to give the Minister of Finance that particular delegated power; I can think of no reason why in this situation one should let the salary increases come by ministerial order. I do not believe that any other substantial areas of the public sector get their salaries decided by ministerial order, and while we are against the methodology that has been used in the presentation of these salaries generally, we are specifically and particularly against this Clause's special power. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to enlighten us as to why it has become or will become necessary to have ministerial salaries and parliamentary salaries decided by the stroke of the ministerial pen.

8.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If hon. members want to take it out, take it out. It exists for everybody. Contrary to what the hon. member who has just sat down said it exists for everybody except Parliamentarians. We are the last people whose salaries require an amendment. He is completely ignorant of the other salaries of the public servants, even though we have passed by an

affirmative Resolution, the salaries for Judges today. We are contrary to being the only people who will have this kind of thing. We are the only ones who do not have it. You want to take it out, I will abstain. They cannot come into force until an affirmative Resolution is passed.

What he said about a stroke of the pen is nonsense. I will abstain. Take it out, I do not need it. Why would I need the power? You think I care about it? It is a matter of convenience one way or the other. Vote against it. My colleagues say I have to vote for it as a collective responsibility, but you vote against it then. We are the only people to whom it does not apply and this Act is making it uniform. We have already done it today for the Judges and I live to hear a member of the Opposition, the President of the Democratic Labour Party, get up and talk foolishness about a stroke of the pen. I live to hear that after seven years. Man, shame on you. You hoping to be a Lawyer?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I live by the same rules that we operate on. If you are not quite as ignorant as you said I am you would also have known that these rules exist and that is why I can stand up. It shows that it has nothing to do with ignorance but if the hon. member believe that when he gets up in here and sets up his face and hollows out that it causes me to move in any direction up or down I want the hon. member to know that he does not move me at all. I am totally disinterested in how the hon. member behaves except when it comes to the question of how he uses his hand to affix his signature to money coming out of the Treasury.

If he knows that it must be changed and it has to be done this way it is his duty to tell us why he would change it and they had other ignorant members of Parliament before me and they will be others after me. I do not mind the hon. member for St. Thomas saying that I am ignorant of something because I think he understands the meaning of the word ignorant. Ignorant means "not knowing" but I object to the hon. member who sits behind him saying that I am an idiot. A Headmaster who cannot get.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member please.....

Mr. TAITT: I do not mind the hon. members over there from time to time getting jokes at my expense but I object to that totally illiterate person.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Cross talking must not be carried on.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I recall that in fact we have not passed the Judges Order yet today in the House, Mr. Chairman. We passed the Governor General's but notice of the Judges' Order has been given.

Mr. TAITT: I think the hon. member has begun to understand my method of debate because even in the height of his apparent perturbative approach, he said the Judges' thing had been passed. Now that is what I call the height of ignorance. If he sits down in the House of Assembly all day and is so confused that he does not know what is passed and what has not been passed then I have not said anything ignorant.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir, you have to be confused at the end of the day when the Opposition defies the title of a Bill, an unprecedented act in this Parliament.

Mr. TAITT: Hear again, Mr. Chairman, he should know that it is not unprecedented. It is not the first time it has happened in this Honourable House and any time they bring down a measure which we consider by its very nature to be immoral, we will divide from top to bottom.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us get on.

Mr. TAITT: You want to go home? Talk to your Leader. It is he that has us here.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are speaking on Clause 5, I take it.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I was rather shocked by the kind of vicious response by the member for St. Thomas. I think that if the hon. member for St. Thomas was thinking clearly, I would suspect that this particular Clause would be in here to facilitate alterations in salaries for Parliamentarians in the future without having to go through the process of the preparation of a new Bill. I would presume that this is the reason. One would not have any major objection to that but one must object to that kind of response coming from a Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Prime Minister to a member of the Opposition.

One other point that I wanted to make is in regard to this whole question in respect to Clause 5. This is information I am asking for. Has the Minister of Finance got the power in respect of other salaries for public workers to increase or decrease their emoluments? This is just for information. This gives the Minister of Finance the power to increase or decrease the emoluments. Is this a built-in whip as far as the Government side is concerned or is this a uniform situation in relation to other public workers?

8.40 p.m.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, this really should not provoke such wrath. The position is very clear. When we were going to implement the Report of

the Select Committee it was discovered that there was an anomalous situation with respect to Parliamentary people in that their remuneration is fixed in a Bill. You know that there is a Civil Establishment Order which sets out the remuneration in respect of the judges' salaries. There is also an Act in respect of the Governor General's salary. But the only persons whose remuneration had to be settled by a Bill on each occasion are the members of Parliament; and the same thing goes for the staff of Parliament. So what we are trying to do is to have a piece of legislative machinery to try to equate the position of members of Parliament with the Civil Servants, Judges and the Governor General; that is all. We have to take the power to increase or decrease. If hon. members remember their constitutional history, I believe it was at the time of the First World War that there was a depreciation in the pound in the United Kingdom; there had a reduction in salary and they had to get the specific consent of the Judges, because the Judges had a condition that their salaries could not be reduced during their term of office without their consent. But if you take the power to increase, you must take the correlative power to decrease. There may be a war where everybody may have to take a general reduction, so what then if you do not have in the power to decrease? Jamaica had a situation lately where everybody in the Public Service had to take a reduction to satisfy the criteria of the International Monetary Fund. There is no question of power being taken unilaterally because it is subject to affirmative resolution, that is, it cannot come into force unless Parliament agrees to it; that is the position.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I just wanted an explanation, and if the hon. member for St. Thomas had the information available at his finger tips as the hon. Leader of the House, this situation would not have occurred.

*The question that Part 5 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:*

*Ayes:* Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. BRADSHAW — 11.

*Noes:* Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 6 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: All emoluments paid under this Act should be charged and paid out of the Consolidated Fund in equal monthly instalments. That means that the Consolidated Fund has to pay the

salaries. The Consolidated Fund is a Fund established by the Constitution. And month does not mean the common law lunar month; the Interpretation Act says calendar month, and a list of the days on which salaries are paid can be found posted in the Ministry of Finance.

I hope I have been able to explain this Clause satisfactorily and that it will therefore give hon. members no difficulty. Of course, if the Opposition wants to establish some other fund from which to pay members salaries, I will hear amendments and arguments and will do my best to answer any points which the Opposition may make on Clause 6.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, so that no one will misunderstand why we are voting against Clause 6, we have already voted that these salaries ought not to be paid; so we are going to vote that the salaries should not come out of the Consolidated Fund.

*The question that Clause 6 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:—*

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ALLEYNE — 10.

NOES: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 7 was called.*

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, Clause 7 will put money in our pockets if they do not carry it. If they vote "no", Clause 7 would give us money; so if they vote "no" they will be voting a few thousand dollars very well, something like \$9,000. So let them vote "no" if they want, I can find some charity to give the \$9,000 to. Clause 7 is an exclusion Clause.

I beg to move that Clause 7 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, it is not without some significance that the hon. member has spotted what we have spotted. We are not going to vote against this. Do you think that we as experienced politicians have voted all day against giving them more money but will vote now to give them an additional amount? This is the only Clause in the Bill that we will be able to support.

*The question that Clause 7 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.*  
8.50 p.m.

*Clause 8 was called.*

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 8 stand part.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. BRADSHAW — 12

NOES: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*Clause 9 was called.*

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that clause 9 stand part.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. BRADSHAW — 12

NOES: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

*The Schedule was called.*

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that this be the Schedule to the Bill.

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

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. WARD, Mr. SISNETT, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ALLEYNE and Mr. BRADSHAW — 12

NOES: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES, Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4

*On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.*  
9.00 p.m.

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

AYES: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS; Hon. H. B. St. JOHN; Hon. L. S. CRAIG; Hon. C. L. BOLDEN; Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE; Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER; Dr. CHELTENHAM; Mr. WARD; Mr. SISNETT; Mr. JOHNSON; Mr. BRADSHAW and Mr. ALLEYNE — 12.

NOES: Mr. TAITT; Mr. GREAVES; Dr. HAYNES and Dr. CADDLE — 4.

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

#### RESOLUTION TO FIX THE SALARIES OF STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 6 stands in the name of the Hon. Prime Minister to move the passing of a Resolution to fix the salaries and allowances applicable to the posts on the Staff of Parliament with effect from 1st April, 1978.

RT. HON. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have to move certain amendments to this matter. Since the Debates Committee agreed with the Union on the post in the bargaining unit and the Cabinet decided on the Clerks, I am informed that the Debates Committee undertook a regrading exercise in respect of the Secretary of Parliament, and I am informed by Your Honour that the Union is aware of it, and I would seek to amend the Resolution to give effect to the regrading. The amendments which I seek to move are in the main body of the Resolution. Delete the words "1st April, 1978" and substitute therefor the dates mentioned in the Schedule; and the Schedule itself to insert a section(b) —

| Rate of Salary                                        |                                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Post                                                  | Salary per annum w.e.f. 1/2/79       |
| Senior Executive Officer and Secretary of Parliament. | 14,856 x 480 — 16,296 x 624 — 16,920 |

Delete the (b) against the present subparagraph (b) of the Schedule and renumber it as (c) so that the Schedule will have three parts and the regrading on the Secretary of Parliament and Senior Executive Officer will take effect from 1st February, 1979.

I beg to move that this Resolution as amended do now pass.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I am very happy to note that the Staff of Parliament is going to get an increase in salary just like all the other categories of workers in Barbados. Earlier today, however, I heard about retroactive pay from April, 1978. Now the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said there were seven fundamental points on which he disagreed and that he could not support it because members of Parliament were going to be given retroactive pay from 1978. Now they are giving the Staff of Parliament retroactive pay from 1978, eleven months and there is not a single word, and that is why the public must see us, not only the Government members but all members of Parliament as cheap, cheap. You set out to pay people money because of the cost of living; you set out to pay them so as to let them enjoy a better way of life, but when you have to legislate to pay yourself, they hold up Parliament for almost four hours, showing the hypocrisy of politicians maybe in the entire world and particularly here in a small native society.

I would like the members on the other side to read what the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Philip South said in here about the salaries. That is why the two of them could not remain in here today, because you are not a united front on that issue, and therefore it is hypocritical to sit down here and divide on every single clause, even the title, to display parliamentary ignorance. You disagree with the title and now we come to the citing of the Bill you agree to it. (Asides) You did not divide on it; you did not vote against it. This shows the hypocrisy. Now what respect can the public have for any of us? How do you feel knowing that you have voted against it? You do not like soft drinks, if you drink them, if somebody gives them to you. This is my approach to it. Anytime I vote against something in here I would not draw a single cent, and that is why I was like the boy on the burning deck when they had the increase on the last occasion. I made my position quite clear, and that is why there is so much corruption and all these things in this country, because of the hypocritical approach of all the politicians in this country. You sat in here led by the President General, the hon. member for St. Michael South West or wherever he is from and divided on every single clause not to pay yourself money, but now you are giving the staff of

Parliament money retroactive from April 1978, and they had a raise of pay two years ago. We did not get one for six years. Reading will be very interesting. I do not read the debates, but I am going to make sure I read the debate of 13th February and I am going to make sure I read what the hon. member for St. Michael South and the hon. member for St. Philip South said, and then we will go out in the hustings on the political platforms.

Do you see this line-up here? Man I am going to make mince meat of you over there 'for the hypocrisy of you all. And the hon. member for St. Michael South West in particular knows that he wants the money more than any of the others. You want it more than anybody else because you are not working.

Mr. SPEAKER: I should remind the hon. member that we are not now discussing the salaries of hon. members.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am just referring to the hypocritical approach to the whole aspect of salaries, that you can sit down and legislate for people to get better salaries in here, but when it comes to yourself they are critical of our approach today. It is real hypocrisy. I do not know what respect you believe the country could have for you.  
9.10 p.m.

Really it is hypocrisy. I do not know what respect you believe the country can have for you because the country is aware of the fact that you must be better paid. They know that you are going to vote against it and then draw it so that they can only see you as a double dealer. That is how they are going to see you.

I was over there for 10 years on the Opposition bench. I know opposition politics. In 1973 there was a raise of pay here and in 1969 we had a raise of pay and in 1971 we got water-washed 18 to 6. I know this good and some were saying we should not get the money and so on. I know this good and I came in but now you come in here today all day and divide. A lot of my colleagues stood up in the dining hall and would not come in. I put the Party's case but now every minute all you hear is divide, divide. Our views on it at that time were quite simple. We felt at that time that we could not afford the salaries. The Minister of Finance has made it clear that the economic situation of the country is a healthy looking one and therefore the members of Parliament are entitled to a proper day's pay for a proper day's work. Coming into the House of Assembly is only part of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: But we are discussing an increase for the staff of Parliament and we can be divided on this because one member of staff is not going to get all. Some has got to get some and others get the rest.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, I must apologise for going off course but I feel very disappointed to be a member of Parliament and to see your behaviour over there today, knowing full well yourself that you have not challenged the increase. Now you go to the staff, hard workers, you had them up in here today, not a single word. The Pope pulled out, now his second has gone, and you are hanging on to say absolutely nothing about the staff of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Resolution and I am going to support any Resolution that has to provide for the workers and the staff or members of Parliament a proper salary. I would give it support. The \$7,000 a month that the Trade Union boss receives that has not been disputed yet.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Lucy is now a member of Parliament.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: No, Sir, but we are talking about money for workers and he is a worker too. That has not been disputed yet. All I heard was to go and get the Annual Accounts from the Trade Union and I went and collected one and I did not see anything in there about the \$7,000 a month. Nobody's salary. I saw a lump-sum, \$156,000 for three people. That is what I saw. It had in a lot of fancy allowances. Look, it gave me a headache, Sir, to try to work out the staff of Parliament's salaries.

Mr. SPEAKER: You are seconding the passing of this Resolution?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes, Sir, It gave me a little headache working out the salaries for the staff of Parliament but I am happy to know that they have received it and I am happy to know that we all are going to get a long drawn out pay which each and every one should be happy about, Sir, even the member for St. Lucy. He showed me his Income Tax today but he only showed me the file number. He did not show me the amount.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I really regret that the hon. member who just sat down found it necessary to make reference to our attitude to the whole question of the increases of salary. Members of the staff of Parliament never promised the people of Barbados anything. Members of the staff of Parliament have never indicated whether the state of the economy was going in one direction or the other. Members of the staff of Parliament come here every

Tuesday and other days, they carry out their responsibilities and I take this opportunity to say that they carry them out properly and generally speaking no one can complain at the level of competence which we have seen in the members of the staff of Parliament.

I would take this opportunity to indicate that whenever a measure comes before this House which we on this side cannot feel comfortable in supporting for any reason and even more important, where we feel that the people of Barbados have been misled into believing that a state of affairs exist which in fact does not exist we will in fact.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are we to understand now that it is based on performance?

Mr. TAITT: Well, Mr. Speaker, some of us will understand whatever we wish to understand but I assure you, Sir, that I understand that this staff of Parliament not only exists, but it exists in a way which all of us in Parliament can be proud of them and therefore we on this side would have no reason to divide against them. We feel that all the people in Barbados who have been negotiating are entitled to an increase, including the members of the staff of Parliament. We do feel that the persons who were referred to by the other hon. gentleman who just sat down deserved the quantity of the increases in the manner in which those increases were brought.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I can forgive Lawson Bayley for writing in the *Advocate* that if things are good now they could not have been so bad 16 months ago. Lawson Bayley is not an Economist and has no intentions to exhort on economic matters. To tell the truth, Sir, it is a little offensive to say that the people of Barbados were told that things in Barbados were bad and they were not so bad. It is a matter of fact that within a couple of weeks of taking power I was told by the Ministry of Finance that the Government's Overdraft was exhausted in the Central Bank and there was no money at the Treasury to pay civil servants salaries. That is a matter of fact. It is uncontestable. You can ask the Central Bank what were the outstanding Payable Orders of September, 15th 1976 and what was the Government's Overdraft. The Overdraft was \$18 million, just a little above the limit, \$400,000 above the limit and the Payable Orders were \$6 million. It is clearly a fact that today or a few weeks ago, I do not know what it is from day-to-day, that Government's Overdraft is much less now than it was this time last year.

In my book that adds up to the fact that times were bad when we took over and they are not so bad now and I think the hon. member does himself a bad dis-service if he harps on things like that.  
9.20 p.m.

The Central Bank reports will show the corrected figure for Government deficit in the last financial year 1977-78 and that it did not go above \$95 million overall. Perhaps the end of this year will show about \$45 million. Really it is too much to be told that there was a time when we were telling people things were really bad but that this was not true because things have got better. There are such things as management, Ministers taking a little care of expenditure, the underlying growth in the economy, improving tax collections and revenues. In other words, countries can go downhill and can go uphill again.

The point about this particular resolution relating to salary increases given to people at the bottom is that generally speaking it exceeds the increase in the cost of living over the relevant period, and is about equal for people in the middle. But we have been asking in three salaries revision that people at the top hold a little strain, and a figure of 5% per annum was set, which was a figure the union agreed on. Whether the economy was in a good position or not, it may well be that on mature consideration it will be found that the cost of living is the most usual measure on which to base increases, and that an increase which exceeds the cost of living increase is a satisfactory one to use. I myself think it would have been very hard to get the unions to agree to any increase that did not cover the erosion of workers earnings. And if hon. members want, I will reveal something for the first time. (*Aside*) I could say it, but I will not say it; anyway there is no point making any more revelations. The fact is 20% to people at the bottom means that the wheel has come full circle. Since 1973 in the public service we have doubled or more than doubled the wages of people at the bottom of the public service. Over a period of five years we have now set them right with the cost of living over the same period of time; we may have even given them a little extra. The ILO expert who came down here said that when he analysed it he found that wages generally have kept in advance of prices. We now have to hope that this year's events, with the rise in petroleum prices, do not so erode the present base that Government has been able to build and to throw us back into a crisis in 1980 or 1981. We will have to try to maintain the advance we have been making and forget all those difficult years, the years the Dems wasted when they imported inflation and multiplied it by two.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business for today. All of the matters relating to remuneration of members have been

completed. We need to appropriate the money next week so that we have to return next week.

I beg to move that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th February, 1979 at 12 Noon.

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

*The question that the House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 20th February, 1979 was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House accordingly.*  
9.30 p.m.