THE

House of Assembly Debates

(OFFICIAL REPORT)

SECOND SESSION 1976 – 81

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 19th March, 1979.

Pursuant to the adjournment, the House of Assembly met at 10.20 a.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. C. L. BOLDEN, LL.B., (Minister of Communications and Works); 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. M. C. C. WARD; Mr. V. L. JOHNSON, M.A.; Hon. L. R. TULL, M.A., (Minister of Education and Culture); Mr. DeL. O. BRADSHAW and Mr. L. L. SISNETT.,

Prayers were read.

MINUTES

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members, I am advised that there are no Minutes ready for confirmation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Mr. ALLEYNE and Dr. HAYNES entered the Chamber and took their seats.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. SPEAKER: Without attempting to draw attention to strangers, I think it is appropriate for me to extend a hearty welcome from this Honourable House to the Honourable Members of the Legislature of Ontario, Canada who are our guests for this week. I know how hon. members feel, and we owe so much to Canada ourselves that this exchange visit means much more to us than would appear on the surface, and on behalf of this Honourable House I extend a hearty welcome to the Ontario delegation. *(Claps)*

PAPERS LAID

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Report of the Audit of the Accounts of the National Insurance Fund for the year ended 31st December, 1977.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of the following:

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Sutherland, Checker Hall, St. Lucy for the purpose of road improvement.

Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Haynesville, St. James, for the purpose of a housing development.

A Bill to provide for the registration and control of land surveyors in Barbados.

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

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

A Bill respecting marine insurance.

BILLS READ A FIRST TIME

On motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG; seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, a Bill to provide for the

registration and control of land surveyors in Barbados was read a first time.

On motion of Hon. C. L. BOLDEN seconded by Hon. H. deB. FORDE, a Bill respecting marine insurance was read a first time.

ORAL REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that the reply to Parliamentary Question No. 23 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is ready.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice that reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15 asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South is ready.

Mr. GREAVES entered the Chamber and took his seat.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I know that we are at Orders of the Day under Government Business, but I must confess that I am particularly disturbed with the equipment which seems not to be working very well. This no doubt to my mind is a very important occasion, the debate on the Appropriation Bill, and I would think that we must have this settled before we go into any sort of debate, and I would like to move that the House be suspended for fifteen minutes so that the technicians would have this matter restored. I regret that after all these days this has not been checked. I am no technical man, but I move that the sitting be suspended for fifteen minutes so as to have this put in order.

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

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

10.30 a.m.

On Resumption –

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day I have to announce that I have received the copies of the Accounts and Statements for the Month of January, 1979, as prepared by the Accountant General.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Standing Orders 6, 16, 18, 20, 42, 43 and 44 be suspended for the remainder of today's sitting.

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

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

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Order No. 1 be the first Order of the Day.

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

THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the annual Estimates have been laid in the House of Assembly and hon. members will observe that for the first occasion since the Fiscal Year of 1959 – 1960 the Estimates are being presented to Parliament with an estimated surplus on Current Accounts. This is not to say that there has never been a surplus of Current Accounts since that date but in the course of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members will realise that the year has been attended by a measure of good fortune and financial bearings which has put us in this relatively happy position.

The total current estimated revenue for the forthcoming year is $354,280,702 million and the estimated Expenditure is $333,052,405 million leaving an estimated excess of current revenue over current expenditure of just over $21 million. *(Cheers)* This compares with the situation last year when we estimated for a deficit on Current Account of just over $40 million.

To report first, Sir, on last year's situation. The total current revenue of Government last year was an original Estimate at $257.9 million. The amount of Government revenue actually collected at the end of February at the end of last month was $267.6 million and we are projecting a collection of just over $47 million this month which will mean a projected current revenue of $314.7 million, which, if realised, will be an increase of almost 25% on revenue collected during the last financial year.

The current expenditure which was originally estimated last year at $295 million was supplemented during the course of this financial year in the amount of over $15 million thus making a total of $310.5 million. It was recognised that this planned level of current expenditure would prove to be unmanageable and Cabinet accordingly agreed that certain reductions should be imposed with a view to maintaining expenditure at a tolerable level. The overall adjusted figure was $287.7 million, but of course during the

year, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we experienced a revision of salaries for all Government employees and I am very happy to be able to report to the House that notwithstanding the payment of increased salaries for Government employees in the amount of over $20 million, our current expenditure is still not really at unmanageable levels and should exceed the current estimate by no more than $4.2 million. We are in fact projecting current expenditure of $291.5 million during the year which despite the wage increase is less than was voted in the Estimates Debate a year ago.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the surplus on Current Account which exceeds, beyond much doubt, what we are now going to experience during 1978-79 will be the first surplus on Current Account since 1975-1976 and prior to that of 1972 – 1973. The projected surplus is $22.8 million which will, if realised, be a record and it will be achieved, Mr. Speaker, without any sacrifice in employment, without the benefit of an increase, indeed without a sugar windfall such as was experienced in 1976 and without any diminution in the current services being rendered to the people of Barbados.

There was a prediction not so long ago that we would expect a Current Account deficit of $1 million, and that the country would be in the hands of the International Monetary Fund in 18 months. All of these predictions, Sir, were made, repeated, echoed and the situation as of now, Sir, appears to be a little more rosy than that. We will have to wait until the budget to know how far the projection we are giving the House today will have been realised. Fortunately, Sir, we will be in a position at Budget time to know this because the improved management of the Ministry of Finance now means that hon. members are able to get the Accounts and Statements to Government almost within the time laid down by the Financial Administration and Audit Act. *(Cheers)* This means that statements which were 18 months out-of-date at the time of the change of Government, even in light of the Financial Administration and Audit Act which says that they should be presented to Parliament within one month of the month to which they refer to, were almost at that level.

Your Honour has just indicated to the House that Your Honour has received the Accounts and Statements for the month of January and I believe they were not received today, Sir, they were received during last week and certainly by the time of the Budget the Accounts and Statements for the entire financial year are expected to be complete.

11 a.m.

As I say, we appear to be facing a record surplus on Current Account and we are projecting the first surplus in the Estimates for twenty years; not since the Barbados Labour Party was last in power has this country been able to project so rosy a financial position. What we will do with the surplus I have no intention of saying today, because to a large extent this is a Budgetary matter, but I will give one or two indications of what we have done with last year's surplus. Capital expenditure for last year was originally estimated at $84.5 million, with supplementary provision during the year of $13.9 million. This made a total of $98.4 million. The capital expenditure in the face of last year's very high deficit was also subject to the Cabinet's direction for reduction in an amount which brought it down to $74.4 million. As usual there has been over-estimation of capital spending. This is certainly something that we have not yet been able to get under control, and during the year we expect we will spend only $65.6 million. This amount may be increased by the repayment of some of the debts of the previous regime. Your Honour will recall that we voted money on the last occasion for the settlement of International Sea Food's debts, but it should not be substantial; certainly we do not have to repay the same amount as last year. The Current Account surplus for last year will be going during this month largely to the financing of capital expenditure. Again this is virtually the first time that this can be said since 1975–76 and before that, but we are projecting that we will finance over 30% of this year's capital expenditure from current revenue; a very desirable state of affairs, but one in which we are doing no more than returning, because I would not like hon. members to lose sight of the fact that the nature of financing and the way we keep our accounts in Government are based on the belief that current revenue must contribute to the capital expenditure so that borrowing does not have to cover the entire capital cost. This has been elementary Government financing in Barbados over the years. The position with last year's Capital Works programme is that the Current Account surplus is intended to finance $22.8 million of it. Loans, receipts and grants as set out in the memorandum to the Estimates on page 3 during the year have totalled $39.2 million, and what is described as "other" – $3.6 million – this is dependent on movement during March which cannot entirely be predicted how the remainder will be raised; this is a matter going on day by day during the month.

It will be observed that the projected overall deficit of Government is now only $42.8 million – that is capital and current combined – whereas the projection at the time of the Estimates was $124.5 million. So not only have we failed to reach the ambitious target set by the Opposition of a Current Account deficit of $100 million, but we have not even reached half that on the combined capital and current accounts. So much for the economic wisdom of hon. members opposite.

The comparative fixture of the public debt at the end of February 1978 and February, 1979 shows that at the end of February, 1978 there was $122.8 million in Treasury Bills outstanding and in February, 1979 the figure was $123.7 million, and Government debentures of $125 million were outstanding a year ago and $127.2 million at the present time. The Ways and Means accounts, that is, government overdraft, is very little different and the total public debt has increased in the course of the year by less than 10% – in the course of the year February, 1978 to 1979. I have not had the particular months analysed but I think it will be found to be the smallest increase for many, many years, certainly for more than ten years; the actual figure is 9%.

Now the Estimates for 1979–80 call for an overall deficit of $94 million, of which $21 million will be financed from current sources. And I want to say something about methods of estimation.

For the past three years, in addition to using the Estimates which come from government departments, we have also been using the Government's computer to assist us in projecting more realistic figures of revenue and expenditure, and as far as current revenue and expenditure are concerned, the computer projection has in fact shown a very high degree of accuracy to within 4%. And while the Estimates show figures of $94.1 million for the overall deficit, the computer projections show an overall deficit of under $50 million. The computer projection is showing a surplus on Current Account in the forthcoming year of $42 million and Capital Expenditure of $92 million making an overall deficit of $49 million. The overall deficit projected by the computer has proved a good deal more accurate than the deficit estimated by Permanent Secretaries and departments. The computer projection for this year shows $49 million; we expect it will work out in the area of $42 million. We are trying our best by using modern electronic means of gathering, storing and assessing information to do away with some of the hit-and-miss that used to prevail in previous years when constantly revenue would be underestimated and expenditure over estimated. I am trying my best to persuade the accounting officers of Government that they must learn to admit their inability to spend at a certain level; that their estimates must reflect what can be done rather than what they think for their programme and projections they would like to do.

There are also one or two other habits of accounting officers which we are trying to tidy up. In cases of non-recurrent expenditure we find the greatest difficulty in persuading departments to order equipment early in the financial year. There is a great deal of ordering of equipment late in the financial year thereby carrying forward payments into the new financial year, so that since we have been in power we have so to speak inherited a one year's lag that always disturbs proper estimating. We have in fact this year decided to improve the capital stock of government in the non-recurrent area. I am putting it a little elaborately, but what it means is that the starvation of the Ministry of Communications and Works and the Soil Conservation Department of the Ministry of Agriculture and other departments of proper equipment for carrying out even current maintenance, much less capital works, is one of the principle characteristics which we inherited from the previous regime's spending method.
11.10 p.m.

This year we are allowing some expansion to purchase every equipment in the department. We have allowed, I think, 75% on non-recurrent expenditure. We are hoping to bring in trucks, road rollers, excavators, the bulldozers, the heavy tractors and so on which are needed by the department in order to improve our roads and in order to improve the tractor service for small farmers which has been starved of equipment for many years now, Sir, and in order to make a start on the enormous improvements which we expect in the soil conservation areas in St. Andrew and adjoining parishes.

I think that the House is aware that the foreign exchange cost of some of this equipment has been met by using contributions which the British Government has paid towards the facility agreed upon in Washington last year. It will be recalled that at that time four Governments agreed to make funds available to the Caribbean Development Facility. These were the Governments of the U.S.A., Britain, Canada and Venezuela. The House may be interested to know that the United States and Britain have fully paid up their shares. So far we are awaiting contributions of the other Governments engaged in the matter.

What I have dealt with so far is current expenditure. In the case of capital expenditure part of the reason why constantly we come to the House for a large vote for capital works and then have to report to the House that much less has been spent on capital works than had been anticipated is quite simply bad planning in the departments. I can defend the capital vote in no better terms than it has been defended by my predecessor in this office some years ago. Departments will put down what they hope or think will look good in the capital projections or what they think perhaps can be made into a political sweetie to sell to the public; but in fact they have no plans for being able to bring these plans into immediate operation. This is spectacularly so because of the many capital projects that used to recur year after year in the Capital Estimates during the period particularly, say from 1969–70 until 1977–78.

Year after year you would see that a post office was to be built in St. Thomas and that a cement plant was to be built; that you were going to be embarking on works of one sort or another in one place or another. When the departments were pressed for progress reports as to how soon they were starting these projects, it was realised that the projects existed in name only. They existed to do no more than to give printed form to an idea. Since those days we are endeavouring to ensure that nothing appears in the Capital Estimates until it has been analysed and approved by the Planning Priorities Committee of Cabinet and the Public Investment Unit; and it will not be presenting itself to the House in the form of a requisition for funds until it is relatively near to starting its operations.

Despite this, we have been able during the past year and a half to get on with a number of projects which I do not think can be realistically claimed by anyone other than the present Government – the Trents School which even now is employing 1400 people, the Ministry of Agriculture's new headquarters and the Government Laboratory which are being constructed on a crash basis to make it possible for the expansion of Harrison College in the Ministry of Agriculture's building at Crumpton Street which are currently employing 380 people – these projects alone, Sir. These are matters on which I would like to offer my congratulations to the respective Ministries, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Agriculture for the speed with which they have been able to get these projects started and moving to the ultimate objectives to which they are devoted; but there are many other matters.

After all, year after year we used to vote huge sums for a cement plant only to be told at the end of it that the World Bank would not finance it because it was not commercially feasible. We very much hope that improved management methods will do away with all of this. With regard to building outside the Government, we observe that the National Housing Corporation has been enabled with the capital grants that it has received, to start new house construction for low income persons to rent at Bagatelle, St. Thomas for which I am very grateful to my hon. friend the Minister of Housing, and another site that increased employment at the National Housing Corporation of 131 persons.

Over 100 persons, Sir, have been taken on at the Parks & Beaches Commission. Not this time to walk about the streets of Bridgetown canvassing for Mr. Carmichael – but on this occasion to do serious work; for we have opened a commercial branch of the Parks & Beaches Commission which is ready to accept commercial contracts from the general public to do work of a remunerative nature and not "fulltime" work in order to employ your party faithfuls at election time. I hope that hon. members opposite when they offer their comments will thank the Ministers of Housing and Health; because the Polyclinic at Black Rock is not employing anybody now, Sir. It is finished, completed, and people are working in it; but I hope that they will offer congratulations to the Hon. Minister of Housing, the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Hon. Minister of Education for the 500 extra jobs that they have provided in this year's figures. The 500 extra jobs added up to this year's reduction in unemployment.

I started out by saying that this is the first occasion since 1965 when the Estimates were presented with a surplus. I would suggest the reasons why it should be so. We have had a better revenue performance. We have benefitted particularly in the area of Corporation Tax which continues to be the most buoyant of our revenue producing proposals.
11.20 p.m.

The Estimates are now more realistic and I hope that in future we will be able to pick up our copies of the Draft Estimates and the Approved Estimates and say to ourselves, these represent an accurate picture of what Government expects to receive and to spend during the current financial year.

I want to deal next with a matter that has attracted some attention outside this House. It relates to the position of someone who has been described as an adviser from the International Monetary Fund. Some time ago the Leader of the Opposition predicted – I referred to it before but I am now saying who it was that said it – that within 18 months, it was a year or two ago he said so, the country would be in the hands of the IMF. To be in the hands of the IMF is popularly understood to mean, Mr. Speaker, that your foreign exchange position has reached such a level that you are no longer able to import goods from abroad which are necessary to sustain life far less industry, far less current consumption and you require what is known as standby credit, you require some sort of foreign exchange assistance from the IMF in order to run your Government.

This function of the International Monetary Fund has been so much in the newspapers all over the world in recent years that the Fund's fundamental purposes which are much wider than those of being a lender of the last resort, maybe they would like to think it is a lender of the first resort, but lenders anyhow from abroad, that we have lost sight entirely of the fact that the IMF provides technical assistance of various sorts to Governments which may be overflowing with funds. For all I know the IMF is providing assistance to Saudi Arabia. The Hon. Minister of External Affairs assures me that it is. No doubt the Leader of the Opposition would say that means that Saudi Arabia is in the hands of the IMF. No doubt he would say that. These forms of technical assistance which have been enjoyed by Barbados have been numerous and

they started during the regime of the hon. member for St. John when he was Minister of Finance. Since then indeed we have had the assistance of the IMF in drawing up a new Financial Institutions Act, and we have had other expert assistance. But the position of Mr. Austin Jackson who has come to Barbados on a technical cooperation assignment from the International Monetary Fund has absolutely nothing to do with the Government's international financial position. We also got the manager of the Central Bank U Tin Tun from the IMF. That has nothing to do with the country's international position, nor does Mr. Jackson's assignment here.

Mr. Jackson, I believe, is described as a budgetary adviser. That may be the IMF's nomenclature. Mr. Jackson had absolutely nothing to do with advising on the budget as we understand it. He has nothing to do with advising on taxation as far as I know, or on revenue. Certainly I do my own thinking, and if somebody else tries to think for me, at least they would try to find out who does. The result of Mr. Jackson's work in Barbados will be found in the yellow pages, not of the Telephone Directory, but of this year's Estimates. If hon. members will turn to page 105(a) of the Estimates, they will find a page denoted "Model Restructured Estimates for Ministry of Health and National Insurance 1979-80". There is printed underneath that a note: "This model is printed for information only and does not constitute Estimate for 1979-80 laid in the House of Assembly in terms of section 5 of the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

The purpose of the model is to illustrate, in general, a new format of Expenditure Estimates which it is planned to introduce when presenting Estimates for all services for the financial year 1980–81."

In other words, we have put these yellow pages in here to let hon. members, the general public and the Permanent Secretaries, the Accounting Officers of Government, see how they will be expected to present their Estimates next year. The Estimates are coming next year in this form. That is what Mr. Jackson has been advising Government on, a different form of presentation of the Estimates. That and nothing more. I doubt he has heard the words "foreign exchange" called during the course of his duties or during the entire time he has been here, or indeed "taxation" either.

The new format of the Estimates, I am going to say something about today to save having to describe it at too great length next year, allows for more meaningful and informative presentation of the main programmes of public expenditure within the responsibility of each Ministry than is possible with the present organisational structure of the Estimates. It will allow the principal activities in each programme to be highlighted or defined where appropriate for presentation as well as management purposes. If hon. members wish to make a comparison, they can perhaps look at Head 17(3) of the real Estimates for this year "Environmental Sanitation" and they can look at page 105(h) – (j) under Sanitation Services. Now these two Heads roughly correspond, although the overall provision will be $900,000 more because certain central services now shown in Head 17(1) will have to be assigned next year to the appropriate place which is Sanitation Services. We will be able to see how it is going to be done and we will be able to pick it up. Take sub-Head 12 – Public Health Services. It tells you what is constituted in Public Health Services: food regulation and environmental sanitation, prevention of infectious diseases, rat control, Aedes Aegypti and so on and so forth; then it will take you down through each of these things that you see in the Estimates each year which are not themselves fully explained – what is meant by environmental sanitation, what is meant by Aedes Aegypti and so on. That will give you some idea of the purpose of Government services and the new presentation will allow closer indication of the true costs of each programme under the principal activities thereunder. In fact, Sir, it will be found that the Jamaican Estimates are very largely presented in this manner.

I have dwelt on that a little time, Sir, because it does not only affect the Estimates but it affects the IMF.

I would just like to amplify something that was said in a Government Information Office Release about this matter. The press is free to telephone the Government Information Service or to make contact with public officers at an appropriately high level to say if particular matters are bothering them. If before writing his editorial in the Advocate or soliciting his friend Dr. Shorey to write his indefensible defence, the Editor of the Advocate had taken the trouble to ring the Ministry of Finance and asked what is the significance of the presence of an IMF adviser in Barbados, they would have been given an answer. We had tracked down the genesis of the rumour. At a meeting which was held at Horse Hill, St. Joseph, the Leader of the Opposition said that the Government had an IMF adviser here.

11.20 a.m.

The next day the hon. member for St. Michael South West, as I understand it, had a discussion with the Editor of the *Advocate*. The next day the Editor of the *Advocate* was alerted to the fact that the Leader of the Opposition was going to ask a question in Parliament about it and he accordingly held space on the front page of the *Advocate* to highlight the question. The following day an editorial was written, a mischievous editorial which could damage Barbados' International standing, by suggesting that the Government has been misleading the public on the state of its financial affairs.

A misleading advertisement was written and the following day a somewhat truncated version of the reply

to the answer was given. The version in reply highlighted again the IMF Adviser and then two days later following the Government's statement Dr. Shorey did his rescue act that he has had to do for Robert Best on previous occasions and got into the act saying that it was quite right to acknowledge your ignorance on the work of the IMF even in a newspaper report and even in an editorial. It is a matter of ignorance only, Sir, and the Government stands ready to assist any representative of the Press with information on matters of this sort.

I noted that one hon. member nodded his head. I think it was the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, when I said that the editoral in the *Advocate* was suggesting that the Government was misleading the public over its financial position. I do not know if he was nodding his head in approval of what I had said or whether he was nodding his head to indicate that the Government was misleading the public. You can lead a horse to the water but you cannot make it drink. You can hold the facts before people's eyes but you cannot make them tell the truth. The truth in this particular case is that the Government at the end of February had a surplus on Current Account of over $9 million and expects an overall surplus of $22 million. I can say no more. I can only put it that way, Sir.

The truth is that the realised deficit has not been realised and that the Government's financial position is much more comfortable than it could have anticipated a year and a half ago. The facts are that the Government's revenue has been buoyant particularly in those areas which indicate an abundant economic activity in the country. The facts are that unemployment has been declining and if hon. members would like to be appraised of what is the particular indication that people look at when they discuss the situation of a Government's International Agency is its likelihood in having to call on the IMF for assistance.

The Foreign Reserves of the Island stood at a record level on the last date on which they were fully calculated, which is March 7th, and just not a small record, they stood at $144.8 million, the highest figure ever known in this Island, very nearly twice as much as the records which the hon. members have been hearing so much stories about for the ordinary months of 1975. The resources of the Government itself, the Central Bank's own holdings amounted to over $150 million in Foreign Currency, sufficient to cover imports into Barbados of 3.3 months which is the target we have set ourselves. Again I believe the IMF set an international policy that countries should have foreign reserves sufficient to allow them to cover their imports for six months. I believe that would be an acceptable level of foreign reserves for a small developing country such as Barbados.

I believe any catastrophe which meant we were going to have no foreign assistance for six months would be such that the IMF would be the least of our worry in those concerns, Sir, but certainly we have achieved the three months' target, despite this is the height of the tourist season and this target includes some sugar receipts. It includes also $4 million in new special drawing rights and therefore I am not going to gloat and exult and say that we have foreign reserves now twice or three times what they were two years ago and twice what they were last year.

I am not going to exult because we still have to exercise care. When countries go about thinking that they are doing well and they immediately assume that everything in the garden is rosy and that the efforts which have brought them to that state could then be relaxed, then certain bad habits are resumed. I do not intend to allow anything like that to happen but hon. members who hear these allegations of how much more abundantly the foreign reserves were under the old regime will take note that in 1973, the year ending the foreign reserves were $33 million. In 1974, the year ended with foreign reserves of $32 million. The reserves in March of that year were $34 million. In 1975 the reserves in March were $36 million at the end of February 29th. In 1976 the reserves were $64 million. In 1977 at the end of March $37 million. In 1978 with the recovery it had already began to assert itself and was $76 million and now it is $144 million.

As I said this is not a budget to forestall letters in the newspaper that will now be written on the basis that the Government's Foreign Reserves are relatively abundant, I would just like to indicate that the Import Licensing Committee will soon be having a meeting to consider the allocations of foreign currency for imports during 1979 particularly for motor-cars and other consumer items and I have every expectation that it will more than meet the allocations for the importation of motor-cars, refrigerators, stoves and so on. I am not saying that the credit restrictions will be taken away from them. I am just saying that we are trying to endeavour to see that the credit restrictions will be the only break on imports. In other words somebody that has the money to buy a motor-car to make a down payment and so on will be able to get a car when he has put the money together. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that I have covered the entire area.

I would like to end with a note cautioning once more again false optimism. On the one hand there are record foreign reserves, a record Current Account surplus, a record Capital Expenditure projected for next year and indeed a very good financial position projected for next year as well. These are all the things on the one hand. On the other hand we are a small Island depending on foreign capital and there is no doubt that the foreign reserves owe something to foreign investments from abroad. There is certainly a new confidence in Barbados being shown by

foreign investors in the last few years and the reserves undoubtedly are being shown from this source as well as from our usual sources.
11.40 a.m.

These things have to be carefully considered by the managers of the economy. The economy has improved enormously, much more than I dared to hope in my wildest dreams at this time last year. It has shown improvement, perhaps the like of which had never been witnessed before the year 1978–79. But all this can very easily be destroyed by a recession abroad, inflation abroad, and increase in petroleum prices leading to a resumption of difficult economic conditions outside of Barbados, and it can be destroyed by the world within as well. Bear in mind that when there are people who walk about in this country encouraged, by those who should know better, to preach the destruction of the peace, order and good government of Barbados, this in the long run can have its effect abroad. You cannot expect people to have confidence in a country where political platforms night after night talk about burning, killing and violent overthrow of government, especially in the light of events in a neighbouring country. *(Asides)* I do not have to be frightened as some member of the Opposition is saying. I would just suggest to them to have a look at their own doings, because we are all threatened, let us bear that in mind.

The country has shown a remarkable recovery this year, but we can easily go down again. We cannot control what happens abroad, but at least let us try to control what happens in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, for the third year running we have offered the Opposition the opportunity to call the Heads so that they can concentrate on the areas they think the government needs assistance or criticism, or indeed just an intensive analysis. Three times they have refused, and this has meant that for several years Education has not been debated in Parliament, Labour has not been debated in Parliament, Housing or Health. On correction, I think that Education has been debated during one of those years, but for several years Labour, Housing and Health have not been debated. The Government does not intend to let the situation continue in which the public will not receive the benefit of debate at Estimates time on the major areas of Government expenditure. I say no more to that; if the Opposition abdicate the privilege offered to them, a privilege never extended to any previous Opposition, Government will have to take its own steps to ensure a fair debate on all subjects.

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

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

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to deal with certain remarks of the hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. I do not know if the Prime Minister as the person in charge of Security intends to have the members of the Opposition arrested or incarcerated or something like that if certain Heads of these Estimates are not debated, he should restrain the backbenchers on his side who like to hear themselves speak – of course they have the right as representatives of the people, to speak in Parliament. But since they are close to the Government benches one would consider that at the time of the Estimates the views of the Opposition should be properly ventilated and members on this side of the House given the opportunity to investigate all of these matters. It is for this reason that we have declined to be engineered into a position where we short-circuit discussion on any of the matters presented in the annual Estimates which we consider to be of importance to the people of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. Leader of the Opposition, but the point which he has now reached according to the Standing Orders, is set out quite clearly at Standing Order No.64(2) which states: "After the motion for the second reading of the Bill has been proposed and seconded debate thereon shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates." Under this Order I can no longer hear the hon. member on his present argument.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I am dealing specifically with the point raised by the hon. Minister of Finance on the presentation of the Estimates and what he describes as our failure to select certain items and to debate them. But I will pass on; I think I have made my point and I do not have to repeat it like the Doxology which you repeat three times. Once it is on the record, that is all I want. Anybody who pretends to be generous and tells me that they have selected certain items and because we do not discuss them...

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already warned the hon. Leader of the Opposition; I will not tolerate this.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am not discussing it any further, and I did not take it as a warning.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your only contribution now will be on the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Appropriation Bill and Estimates. If you have nothing to contribute in this respect I will ask you to take your seat.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: But I have a lot to contribute, Sir, as you know. I did not take it as a warning; I thought you were drawing my attention to a particular rule. Thank you for your direction.

I think what concerns most of us on this side in dealing with the Government's policy on the presentation of the Estimates is what appears at first inspection to be a kind of turn-around in the short period of time in the fortunes of the Government in so far as Government revenue is concerned. There has been a reduction in Government spending over the projection – I am speaking now particularly of the Current Account Estimates, not Capital Estimates. In the past, as Minister of Finance, I was frequently criticised by the then Leader of the Opposition – who now finds himself in the same predicament of overestimating capital expenditure, and he himself has stated here today that public officers were frequently over-ambitious in the projections of the capabilities of their department to carry out certain programmes within the time frame prescribed by the Financial Administration and Audit Act.

I am not going to criticise the Ministry of Finance under his aegis because the same thing has happened this year, because it is inevitable that for a variety of reasons you must set a programme which normally has some element of excess so that you do not have to come back to the House and run out of projects under which you keep people employed insofar as capital expenditure is concerned.

11.50 a.m.

But, current expenditure after the Estimates Committee on the various departments have pruned the Estimates to the irreducible minimum as I pointed out at the time of the presentation of the Estimates in 1978, they were dealing with the matter in terms as envisaged under the directive which was issued at the time. In view of the statement which I have just made about the irreducible minimum which has been brought to the House to contain expenditure, this can only take place at the expense of employment.

Towards the end of his speech the Hon. Minister made a statement to the effect that the Government had embarked upon a programme of building a new Ministry of Agriculture and a school at Trents in St. James. I would like to say more on that later. These are located in Zone 1 on which the public has not been given a satisfactory explanation; and the fact that the construction of a Government building, whether it is done by the Ministry of Communications and Works or whether it is done by private contract, frequently does not differ in new employment. There is invariably the diversion of a labour force in the building trade from one project to another project. The Ministry of Communications and Works employs a very large number of persons at Key Scale, unestablished staff, which means that there is a certain amount of ebb and flow of workers between the private sector and the public sector; and if a new project is embarked upon, it means that the labour force is taken up from another private project, and the people who are employed by a particular contractor are merely put on a new project when the last project of that particular construction has come to its completion.

It may be that this is the critical analysis path that the contractor is working out, that there is a certain amount of overlapping, you may not need all the electricians on one project or all the plumbers on one project, but that is what normally goes on. So we are not impressed by the numbers which are trotted out here to try to establish that because three projects are taking place in Barbados that this necessarily means an increase in the level of employment of people in the construction industry, and that is the point I wish to make; but the most significant feature, Mr. Speaker, about the presentation of the Estimates which are in no new form – despite the yellow pages referred to by the Hon. Minister of Finance – I do not know why he was so hypersensitive on the subject of the budgetary expert and the International Monetary Fund.

I do not know why he should be so hypersensitive over the antics of a former colleague or the vapourings which abound at political meetings I took no notice of them when they went on under my regime; and I think that it is undignified for him or any of his other Ministers to treat those things with any sort of frivolity; but I do not think that it looks good for two legal luminaries. It is really pathetic for us in our profession to see ourselves in that position; but I do not think that the Minister should be so hypersensitive when people ask questions in a newspaper. He should get up and give a simple explanation, if there is a simple explanation.

While I am on this point of Government administration and policy, I would like to say that the Hon. Minister of Finance and Prime Minister certainly did not quote me accurately; because I never said that Barbados was going to be in the hands of the IMF in 18 months. You will remember, Sir, that on that occasion the Minister congratulated me and said that he was glad that I was warning the people in Barbados. I was warning him that we had to be careful, or we would find ourselves in the same position as Jamaica or Guyana. I did not make or attempt to make any prediction about any year that Barbados would find itself in the position in which our sister colonies in the Caribbean unfortunately found themselves. I beg your pardon, I meant sister colonies of the IMF; but I should like to say sister territories of the Caribbean. I meant no disrespect of any kind to my other colleagues in the other countries of the Caribbean.

So, I would just like to correct the Hon. Minister on that. I would like to return to certain other aspects of the Estimates. From a predicted deficit of approximately

$40 million on current account, we are being informed that although we have not come to the end of the financial year we will have a surplus of some $31 million; and this despite the fact we have had an increase in the salaries of public officers and various supplementary appropriations on current account which have been passed in this House from time to time during the current financial year. When you look at the breakdown of Government revenue you will see something very significant.
12.00 p.m.

It is, Mr. Speaker, that the revenue from taxes on income and taxes on companies is supposed to have risen by some 50%, but in the period for which we do not have actual out turn figures we are being asked to accept that we will receive from these sources some $70 million when revenue apart from pay-as-you-earn and professional instalments from professional persons and so on, are not due until 30th April, the final income tax returns, therefore the revenue from companies and corporations in one month is expected to give us this miraculous result of $70 million difference in revenue between what we actually have and what we could actually receive in the next eleven days. Well I am very glad to hear that we the citizens of Barbados are able to make some contribution to capital expenditure from Government revenue, but that contribution to capital expenditure is being made at the expense of increased corporation tax and increased collections from the Inland Revenue Department. Now it could not be all arrears.

There is also a sum of some $5 million or $6 million from the unemployment levy. Now we were told, when the unemployment levy was introduced, several things, but the salient point which was being made then was that the purpose of the employment levy or unemployment levy, whichever end of the telescope one chooses to look through, was to encourage business concerns in this country to increase the level of employment. It has turned out that the levy is nothing more than an additional form of taxation, of getting revenue into the Government because if the measure had been successful there would be very little revenue coming in from the levy, using a mutual term. I will not call it the employment or unemployment levy; it is called on page Roman (i) of the Estimates the "Employers Levy", and the figure set down in the Estimates for 1978–79 was $5.5 million and the figure set down for these Estimates is $6.6 million. So we actually expect to be getting more from the employers levy. It is no longer the employment levy or the unemployment levy; it is now the employers levy, therefore it is a tax on the employer.

Now we have to look at this very very carefully as I said before. If the purpose of the levy was to encourage people to take on more workers, then it has been an abysmal failure because the more money you expect to make out of the employers levy, it is axiomatic that the less fresh or new employment you expect to be generating. But the whole idea of an unemployment levy or employment levy is one which I do not think that people who understand business organisation will accept as a sound economic measure, because in the theory of the firm and in the theory of industry, an entrepreneur, an employer if you like to describe him as that, tends to have his factor combination, both his labour and his capital so well balanced that he has X number of workers working on so much capital investment, whether it is machinery, plant, buildings or otherwise. If you then tell a manufacturer or a shopkeeper in Broad Street – I know of no stores in Broad Street, they are all shops. I know what I am saying. There is one store, I believe; Plantations Limited has a supermarket. They are all shops and they are all shopkeepers. The Shops Act applies to them. They are all shops, but Barbadians call a shop a store and a store a shop. If you tell a shopkeeper that he must increase his staff by 8% per annum, you will have workers falling over one another when he is already employing the number of workers who can look after the number of customers that he normally expects to come into his establishment. If you have a man who is running a machine shop, he has one machinist to each lathe that he has in his shop; he may have one extra man who is trained in case somebody is ill who may be doing odd jobs and can also stand by. If you tell him he has to increase, you may be actually constituting dangerous conditions in that particular machine shop if you try to increase the number of people inside there for the sake of avoiding payment of this employer's levy as they are now saying. So the result is that the man who is running his business efficiently prefers to pay the taxation than to jeopardise the safety of his workers or have too many people cluttering up the counter in the shop selling cloth. They may be falling over one another and blaming each other for the inefficiency which would be attendant by overcrowding behind the counter. But having abolished the trade tax, the hon. member had to find some other source of revenue; so some of these UWI economists whom he has advising him and who have some peculiar political philosophy sometimes on the verge of their departure from academia, managed to persuade the Hon. Minister perhaps that an employer's levy is a good thing, but I am only pointing out that it is a form of taxation, and I do not think that the hon. member has produced during the past year any figures to establish that as a result of the employers levy any business which was being run efficiently before has increased its staff. Far from that, some of them have gone into receivership, liquidation, maybe not as a direct result of the levy. The sugar industry certainly has not increased anything and from the figures I saw in the report of the Sugar Industry Review it appears that employment has actually declined during the last twelve months, from the last Quarterly Review or half yearly Review which I saw some three months ago. So in that respect it has been a taxation

measure and it has not been a measure to generate fresh employment in this country.
12.10 p.m.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Minister of Finance in his introduction was very careful to say that it was not the first time that the Government Revenue had made a contribution towards Capital Expenditure. What he was saying is that it was the first time since 1959 that the Estimates were being presented with a surplus. Well whether the Estimates were presented with a surplus, or possibly a surplus, is a matter of juggling with figures and all I can advise the hon. member is this that I hope that at the end of the Financial Year that he will have this surplus, after the systematic rates have been made. We will not have any salaries revision, but if he has cut down the projected expenditure to the bone and he will not be faced with a dilemma except for the teachers perhaps of having any salaries revision in the current financial year, if he can keep the people away who come for Supplementary Estimates for one thing or another, I hope that the current revenue will be able to make a further contribution because it will certainly reduce the Debt Charge, which the taxpayers in this country are being asked to shoulder.

The charges of the debt increased by some $10 million. That is my recollection. Not that the debt has increased but the charges of the debt have increased to $10 million and therefore any contribution which revenue could make to Capital Expenditure certainly is something which all of us as taxpayers in this country will welcome.

At the same time I should point out that whereas the receipts from taxation on Companies and personal taxation was projected at $105 million that has now gone up to $156 million. I just want to check that, Sir. Taxes on income and profits were estimated in 1975/76 at $82.7 million. In 1976/77 at $93.2 million. In 1977/78 at $105 million and in the Estimates for last year, and this current year which we are now in, Sir, have shown a projected increase of only $300,000 to $105,830,000 whereas they were $105,535,000 in the year before.

In this year the tax on income and profits in order to justify the surplus of $21 million has increased in these Estimates by something like $51 million approximately, over $50 million, nearly a 50% increase in the burden of taxation. Now how does this arise? We are not now discussing a situation where there is an increase in the level of consumption and therefore your taxation and goods and services coming in through the Port, and the burgeoning of taxation, the burgeoning of tourism and so on, that does show an increase from $53 million or $54 million to $73 million, but this is direct taxation, not indirect taxation. Direct taxation is going to be increased by the receipts. I want you to get this straight. I am not saying that the hon. member is going in the Budget and increasing Corporation Tax from 45% to 60% or personal income tax rates are going up by 50%. I have not said that because I do not know that, Sir. The hon. member does not even know himself judging from the statement which he made earlier today. I have not said that. What I am saying is that the receipts over last year's Estimates are supposed to be going up by 50% without any indication from the receipts which we are getting from goods and services that there is a similar generation of productive activity in the economy by the in-flow of goods and services and so on that there is going to be a commensurate increase in this kind of economic activity which will reflect itself in the amount which we are going to get from taxes on income and profits.

Now despite all the optimistic projection which has been splashed over the headlines despite the Barbados Turf Club bumper crop sweepstake of $100,000, I could not believe myself but then when I saw the ads appear and then looked at it again it meant the sweepstake bumper, not the crop was bumper. You understand me. You listen to it on the radio and you would believe from the advertisements which were being put out that this was to celebrate some kind of a bumper crop in Barbados.

Sugar prices are not good. Unfortunately we do not reflect on that situation. It is the situation which I predicted a long time ago. I have said several times that the kind of production which you get in the Sugar Industry depends on the distribution and the volume of rainfall. I am saying that we are not going to get any bumper crop this year. We are going to get a fairly low, middle-low average kind of sugar crop from all the discussions that I have heard and had from people who ought to know and. therefore the inflation in the receipts from taxes on income and profits could not be a reflection on the earnings of the Sugar Industry in Barbados. I am therefore investigating whether we are being realistic.

I want to make my position clear. It does not matter which side of the political fence you have to be on. We like to hear things are going good but at the same time we do not want to delude ourselves for any political reason into believing that things are better than they are going to be. I like to hear that.
12.20 p.m.

I am a bit concerned over the inflation of the taxes on income and profits. It can mean one of two things – either that we can expect some kind of increase in the rates of personal taxation or corporation tax of course, because those are the two sources from which such an increase can possibly come; or so much economic activity is going to be generated in this country that we are going to have a 50% increase in the level of economic activity,

and that the GDP is going to have an increase if not exactly 50%, certainly of a level which when you get the multiplier effect of the spin-off from this level of activity will reflect itself in a 50% increase in the level of tax on incomes and profits. And so this is the major area from which the hon. Minister of Finance expects his surplus of $21 million, because that in itself will wipe out his deficit of $30 million and provide the $21 million. But it is direct taxation, therefore the amount of purchasing power which is going to be left in the pockets of the consumer and taxpayers – this amount of $51 million more is going to be reduced and this in itself will have a kind of reversionary effect and probably in itself reduce the expectations in the result that the Minister of Finance has presented here today.

I really do not wish to deal with all the statements made by the hon. member. His debates are inter-larded every day with statements about the previous administration. You wonder when you read this and the activities that he indulged in – marching to Government House, bringing people and putting them in your position, together with all of those things he claims now that the previous administration did or did not do, we wonder that we did not have a revolution before in Barbados. This is now the usual style of the hon. member to get up and not be able to make a speech without reference eight or nine times to the previous administration. You would not believe that apart from the legal department – for which he is not responsible that we would have to ask the Hon. Minister of Legal Affairs about these resignations – he has hardly had a resignation in the Ministry of Finance, and that is to his credit. I am not saying that it is to the discredit of the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs that he has had large scale resignations, but it is a remarkable performance when you compare the response of the officers. May be my people were better trained. I do not know if they were more civil or more long suffering; I do not know what the explanation is, but when we from this side look at the performance, they are the same people. There have not been on any new courses in the Ministry of Finance. True the hon. Minister has had a little assistance on the Estimates which you are only going to see the results of next year, but I want to remind the hon. member they were good quality staff and they managed things well; and every time they get up and accuse the Government. Yes, we have an army of occupation but not in the Ministry of Finance; an army, I am not talking about the officers, I am talking about the army – the N.C.O.'s and the rank and file. I do not want to tell you the story of what you have to endure from them, but you have a good staff; and every time you get up you say we did not do this or that, you are reflecting on the same staff. Nowhere will you find there was any coercion on any Government department to present facts not in the true light of what the current situation was and we have to bear this in mind. So when you are trying to swipe at the Opposition, you must remember that a Government does not run itself just with Ministers; a Government runs itself with the quality of the public service which it has to work with from time to time. This has not changed, and if junior people have come up, they were trained during the fifteen years of our administration and we all have to give credit for that. The Government of Jamaica has only been able to survive because of the high quality of the personnel they have in the higher echelons of the public service and particularly in the Ministry of Finance; and you will not hear Mr. Michael Manley getting up and blaming the present woes of Jamaica on previous administrations, because Jamaica is a bigger country and they have bigger people perhaps; but Mr. Manley understands the politics of government and the politics of change.

The hon. member had stated that there has been a starvation of equipment, particularly in Soil Conservation and at the Ministry of Communications and Works. I want to examine this starvation of equipment in departments. We do not manufacture earth-moving equipment, machinery or capital use goods in Barbados. At one time we used to manufacture some sugar factory machinery; I do not know if we now do anything more than repairs. We seem to do more cannibalisation because our factories have been rationalized, some closed down, others amalgamated etc. If you are looking carefully at your expenditure patterns, the last thing you would want to do is to indulge in heavy capital expenditure in machinery and equipment which is not manufactured in Barbados; and you have to tell your Public Works people from time to time to try to repair this or that. Obviously there comes a time when equipment will get so run down that it is beyond repair, but it was my experience – and I am sure the hon. member must be aware of this – that machinery from all government departments which were declared by Boards of Survey to be beyond repair, whether they were lorries, road rollers, traxcavators – name any kind of equipment – ten years after these particular items were sold by public auction they were supplying items to the same Government department, frequently owned by government officers who had found that the equipment was usable. You know that, Sir, from your own experience. I am not saying that you are a heavy machinery man, but a representative of the people concerned with public expenditure. We all know that this happens. So to say that we starved government departments of machinery – some need starving, because if left to them, every time a cotter pin drops out of a bicycle they would buy a new bicycle *(Laughter)* I do not know what the laughter is about; does not Your Honour know what a cotter pin is? Or let us say that the kingpin from a truck steering dropped out, they would say the steering is gone rather than go underneath the truck and check and put in a kingpin. And the Board of Survey people would walk around the truck and say that the steering is gone. Then two weeks later the truck is back on the road supplying the same department with boulders and

what not. So I really cannot take that as a serious criticism; it is probably a word of commendation from the hon. Minister that we did not allow indiscriminate purchase of new equipment which did not find itself reflected in the generation of employment in this economy; perhaps the Caterpillar Company in the United States or Mr. Branford's company in England or Massey Fergusson may have benefitted. We are not an industrial country and any attempt by a department of government in seeking new equipment has got to be scrutinized very carefully.
12.30 p.m.

Any attempt by a Government department to try to get new equipment has got be scrutinised very carefully; so I do not think that I can really regard that as any serious criticism by the hon. member; and I would only suggest to him that he should watch very carefully attempts by Government departments to have a lot of pretty machinery which they do not necessarily need. He has heard me say this before. Particularly the rapid turn over of vehicles in the Police Department is a cause for alarm sometimes – and I mean "turn over" literally – turn over on the roads and turn over in the number of new vehicles they will come and ask you for every year. That in the Police Department is almost unbelievable I can say this because I had to resist to a very large extent excessive demands for new vehicles in the Police Department, because frequently I think that they were not as careful as they should have been because it was the Police Department, and anything they asked for should be given. I do not think that they used to be as careful as they should be in requisitioning new equipment. So this is something that we all, as trustees of Government funds, have to be careful of.

Mr. Speaker, I will end where I began. Nobody in here wishes to have any important Heads left undebated; and I hope that in making their contributions hon. members will bear in mind that there is a limitation prescribed by the Rules and Standing Orders of this House; so that although all of us have particular parochial requirements, we have our constituencies, we have complaints and matters of that kind, I hope that we will look at the broader issues so that we can get around discussing the very Heads which the hon. member said we have not been able to discuss in the past few years. No one would like more than to discuss and examine the Government's record under these Heads which the hon. member claims that he has been stopped from giving an account of.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is that this Bill.....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the Estimates every year does provide an opportunity for the people of Barbados to get some appreciation of what is anticipated by both the Government and the other representatives in terms of the development of the country. These years Estimates have been accompanied by a trumpetous – I almost said glorification – but for the first time in 20 years in the presentation of the Estimates there has been a surplus.

Mr. Speaker, the Rt. Hon. Gentleman made a number of statements which, in my opinion, were calculated to give the people of Barbados the impression that things have gone so remarkably well, and that the management of the economy has been so superb, that indeed the economy has been in that position for the first time since the last Barbados Labour Party took office. Having made that statement in his opening remarks, he said later that they were not in terms of the presentation of the Estimates.

Mr. Speaker, that may be in essence a relatively small point, because what is important is not how the Estimates are presented. What is important is what is the real meaning of what is contained in the Estimates. I wish to deal with a few points generally, and I think one that is of significance is that not one single person in this country generally believes the claim by the Prime Minister and Minister Finance that there has been no diminution of services while this so called surplus was being generated.

Now, Sir, how is it possible for anyone who lives in this community to stand up seriously and suggest that in the last year there has been no diminution of services in this country? When it comes to the presentation of balance sheets or the presentation of figures generally, depending on your perspective, depending on how you look at it, you can arrange those figures in such a way as to show almost anything; but, Sir, let us take the schools in this country. It is a common fact that in the schools of Barbados a number of normal requirements have been absent for a substantial period during the last year. Take for example such things as toilet paper. I say without fear of contradiction that in a majority of schools in Barbados exercise books, chalk and toilet paper.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I am wondering under what Head of the Estimates the hon. member is talking on. *(Asides)*. Let us have some order please.

Mr. TAITT: The point I am making is about the diminution of services.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish that you would not be instructed by the hon. member for St. Lucy.

Mr. TAITT: I was not aware that he was instructing me.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am aware. I only invite the hon. member to discuss the general principles of Government

policy and administration as indicated in the Bill and the Estimates.

Mr. TAITT: With all due respect, I am making the point that the policy of the Government in cutting back services in the Government itself, has had a fundamental effect on the presentations of the Estimates. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that last year when the Estimates were presented we were given the idea that they had been carefully pruned, and that the figures which came before us were representative of accurate Estimates of what expenditure was contemplated. So as soon as the last Estimates were presented, a directive went out from the Ministry of Finance to all Heads of Departments from the Ministry of Finance calling on them that despite the fact that the Legislature had approved levels of expenditure.....
12.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand the hon. member to have risen to merely carry on repeating what the Hon Leader of the Opposition has already said? That is the very point the hon. member made and our Standing Orders forbid it, that you rise to repeat what he said and another hon. member rises to repeat what you said.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I shall be guided by you in these matters. But, Mr. Speaker, the policy of a four day week for example is bound to show up in terms of an alleged saving in terms of money. Mr. Speaker, some time ago in the United Nations they had a problem with expenditure over revenue, and many countries were concerned that if the United Nations did not show up a reduction in the cost of their administration that they would not make their contributions to the United Nations. The manner in which they solved that problem was to fail to fill vacancies in the United Nations Establishment. Mr. Speaker, again as part of the policy of the Government, there has been a decided policy that vacancies would not be filled so that it is bound to show up at the end of a year as an apparent saving. This is obvious. If you have statutory posts in an administration, these statutory posts carry with them a certain amount of money. If those posts are filled or not filled at the end of the year, those posts should show up as having been expended according to the system we use in this country. If however throughout the year acting posts are not filled, if throughout the year a directive comes down that before any post is filled it must be directed to a particular Ministry or a particular department, at the end of the year you will be in a position where you can point and say there has been a savings in expenditure.

In fact if you take Estimates for any given year, whereas expenditure might show up as $200 million, the real actual money spent may very well be $180 million because of what is called votes that lapsed. For those reasons when a Government makes a policy to become involved in tearing down in those areas, that is one way in which you arrive at a so-called surplus.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the facts that school teachers have not been paid during the year past any increase in their salaries the amount of money that would normally be expended during the financial year past does not show up in the Estimates as an expenditure. It will obviously be a "saving". Furthermore if one takes the point of the employment levy, if the hon. member says on the one hand that there has been a reduction in unemployment and yet if there has been a reduction in unemployment one sees an amount appearing in the revenue for the unemployment levy as part of the revenue, clearly, Mr. Speaker, on the expenditure side for the following year, if in fact money has to be returned that has been collected, that money would not show up as revenue; that money would have to show up in order to balance it on the other side as expenditure. In other words, Mr. Speaker, $5 million that will show as part of the surplus may in fact according to the hon. member himself be $5 million that ought to be expended in the following year. I see the hon. member has managed after a short exit to find what the school children have been able to find. I hope he makes good use of it.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the Estimates themselves, and one sees that we are in fact showing a $50 million taxation expectation, it behoves one to wonder how is it going to be possible when there has been no economic development commensurate with the figures where this money will come from. It must be a question, Mr. Speaker, of taxation or it must be a question of under-spending to the point where, as I have said, the social services of the country are reduced. I ask the hon. member if he has gone through this country and if he is able to say after having gone through Barbados that the social services of this country are at the same level they were a year ago.

There is one aspect of this business of the presentation of the Estimates I would like to touch on. There is no magic about the yellow page which has been inserted in the Estimates. Planned programme budgeting, Mr. Speaker, was introduced in the United States under President Kennedy, and it had to do with a requirement which the then Defence Secretary, McNamara had instituted in the Defence Department, and without going into a long history of it, Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the budget, what they call the Appropriation, in the United States was then put on the basis of programme evaluation, programme budgeting. It follows therefore that the presentation of what would be to us the Estimates would have to take account of the programmes which were being implemented as opposed to what has been described as the iceberg type of budgeting where a substantial portion of the previous year's Appropriation remains and a small bit is added on on a yearly basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have not heard from the other side that it is their intention to introduce planned programme budgeting nor have I heard from the other side that they intend to experiment with what has been described as zero base budgeting, but a casual look at the presentation of the Estimates on the yellow pages which the hon. member referred to, suggest that we are going to be having the system of presentation without necessarily having the fundamental change in approach which would be necessary for that system of presentation to have any meaning.

In a small country the size of Barbados where we have a population of approximately a quarter of a million people, the kind of Estimates presentation which we have does permit hon. members to look at expenditure in some small detail, whereas the programme approach budgeting will tend in my view to lessen the opportunity for examination. But it is a moot point whether one accepts the programme system or whether one accepts the iceberg system. What I think is going to be desirable is that we get an indication of projects other than a school at Trents, which school was in the planning stage and as far as I know in the process of implementation. If we hear that the building of the Ministry of Agriculture's new building is a project, let us say it is a project.
12.50 p.m.

One can hope that the Government would not merely talk of development projects in terms of shifting one set of the Ministry of Communications and Works workers from one building site to another and then announce that there has been X number of people employed on one site and Y number of people employed on another site. Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied that this is the kind of employment generation to which the hon. member and Minister of Finance spoke about. A year ago.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of elucidation, if the hon. member does not mind my rising at this stage. With my experience if you do not interrupt, the point will never be made with the project.

The Ministry of Communications and Works is not building any project to which I referred. There is no question of shifting MCW workers from one site to another. I have selected projects which are being built by Contractors, so it is misleading for the hon. member to say that I am suggesting that the Government is building them. Those are not MCW workers.

There is one other point, if he does not mind me just adding it with the Ministry of Agriculture building. The Ministry of agriculture building is not just a building. It is the first office building in the Tropics, in any developing country, which is using solar cooling as part of heating the building. We are cautiously accepting some of the research and development cost of solar cooling in that building. It is an experimental building being put up for particularly experimental purposes as well as to provide a house for the Ministry of Agriculture so if that does not qualify as a project, Sir, I do not know what would.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the fundamental point is that whether they are private Contractors or MCW workers and you are shifting one group of workers, perhaps we can hear from him later as to what extent the MCW workers have been reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member in his point of explanation has touched on the question of solar heating in the Agricultural Building. *(Asides.)* Solar cooling. Solar heating and solar cooling are the same principle. The hon. member for St. James would not appreciate that the technology is basically the same. It would take someone with some knowledge of the technological aspects to understand the difference between cooling and heating. It is not a question of who can shout the most. It is a question of who knows what he is talking about. Mr. Speaker, in this country we are going to take the lead apparently in applying solar cooling. Now, Sir, I think you will agree that in some of the developing countries, with vast arid areas that in fact this possibility would be even nearer a possibility that it is something which would be taken up by these countries who have the capacity and ability to develop their technology.

Mr. Speaker, in no country in the world have they been able to perfect solar cooling in a manner that is efficient. Mr. Speaker, there has been a number of experiments which have been demonstrated that is not...*(Aside.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us have some order please. (Pause.) Please let us have some order.

Mr. TAITT: It is significant that when anyone makes a point which disturbs them they erupt into shouting matches. Mr. Speaker, I challenge them to produce evidence that the development of solar cooling has been accepted in North America to the point where it is a marketable commodity. You tell me that in an area where the whole of Arizona can use solar energy for cooling purposes there are still using refrigeration? There are still using the same things that we are using in this country.

Mr. Speaker, without reference to the use of solar energy, here it is in Barbados we have made such a break-through and advance so much that we are going to be led by the distinguished ex-Minister of Agriculture. We are going to be blown to the full extent of the wind to spend some money on solar heating. I wish them luck, Sir. I hope that at the opening of that building when the

solar energy cooling has been demonstrated to the superiors that they will announce to the rest of the world what a break-through they have made and in fact that they have spent some money on the people of Barbados in a good and efficient way.

I take the point of the Prime Minister that it was experimental. He himself said it and it is in the Estimates that it is experimental but the other hon. members are prepared to shout and behave as if it is something that has been happening in the world for the last 20 or 25 years. Mr. Speaker, the whole question of energy and the development of energy is something that is going to be crucial, not only to developing countries in the Tropics but to countries everywhere. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the Heads of Governments of the European Economic Community met and one of the decisions they took was to ask other countries in the world to cut back on their energy. Mr. Speaker, if in fact they have managed to develop solar cooling as efficiently and in an unexpensive way of moving forward, Mr. Speaker, we would not have been waiting until now to see it in Barbados.

Mr. Speaker, other aspects of the Estimates will be discussed in greater detail. One of the things which I hope we will get the opportunity to discuss fully is the whole question...

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: While I would like to give him the opportunity to talk a little more nonsense, I beg to move, Sir, that this Sitting now be suspended until 2 o'clock today, Sir, for lunch.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, while I have no objection to that, I take objection to the manner in which the Acting Leader of the House sought to get up in the middle of my speech. If the hon. member asks someone to give way, that hon. member has a duty of courtesy not to make serious remarks about the hon. member's speech while it is going on. I am prepared to await Your Honour's ruling for suspension but I deplore the attitude in which the hon. member attempted to interrupt my speech.

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

1.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. The hon. member for St. Michael South West.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying just before the interruption, it is one thing to indicate that there has been a paper surplus; it is another thing to claim that that surplus has occurred without a diminution of services. It is yet another thing to examine the social services, economic services and the other services in a country to determine what has been the price of that paper surplus. I submit that the price of that paper surplus will be felt in the pockets and hearts of the people of the country.

The hon. Prime Minister in presenting the estimates and speaking about his government's policy with regard to the Press said that he stands ready to assist the Press. Mr. Speaker, if I were still practising that noble profession of journalism, I too would be wary to treat any information given out by the Government with the greatest reserve. Any information emanating from a government headed by that hon. gentleman I would treat with the greatest reserve. He says he stands ready to assist the Press. Like how they assist at CBC? How they direct what is and what is not to appear in the CBC newscast? Assist the Press in the way they assisted the movement of most if not all of the competent people who worked at that place? All the professionals who have had to find refuge in places like Montserrat? The list is long and I do not intend to call the whole list, but everybody in Barbados is familiar with the movement of people like Ellis who will be soon moving.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is well aware of how far he should go and how far not.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, you will recall that the hon. Prime Minister referred to an editorial by Mr. Best and quoted that the hon. member for St. Michael South West.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do recall, but this is the point which we have reached. It will be found at Standing Order No. 64(2) which I have had to direct another hon. member's attention to already today. The point we have reached is "after the motion for the second reading of the Bill has been proposed and seconded, then debate thereon shall be confined to the general principles of Government's policy and administration as indicated in the Bill and Estimates." That is the point we have reached.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I was dealing with the broadcasting policy, the public information policy of the Government, and I am saying that the position of the Prime Minister is well known and has been recorded in the debates of this Honourable House. It is unfortunately the practice of the Government that where a journalist writes something which does not apparently find favour with the hon. gentleman, such a journalist may very well find himself being castigated in this Honourable House, as has happened in the past. There are hon. members of this

House who feel as I do, that whatever the Press writes in a country is in fact the privilege of the Press to write. I myself have never and will never consider it desirable to either abuse the members of the Press or to interfere with them whether at any time when I had authority in this country or at the time when we resume authority in this country. To interfere with the Press is to interfere with the basic democracy of the country, and to use the opportunity of the House of Assembly to castigate persons who are not in a position to respond – as we have seen happen from time to time by the Prime Minister – is not to my mind the best policy on broadcasting for any Government, and least of all a Government in a developing country which calls for people to respect the democratic rights and the human rights of the people. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a free Press is one of the fundamental rights required in a community such as Barbados. Not every hon. member of that side subscribes to the view that the Press ought to be interfered with, and I am pleased about that; and I hope that hon. members on that side will come out and state categorically that they do not agree with the policy which from time to time sees ordinary members of the Press vilified and accused of ignorance and various other things.

Mr. Speaker, in the details of the discussions which are before us we have a large number of things on which we will want answers. In some respects it does not matter which Item is taken first, because in all of the Items before us there is evidence of a heavy-handedness on the part of the people who have authority in this country at the moment, and it is my anticipation that during discussion on these Estimates the hon. Ministers on the other side will find it possible to give us definitive answers on a number of questions which we propose to ask them about the sacred trust they have been given by the people of this country to run the affairs of this country for however long they run it. I find it extremely....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. member, but it is my duty as Leader of the House to draw to the attention that the hon. member began to speak at 12.35 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, its clear that hon. members on the other side would wish me to stop, but I find it particularly interesting that it should be drawn to Your Honour's attention....

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not find it interesting, so please address the Chair.

Mr. TAITT: I will wind up Sir, and say that in due course all of them on that side will have to account for the diminution of social and other services in this country. I am contending, for example that at the hospital the services have dropped to a new low. There has been an absence of drugs at the hospital; there has been an absence of the normal movement of persons into acting positions, and in due course the hon. member for the City will hear of all things which she wants to hear. 2.20 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Please let us have some order from the Government benches.

Mr. TAITT: I am grateful for your indulgence. I will have nothing more to say until we get into a more detailed examination of the failure of that group, especially those on the front bench, who continue to ignore the recommendations of the people in the back, and who continue to carry this country a fast way down hill.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for St. Michael South West concluded by expressing the hope that in the course of discussion over the next few days the Government would provide definitive answers to the number of questions that he proposed to raise, I would just like to say that Oppositions, and the present Opposition, has a responsibility to this House and to this country, which today they have not been able to discharge. It is the second time that we have had discussions – the "nth" time that we have had discussions in Parliament, in which we have had serious discussions on economic matters; and the Opposition has once again failed this House and failed this country.

It is fashionable to reduce many forms of human experience these days to cricketing terms. The Super Test is with us, and the Third Test is currently in progress. I do not know, if you, Sir, will permit me to say that the Opposition is like a team in which two leading batsmen are out without any score. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition in a very flat footed innings – and I think that that was the cause of his downfall. He started on the question of calling the Heads and he ended on the question of calling the Heads and in between he never moved from that position. He scored no runs. He was followed by No. 2 batsman who attempted to imitate one of his found strokes. Of course, the Chair had to intervene and point out to him that that was not permitted under the rules. In this context the Chair is umpire; and after losing concentration he found himself chasing a ball called solar cooling or solar heating, Sir, and in the end he played into the hands of the great Mr. Fields. No score whatever.

Again, Sir, they have failed to rise to the occasion and tell us something about how as an alternative they would have set about structuring Government expenditure, what would have been their priorities and what would have been their emphases on what sort of

strategy they would have been adopting in this wide area of forecasting and planning Government expenditure.

I want to make the point that again in these Estimates two features that have been criticised in the presentation of many Estimates are again present. We have the phenomenon of misforecasting, if I may put it that way, because while on the one hand we had the Government saying that while they were anticipating a surplus in current revenue of $257.9 million, they find themselves ending up with $313.3 million. This is followed by the situation where year after year they budget for one figure in relation to Capital Expenditure, and at the end of the year they have spent far less; and there seems to be a conspiracy on the part of the two spokesmen on these matters.

It seems to me that this is something that has happened and is happening, and nothing can be done about it. I have already argued that we cannot begin to relate the absorption capacity of the Government to their capacity to the many schemes which they set themselves to implement unless there is an improvement in the Civil Service itself, its rules, its procedures and its personnel as regards recruitment; and I would hope that the Hon. Prime Minister, good democrat as he is, will remember the affirmative vote of this House in favour of a Resolution that I brought asking for a look into the Civil Service; and I would very much hope that the recommendation of this House will be carried into effect so that we will be able to tell ourselves that the fault is not in the Civil Service itself, or the rules or regulations relating to the Service, but the fault is to be found somewhere else.

I join the Prime Minister in hoping that the Estimates will be more realistic and there will be a certain projection of the revenue that has a reasonable margin of error. No one is suggesting that if you forecast a revenue yield of $3 million you will get a yield of $4 million; but if you are 20% or 25% out, you certainly raise questions as to whether or not there is any realism in the forecasting technique, and so you give cause to considerable suspicion.

I move now to my next point which has got to do with what appears to be the central point which the Opposition was trying to make, mainly that this surplus on current account was a result of a deliberate under spending on the part of the Government. The point that I am attempting to make is, which I understood them to be attempting to make, is that there has been no growth in the economy, and that the tax yield has been the result of an oppressive system of taxation, of direct taxes.

Now, I wish to make the point that taxation must have a base, and particularly so the corporate taxes; and if there were no profits obviously they could be no taxes on those profits; so that is wrong to attempt to make the point that we attempt to tax what was not there. There had to be profits in order for the profits to have been taxed.

The second point is, Sir, that the economy has shown a real growth. I do not know if we will be recording a 4 or 5%, but there is no doubt that there has been growth in several sectors of the economy, and this has been a result of that growth that is now reflected in an increase in the tax yield. I think that what the Opposition was trying to do was to dampen the applause which is due to the Government and to the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance for what is the real difficult period that this Government has gone through in the last two years. There can be no gainsaying the fact that when the present administration took over the management of this country's affairs two and a half years ago, that Government's finances were very chaotic and depressing. The position now is that there is an increasing buoyancy in Government's finances and there is increased cause for hope as opposed to despair which was the situation two and a half years ago.

The point is that the applause will be in vain unless we ensure that almost simultaneously with our increase of current account, we come to this House and to the country with a package of social measures that will to some extent absorb that increase and redound to the benefit of the masses of this country.

2.30 p.m.

In short, money saving for money saving sake does not make sense either politically or economically. I also make the point that Government's finances can be likened to an individual's finances writ large, but that analogy must not be pushed too far because while it is expected that at the end of your day and mine we would at least leave enough to pay what the lawyers describe as our just debts and our funeral expenses, there is no such expectation in relation to a Government, so that while a government must not mortgage excessively or unnecessarily the future at the same time we have always got to bear in mind that a lot of what we are doing now is really for the benefit of future generations.

Now in developing my point with respect to this package of humane measures which I would expect the Hon. Minister of Finance and Prime Minister to be announcing at a later date, I would like to suggest that there are still areas of our social landscape that are extremely harsh and unpleasant to the eye. In 1979, today Sir, there are still thousands of people in our community who are without running water in their homes. There are still a few thousand people who are

without the basic necessity of electricity, and it seems to me that this administration must set itself as one of its new goals and urgent priority the question of electrifying all the houses in this country, the few thousands that are still without electricity, and bringing running water to the several thousands that are still without. So that though we applaud what has been a significant management achievement in being able to realise a surplus on current account and to budget for one next year for the first time we will be doing that in twenty years, saving money and realising a surplus for a surplus sake makes no sense and it must be tied to a formula for spending this money as sensibly as possible, and we must not as I say, do anything to lessen the applause to the Government, because whilst the last administration was able to realise an accidental surplus on current account in 1973 and 1975, they were the results of windfall circumstances, and we were able to do this this year without any windfall, for instance, in sugar. So that we must get these matters in perspective and recognise that it has been a result to a large extent of very skillful management on the part of the Minister of Finance in this administration.

On the last occasion that I spoke on the second reading of the Appropriation Bill, I made the point then that it was very important that the scarce money that we had, whilst maintaining essential services, we plough into the productive sectors of the economy. I said that I believe that if we did that over a period that we would find that we would not only be absorbing the unemployment, we would be adding substantially over a time to the tax yield position and we would also be strengthening or foreign reserves situation.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to hear the Minister of Finance mention, and I think for emphasis he used this form of words: that we experienced a large amount of foreign investment from overseas – I think for emphasis he used that form of words – and that tourism held up so well that it was able to contribute substantially to our foreign reserves situation. The wisdom of all of that is so obvious that it needs no particular over-stating.

I find it very difficult to understand how it is that the Industrial Development Corporation can only get a modest increase in the context of the necessity for that particular sort of strategy, but I am glad to record that the Head Tourism has seen an increased of $1 million, and in my view it is still inadequate for the job that has got to be done. It is not generally understood what is happening. Let me just make one quick point before I go on. There are more provinces in Canada, States in the United States and countries around the world both developed and under-developed that are not out there making noises as it were to get the offshore business which is coming out of the few countries from which offshore business comes. If we in Barbados therefore are to maintain the level of jobs which we have been providing in the manufacturing sector in the past and even to get more as set out in our Development Plan, we must have some more money to make some more noise out there. Out there is becoming a very noisy place with a lot of countries developing very sophisticated techniques for noise making in trying to attract offshore manufacturing business and the greater part of our budget has got to do with salaries, and there has not been enough money diverted to promotion either of the Industrial Development Corporation or for the Tourist Board.

The point that I make is that these Estimates should have reflected emphatically a distribution of the weight in favour of the productive sectors of the economy, the ones that would bring us jobs, that will ensure that the foreign reserves hold up, that will ensure in the end that the economy grows. There still seems to have been a kind of irrational collection of public works projects much in the way as when we first started C.D.& W. planning away back in the 1940s which was no more than an irrational collection of public works projects.

I welcome, Sir, the increase in expenditure which will be devoted to housing. Within recent times a lot of people have jumped on the housing bandwagon. All of a sudden a lot of people are committed to housing. They have seen the urgency and necessity. My position is one for the records and is one of record. I have consistently argued from the first day I came into public life in this country the importance of housing. I have argued that it has been the most neglected social infrastructure as it were in this country when a lot of people who are now on the bandwagon never regarded it as the twentieth social priority. Well all of that is very consoling to me.

The point I wish to make is this: the Government alone cannot do the job that needs to be done in housing. The proposal which I have to make is simple. In the same way that the Government has for years given incentives to people in manufacture, to people in hotel development and the like, equally the Government must now address their attention to giving a package of incentives to the land developers. I am not talking about speculators who want to buy it for 50 cents a square foot or five cents a square foot and sell it for $1.50 a square foot; I am talking about the person who wants to buy 50 acres of land, put in the services, build the houses and sell those houses for a realistic profit.

2.40 p.m.

It is my contention that they too are entitled to a package of incentives and I am saying that if we recognise the mammoth nature of the job in housing that has got to be done and the fact that Government itself cannot

do it then we ought as a matter of urgency address our minds towards providing these incentives for the land developers.

I note, Sir, that we continue to provide a significant sum in these Estimates, about $800,000 towards the Establishment of a Cement Plant. I have made my position clear on this, It seems to me that the last administration and this administration too, both administrations, have wasted quite a significant portion of the taxpayers money in trying to develop feasibility studies of the Cement Plant. We need to have guaranteed supplies of cement and one of the options of any Government is to go ahead on your own, or in an alliance with some joint-venture with others in providing a Cement Plant. It seems to me, Sir, that there is no reason why we ought to continue these feasibility studies. I do not know at what point they are going to end. The last administration spent $3 million alone in trying to develop feasibility studies.

The thing for the Government to do at this point is to make it clear to everyone that we would welcome private interest in the Cement Plant here and they will have to do it on certain terms and conditions. For sure they will have to protect our environment. For sure they will have to guarantee that they meet the local demands and perhaps they might even have to allow for some say or some supervision over what is charged. Outside of that, it is not an area in which the Government can any longer justify sinking millions of dollars of the taxpayers money only at the level of a feasibility study. I think that the time has come when we have got to say "enough of that", and allow the private sector to get ahead with that job.

My attention has been attracted, Sir, to the amount of $300,000 to provide Day Nurseries at page 9 of the Estimates under the Headlines of Capital Expenditure. For many reasons, Sir, this is a very inadequate sum.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are not now discussing the Heads. You are merely permitted to state whether the Government's policy on this is good or bad as the case may be. The opportunity will be afforded to you to go into detail later.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Grateful, Mr. Speaker. All I am seeking to do is to say that in my view it is not a good reason, Sir, that more and more research indicates that perhaps the most critical period in terms of channelling a child for learning and guaranteeing what will be the results later on is that pre-school stage, under 5, so perhaps one way in which to ensure that your investments of some $66 million in education is realising the best return, is to invest more money at the pre-school stage and the amount of $300,000 in relation to $66 million in relation to education seems to be out of proportion.

The second point I make, Sir, is that in the International Year of The Child one way in which we could have shown our commitment to that policy might have been to provide at least $1 million for Day Care Nurseries and the third point I make, Sir, is that we have a democratic feature now in Barbados where at the age of 30 or 34 more and more women are finished with child rearing. They are no longer having any more babies because they have had the final operation of tubal ligation or they have two or three children at pre-school stage but they are interested in going back to the labour force. What are they to do with those children? All of these developments that are being planned across the country should be regarded as an incomplete plan unless Day Care Nurseries are provided for them.

I too, Sir, regard it as very necessary that we do not allow ourselves and our optimism to run away with us. The International economic situation is still in a very precarious state and like a bolt from the blues, Sir, all the achievements we see in Barbados in a jiffy, in a small Island economy like ours, Sir, can be blown off course. The Prime Minister has already identified some of the many factors that can be responsible for this. A dramatic worsening of the energy situation, a sudden collapse of confidence, whether internally generated or externally. There can be an outbreak of an epidemic. Any of these features can be responsible for the collapse of the situation which we have fought so hard to develop over the last two years or more and whilst it is important that while going forward with great heat and energy we should still remember, how delicately balanced the external economic environment is.

What seems needed immediately is a massive injection of capital into the Barbadian economy both in terms of the private sector and the public sector. I think that one reason why we can feel particularly pleased with these Estimates is that they are calling for a substantial investment of capital into the Barbadian economy. I can only hope, Sir, that this effort on the part of the public sector of the Government is matched by the private sector. If at all there is any over heating of the economy down the road, we can then fall back on certain well-known techniques to defeat the situation.

I think that we can all join in welcoming the Estimates and skill with which they have been envisaged.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, as the Government applauds itself in relation to the improvement in Government finances as they see it, a vast majority of people in this country would be going through an agonising dilemma of trying to understand how that despite these wonderful improvements their economic and

social position has considerably worsened over the past two years.
2.50 p.m.

Indeed Mr. Speaker, as I prepared certain notes at about 5 o'clock this morning, I did make a note to the effect that one could expect all sorts of idle boasts from the Hon. Minister of Finance in respect of surpluses, etc. I had also made a point that the pattern of economic development of Barbados over the past twenty years – up to 1975 – was one in which current expenditure made a substantial contribution to capital development in this country. This was reflected in that amazing growth of the tourist sector, the agricultural sector and other sectors, despite the fact that the average borrowings, both externally and internally, during that period amounted to no more than about $14 million over a fifteen year period – $14.5 million or something like that. It is in my view when you consider the major infrastructural developments whether in Health, education, communications, electricity, water, etc., to have had the level of debt kept at that low level could only mean that your current revenue during those years was making a substantial contribution to the capital development of this country.

Another point which I think is most important to realize – and again the hon. member for Christ Church East has fallen into the trap – is the fact that Barbados like any other country that exports and imports will always have a problem in the matter of balance of payments. But there was never a balance of payments crisis in Barbados until December, 1976 and in the first six months of 1977. The nearest that this country has ever come to it was in 1975, and the hon. member for Christ Church East has adverted to the question of windfall. Fair enough, there may have been a windfall in terms of sugar prices, but I understand that a major content of administration and skill had to go into the planning in order to get that particular price. I understand that skills in marketing etc., were involved in that exercise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note – and I want to review the economic background to these Estimates because they represent a continuing pattern which I think in the long run is destructive to the economic fabric of this society, because what is happening is that you are getting a relatively well-off government in an increasingly impoverished society.

The Democratic Labour Party took certain measures – I do not want to use the term defensive measures. One of those factors was the tax on the increased sugar revenue in that particular year, the introduction of the sales tax to dampen consumer demand, the pegging of the Barbados dollar to the United States dollar, and effective price control. Now in 1976 – if I may take the chance of quoting from the Hon. Prime Minister – he was able to report that in 1976 the Gross Domestic Product of this country had increased by 5%, that there was real output to the extent of more than 4%, and that all sectors of the economy, including manufacturing and particularly manufacturing, had shown significant growth. And I believe he used the figure of 15.6% increase in respect of the manufacturing sector. He further stated that there has been a stabilization of prices and that there was no price rise in excess of 5% in 1976. He also stated that the unemployment level had fallen from 22% to about 13%, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, despite the energy crisis and the four-fold rise in the price of oil, Barbados ended up with a surplus on the balance of payments in 1975 to the tune of some $35 million. After four months in power they had succeeded in converting that surplus into record deficit in the region of $34 million.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Sir. The hon. member read out non-figures. The balance of payments position of Barbados, the reserves of Barbados, have never been in deficit, whether to the tune of $34 million or anything else. It is absolutely untrue to suggest that.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I said balance of payments, I have not dealt with the question of foreign reserves. If you look at this matter very carefully, Mr. Speaker, you will see where the serious errors by the present Government took place. If you look at imports into this country during the period September to June for the years 1974-75, 1975-76 and 1976-77, you will see a movement from somewhere in the region of $323 million to $343 million, and then a massive jump in 1976-77 to $400 million or an increase of over $56 million. Or if you look at it another way and look at the balance on visible trade during that particular period, you will find a deficit somewhere in the region of $65 million. This was reflected in a severe drop in the foreign reserves of this country from a level of somewhere over $100 million in June 1975 to the catastrophic levels of about $26 million in July and September, 1977. Now it was at that point that the Government was forced to introduce a series of economic measures which are reflected in the pattern of these Estimates, measures which differ only from those normally recommended by the International Monetary Fund in respect of the fact that they did not resort to a valuation of the Barbados dollar, which was the only measure they did not embark upon.

Now what were these measures? Firstly, to take as much cash out of the economy as possible. This reflected itself in the policy of wage restraint which started at a zero position, then went to 5%, and then under pressure to 20% at the bottom and 10% at the top.

Secondly, we saw a wide range of taxation which resulted in the surplus you are seeing here. You are seeing

here the benefits of the tax imposition of the present Government arising from two consecutive Budgets, and that is where the surplus lies.

The third important measure introduced was the question of controls of consumer credit, not only in respect of the individual, that is, the amount of money you had to deposit at the time of purchase, but in terms of the directive to the banks of this country to keep credit in certain areas at a pre-determined level.

The fourth measure was a deliberate failure to control prices in this country. If you allow prices to go up, then the net result is a drop in purchasing power of the average dollar of the average individual; for your dollar there are fewer things you can buy because it is necessary to have a larger deposit and a shorter period for repayment.

The next step that they took was to embark on a policy of heavy borrowings. Up to the end of November last year – and I will not accept anything that the hon. member and Minister of Finance says about the level of either foreign reserves or alternatively the national debt in relation to February of this year. The figures I have go to November, last year.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I understand the hon. member to say that he does not accept figures the Minister of Finance produced. This is a reflection on the Minister of Finance and he must withdraw the remark.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not agree that the hon. member must withdraw. The hon. member has not got to accept what any other hon. member says because he may not understand what the hon. member said.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting things about economics, is that basic understanding and reliance on that understanding is the best guideline to use whether in government or opposition.
3.00 p.m.

If these things are taken into account I think that we will see a much more realistic pattern of Government's intervention in the economics of this country. The next step, Mr. Speaker, was excessive borrowing; and I want to draw to the attention of this Hon. House that the Government of Barbados drew down on the special balance of payments support funds made available by the Government of Trinidad; and in the same year, 1977 because they landed the country in an economic crisis created by themselves they drew down on the IMF compensatory facility, and this is reflected not only in the marked increase – almost 50% from the time they took over office in this country – but the shifting pattern in the emphases.

I think that the foreign component of the national debt had almost doubled since they came into power; and I would like to quote, Mr. Speaker, from an eminent adviser to the Government. When in fact they get up and try to say that there was no deliberate policy to cut back on Government expenditure, the fact is that for some time there has been not only a freezing of Government expenditure, but a freezing of the work force in this country. People have been put on a shorter week. Mr. Speaker, we all remember the four day week as part of this package.

Apart from this, Mr. Speaker, this was also reflected in the attitudes of the private sector. I cannot quote directly from the document because I do not have the document here; but I would like to say that an eminent adviser to the Government called Osbourne, said that there was some evidence that Barbadian businessmen during the last two years had allowed for accretion of staff from resignations and from retirement.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I must say that if the hon. member is reading from a document.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I have just said that I am not reading the document. *(Asides.)*

Mr. SPEAKER: We must have some order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am just making the statement without hearing loud mouthings. If the hon. member is reading from a document, he must make that document a document of the House.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I said that I do not have the document with me but I will refer to it from my memory; but it is all too obvious that any Government that embarks on that kind of package of economic policies that I have outlined cannot come back and claim that they have created a situation either for expansion in the economy or for job generation within the community. Those were the policies. I have anticipated and said that my belief is that the Estimates this year would show a surplus on current account. Those were the directions in which these economic policies were leading. You cannot institute those policies, and at the same time say that you are not impoverishing the nation. You cannot say at the same time that you have not been creating a situation in which there would be further unemployment; and this is reflected before us in the Estimates of the Employment Levy.

Secondly, according to my prediction, what the Government has done is to put itself in a position to borrow as it likes; and I am confidently predicting that you will see massive expenditures next year and this year and also massive borrowing based on these figures –

which have no relevance to the true economic development of this country.
3.10 p.m.

There has never been a time in Barbados when there has been economic expansion.....anytime there is economic expansion or significant economic growth in Barbados, this is automatically reflected in the pockèts of people in this country. How on earth can anyone come in here and say that there has been an improvement in the lot of the masses of people. I will concede that the Government's finances are better off, and the Hon. Minister of Finance not so long ago in this Honourable House said that a Government can be poor but it citizens rich, and indeed he quoted the State of New York as an example, but the converse can also be true. A Government can be rich and its citizens poor, no wonder the situation of Iran and elsewhere. The Persian Gulf is an interesting example of that type of situation, and I would implore and call upon the Government to embark upon a series of economic policies that have some relevance to the economic development of the people of Barbados. I can say that the hon. member for Christ Church East, although he was grossly mistaken as to the origin of the economic crisis and did not carefully think out where it stated and what has led to this situation, nevertheless made a very useful point, that the collection of revenue should have a purpose and that purpose should be economic development.

I see nothing in these Estimates, Mr. Speaker, to suggest to me that we would not be seeing the same trend that existed over the past two years. The same trend will continue, and the Government is fooling itself in the belief that because you have tidier finances in their view, better personal housekeeping, so to speak, that that in itself is form of economic development, and I would strongly urge on the Hon. Minister of Finance that he looks back to see where the origin of the true balance of payments crisis was, see what happened to our foreign reserves between September, 1976, and June, 1977, come to the public and tell the public whom he has been asking to make sacrifices the reasons why he is asking them to make sacrifices. You made your serious errors in those nine months; you have taken to task....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member should address the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Finance made some serious errors during those nine months. He has had to take serious measures to correct them, and the point now is that he has corrected them at the price of the impoverishment of the masses of this country, of blood, tears and unemployment and of a reduction in the social services.

I would have expected at this stage that these Estimates would demonstrate that at least he is willing to repay the debt which he owes to the masses of people in this country.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I once again want to reiterate, stress and make absolutely clear that the crisis which the Hon. Minister of Finance was trying to confuse the public with by suggesting that Barbados had a major balance of payments crisis in 1973–1974 and 1975 is completely untrue, and the figures available to us, Mr. Speaker, would demonstrate in no uncertain terms that there was never any financial crisis in Barbados of balance of payments, no severe depletion of our foreign reserves until that period September, 1976 to June, 1977, and the subsequent measures taken were the classical measures recommended by the International Monetary Fund whether they were here or not. They were certainly here in terms of the kind of policies recommended with the single exception of the devaluation of the Barbados dollar.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John on that side of the Chamber as far as I am concerned is the authority on economic and fiscal matters for that party. I respect his judgment in some matters and I respect his pre-eminence on economic matters as it relates to the Democratic Labour party. When he gets up therefore and says that the problems that Barbados suffered during the time of the oil crisis were economic problems largely imported, we have to conclude that he acknowledged that there was a serious economic problem in this country, but to hear the hon. member for St. Michael South Central get up and say that there has never been any financial crisis in Barbados, leaves me to hope that he is a little more accomplished in the calling for which he is accredited than in matters of economic significance.

Sir, I cannot understand how it could be possible for a man who is supposed to be responsible to get up in this Chamber and make such a loud noise full of fury signifying nothing. (Mr. SANDIFORD: Sound and fury.) I do not need to be accurate. I refer to you on matters classical. I would like to know how it is possible for him to make this kind of sweeping statement that there has not been any problem in this country. He quotes from the Central Bank statistics to prove that we have no significant problem in our balance of payments. I do not know which edition he was reading from, but I would like to bring his attention to the Quarterly Report, Volume IV for December, 1978 of "Economic Review", and this is setting out in some great detail the significant improvements which have been brought to this country as a direct consequence of the measures taken by the Minister of Finance over the last two and half years. This report talks about the resurgence of manufacturing imports, the increased earnings of foreign exchange as a result of the buoyancy of the tourist industry and the manufacturing industry in Barbados. If you look at the

very first page talks about the very modest increase in prices the strong performance in export earnings and goes on to laud the fact that this Government has been extremely successful in curbing the economic crisis which we inherited in 1976. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central gets up, says he was up in the wee hours of the mornings when the rest of us were sleeping. One can only conclude that he was still bleary-eyed because if he had followed through with his research he would have been able to prove for himself without having gone to such extremes this early morning. Just one page would give the lie to everything he has said so far in the last half an hour, and I wonder why it is that we have to come in here day after day and listen to this nonsense. He said for example that there has been a reduction in social services in Barbados. Now if that is not an irresponsible statement, I would like to know what is. In the area of health alone we can point to two significant institutions built by this Government for the furtherance of health services in this country – the Maurice Byer Polyclinic at Speightstown and the clinic in Black Rock.
3.20 p.m.

The important thing to note, Sir, is that these two clinics have been built. They are modern looking clinics and architecturally pleasing. I am only aware that the hon. member for St. Michael South built a crematorium which has since been re-christened a clinic and which was built at a cost of over $1 million. A very small building, a little 14 x 5 building costing almost $2 million. It was to be a bus stand, then it became a crematorium and then it became a Health Clinic and we built those two facilities at a significantly reduced cost in one year and they are telling us that we have not done anything, all we are seeing is a diminution of social services.

We have undertaken a massive extension in the direction of Housing in this country, an accelerated step in early housing which the hon. member for Christ Church East just alluded to that fact but yet we have to come in here and hear people telling us that this Government is running this country into a state of bankruptcy, taking away people's gains over the last 12 years and so on and so forth. People were working off and on and that type of nonsense. I am going to ask you to go outside in the street, stop anybody at all and ask them if they feel much worst off economically now than they were in 1973 and unless you pick Nord from by the Farm or Hinds from down by Plantations Building the answer will be that they are better off.

The Barbados Workers' Union goes around day in and day out talking about the enormous gains they have made. The settlements which they have had, the Police Service, all the Statutory Boards getting a significant increase in wages and they are telling me that they are worst off now with an inflation rate less than a third of what it was in those days? People have more money with a significantly reduced inflationary rate and they are worst off? That is DLP economics.

As I said to you, Sir, I am prepared to listen to the member for St. John on these matters as they relate to the Opposition and when he got up this morning, he danced around, he did a couple of pirouettes and he sat down because he realised that he was out-flagged earlier and he had nothing to say. The only thing he talked about was kingpins, linchpins, – let me get it right. He talked about kingpins, collarpins, linchpins, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West came along and talked about toilet paper so all I can say is that the hon. member for St. John, being the prominent Economist that he is and the expert on financial matters that he is recognised that he better not interfere with the advancement of the Barbados Labour Party and he danced around and sat down but here we have this neophyte in this Chamber coming in here and talking all sorts of nonsense at the top of his voice.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should desist from calling people neophytes.

Mr. JOHNSON: This is not a bad word, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not the point at issue.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a beginner?

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not the point at issue whether it is a bad word or a good word.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, a neophyte is a man who is new.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am asking the hon. member to desist.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central is relatively innocent of economic matters and he comes in here and he talks at great length about what this Government has done and what it has not done. Now, Sir, he talks about balance of payments and at page 14 of this Report which I have just cited, the statement here – Foreign Trade Payments – "The overall balance of payments improved slightly in the third quarter. The Foreign Exchange Reserves were up by $4.8 million in contrast with $4.5 million observed in this period over the last four years." Over the last four years there has been a falling-off and this tells us that there has been an improvement in the balance of payments position but yet we have to come and listen to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central tell us that we are worst off in terms of balance of payments. I do not understand why it is that this Honourable Chamber has to be subjected to this kind of

irresponsible behaviour. I believe it is made to score points politically but I do not think we ought to get up and deliberately set out to deceive this House or mislead this House, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: You must withdraw the remark.

Mr. JOHNSON: I withdraw it, Sir. I do not understand why it is necessary for members on that side to come in here and quote statistics that do not coincide with that of the Central Bank when the Central Bank is the accredited Agency or Institution which accumulates statistics on money matters in this country and if they tell us it is better off, I am prepared to believe the Central Bank's Report. We have numbers here at page 14 and 15 of the Quarterly Report, Volume 4, December, 1978.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central accused us of a deliberate attempt to cut Government spending. Of course there was a deliberate attempt to cut Government spending. When we came into power in 1976 we had a kind of waste situation in this country that was unparallel and the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister had the responsibility of cutting out this. That is part of management to plug up the loopholes where money was being spent on non-productive things. Money earmarked for one thing was being wasted on insignificant projects. We had to cut that back and as a result of that the people of Barbados are able to benefit from those savings that the hon. member responsible for Finance has been able to save. Those savings that he was able to realise have been put into productive enterprise in this country. *(Asides.)* I just gave you example. The Maurice Byer Clinic, the Black Rock Clinic, playing fields, housing and so on and so forth.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I believe the hon. member is inadvertently giving the House the wrong information. The money from which the Maurice Byer Clinic was constructed was money from the European Economic Fund under the Lome Convention. I am sure that the hon. member might not have intended to mislead the House, but this is the information.

Mr. JOHNSON: These Clinics are manned by Barbadians and paid for by Barbadian money. We do not get money from any International Development Fund. The money being paid to staff those Institutions is money that has come out to provide jobs for Barbadians, jobs they would not originally have had if the level of the waste had continued so the hon. member for St. Michael South West is introducing red herrings across the trail.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central said, Sir, that we have got a comparatively well off Government and an increasingly impoverish society. Now, Sir, can you really tell me that a $22 million surplus on Current Account means that the people of Barbados are worst off? The hon. member for St. John got up this morning and talked about tax and unemployment. He referred to the Employment Levy as an Employers' Tax. Now I have a lot of respect for the hon. member for St. John but.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I am on a point of order, Sir. He said that I referred to the Employment Levy as an Employer's Tax. What I was pointing out, Sir.....

Mr. SPEAKER: You rise to elucidate a point?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Yes. I said that the Estimates referred to it as an Employers' Tax and the nomenclature has changed from the Employment Levy to the Unemployment Levy and in these Estimates on page – I was reading it this morning. On page 1, Roman (i) which is about 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, – that would be 17 of the Estimates, the very second item on that page says Employers' Levy. That is what I said.
3.30 p.m.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, he called it an employers tax, and he said that if it had achieved its objectives it would not be there and therefore it was converted into an employers tax. The point is that the hon. member for St. John must know that it is not a tax on any employer. Employers in Barbados are better off as a consequence by providing employment for Barbadians. You talk about people working in industry where if you put more people to work it puts them in danger and all that nonsense. Sir, I have never heard anybody else get up and say that to employ people is bad. But that is what they are saying, that to increase employment numbers in Barbados can be dangerous; that is what the hon. member for St. John has said. If that is so, we of the Barbados Labour Party want to be bad; we will continue to employ Barbadians to put money in their pockets so that they can give the lie to the Democratic Labour Party's claim that the people are not better off. We feel that when we reduce the unemployment situation from 25% to the point of 14% now, it is a significant achievement for Barbados, and people will respect us when the time comes for them to speak in 1981 or whatever it is. People are working in this country now. That is a fact of life that the Democratic Labour Party have to put in their pipe and smoke. People are significantly better off now than under the Democratic Labour Party, and to think they can come in here and all they can talk about is schools not having toilet paper; that is the hon. member for St. Michael South West; his contribution to the Appropriation Bill is about no toilet paper at St. Leonards School.

The hon. member for St. John went on in his usual style to talk about the management of the public service. What he does not recognize is that the public service is going to be effective as long as it has good management. The hon. member for St. Thomas, the Hon. Prime Minister, is calling the shots now and therefore if we are getting more production and better results from the public service it is because the Barbados Labour Party is able to conceptualize their programmes with greater clarity and that the public service can understand our employment programme. But the hon. member for St. John spends all his time referring to them as an army of occupation, and we are saying now that that army of occupation out-performed him by leaps and bounds, and that is what we have been doing in the last two and a half years the Barbados Labour Party has been in power.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West talked about the economy of Barbados and the pioneering achievements of this Government. We have been watching a fledging industry in Barbados struggling to get on its feet. Three or four years ago Barbados had one solar energy company, pioneered by a young enterprising man who I am sure is known to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. He at great loss set out to revolutionize the use of energy in Barbados, so that we could reduce our dependence on fossil fuels by harnessing one of the resources most available to us. He has been able to bring this industry to the point where now he is able to offer assistance with a cooling system, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West got up to castigate the Government for promoting an environment in which the solar energy people can flourish to the point where we have buildings being air conditioned by solar energy. And he talked about there being no place in the world where solar energy was used successfully for.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. The gravamen of my statement was that the technology has not been perfected. It had nothing to do with the establishment of a solar heating operation in Barbados as an industry; it has to do with the use of solar energy for cooling purposes in a building for the Ministry of Agriculture, and I repeat the point I was making that nowhere is the technology relating to cooling by use of solar energy perfected to the point where it can be marketed. That is the point I was making.
3.40 p.m.

I can understand that statement coming from the hon. member for St. Michael South West because his knowledge is limited on a lot of these topics. I would invite him to go and read all the available information coming out of Arizona and out of Florida, and out of those states in the USA that have a tropical situation; and he will be able to appreciate that huge buildings in the USA are being cooled by solar energy – huge buildings, far beyond what we will ever hope to build in Barbados – are being cooled by solar energy. I do not expect that he will have this information, but I do not think that he should castigate the Government because as a consequence of our policy to promote solar dynamics for small entrepreneurs there are now, I think, three thriving businesses providing solar heat in this country because of the enlightened policies of this Government.

He talked about Housing. I would like the hon. member for St. Michael South West to observe that the programme of the Barbados Labour Party as it relates to improving housing for the people of this country is that he should bear in mind that all that we are talking about has been accomplished in two and a half years; and we are still able to present a significant surplus on current account. I take serious issue with the member for Christ Church East. He has castigated us for everything. If he does not like that word, he is quarrelling with us a little bit because we are showing a surplus on current account. There is nothing wrong with it. A prudence of management always dictates that there should be a cushion to deal with unexpected occurrences and you will have to bear in mind that we have been able to identify new projects, to have far more housing starts than have been seen in this country in the last 15 years, more social services than have been seen in the last 15 years; and still with all of that this Government has been able to demonstrate that it can show a surplus on current account.

These are not things that we should be quarrelled with about. We should be congratulated in respect of accelerated spending and the provision of additional services and still being able to have a surplus. That means that we are not wasting money in the reckless way that was done during the time that the Democratic Labour Party was in power. Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by cautioning and imploring members on that side not to castigate members of the Barbados Labour Party when we are not in a position to be castigated, and not to do as the hon. member for St. John did this morning. He stood up, span around a couple of times and sat down because he recognised that there was nothing about the Government Fiscal policy that he could successfully quarrel with; and being an intelligent and enlightened economist, he did his portion. He showed his constituents that he was in the House but he did not go to the extremes of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and bring himself into the ridicule and contempt which this House will have to hold him for the statements that he has made in this House this morning.

Dr. HAYNES: Sir, on a point of order. The hon. member said that I brought this House into ridicule and contempt. I hold that statement grossly unparliamentary, and I would ask you to have it withdrawn, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. member did make those remarks, I will ask him to withdraw them.

Mr. JOHNSON: I withdraw them.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a little contribution to this debate. I will stick to the principles. Unlike the hon. member who has just sat down, I am not so naive in politics as to expect congratulations from the Opposition. I think that it is our function to explain the measures which we are taking to deal with some of the economic problems that the Government has had over the years, and let the public determine whether we have done wrong or not at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, at this time last year in the Estimates for 1978–79, what the Minister put forward to the country as a deficit meant that after a number of years – 1972, 1973 and 1975 etc. there was a deficit of expenditure between Government revenue and Government expenditure; but recognising that there was this deficit, it was important from the economic point of view to take whatever measures were necessary to reflect a balance between expenditure and revenue.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I recall in 1976 soon after I had taken my seat in this House, the Government made the revelation that one of the problems in Government in Barbados was that there was too much wastage. I am satisfied that the managers of our economy, those of us who have the responsibility in Government departments and governmental agencies may pass words to the Minister of Finance. I believe that certain steps were taken by Government to balance the economic position of Government. Of course it has taken a long time to get through to the average man in the Street; and that has not been helped by the regular nightly discussions; but it seems that the average person would realise that there was no change in the Government's Manifesto promises, because many of the programmes are long term, and many of them have been realised too; but, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it was the failure of the public relations section of the Barbados Labour Party not to allow the public to know early between October and November, 1976 what was the true position of the country's finances at the time; and therefore they may not realise the reason for the steps that we have taken in the national interest with a view to setting right the economy of this country. This is a bold Government, and if some of its members are unpopular, it still feels that national considerations must supercede narrow partisanship.

I hope that some of these circumstances will be distributed to the broad masses in such a manner so that they themselves will realise that holding strain for two and a half years was in the end worth it.

3.50 p.m.

Sometimes the picture of onesidedness may appear. It was in 1977 in this same debate that the present Leader of the Opposition agreed that the country had to hold strain. He found it impossible then to complain about the policies which the Government was then pursuing and he is tied by those works in 1977. In other words, in 1977, Mr. Speaker, there was virtual unanimity on both sides of this House with the economic measures being pursued by this Government. Two years later the benefits are coming to light. I expect that by this time next year rather than unanimity there will be some disparity, some widening of the gulf between the Government and Opposition in this area, because I hope, even if cautiously, that from now on the Opposition will not find itself in a position to criticise the Government for unpopular measures even though they may have agreed at one stage. It was really interesting to hear today people refer to the measures taken; for example, the credit squeeze, as though that was something that was oppressive to the broad masses of people and not something that was done in the interest of the country. Perhaps it may tell us something about the patriotic nature of some of us in public life.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I keep saying in this House of Assembly that to my mind there were two positive steps taken within the last year or fifteen months for which this country in the future will owe a great debt to this party. I refer to the establishment of the National Bank of Barbados and the Insurance Corporation of Barbados, two organisations which I believe in time will have a tremendous impact upon the economic life of this country. Perhaps it is noteworthy, and I am saying it from a cursory glance at the Estimates, that there is no reference in these Estimates to the state of the National Bank. We cannot expect since the profits from the National Bank and the Insurance Corporation have to be paid into general revenue, perhaps it is asking too much, but I am sure that at some appropriate stage later this year we will be given a financial picture of the progress of the National Bank and the impact that the National Bank is making in economic matters in this country.

I see that as a positive step taken to close the gap between revenue and expenditure. I see the steps to cut down waste are also positive and I totally disagree with those on the other side who have scoffed at the fact that it has been said by the Prime Minister on more than one occasion that there has been a drop in the level of unemployment. The figures of 131 persons who were taken on on the National Housing Corporation staff at various levels between 1976 and November last year were not pulled out of a hat. These figures were given in this House of Assembly some months ago as a result of questions asked from the other side during a debate.

Nobody has bothered to consider that there has been an increase in the level of employment, for example, at the Transport Board, but I believe it is known that there have been additional drivers, conductors, mechanics, people cleaning buses, inspectors, and at various levels there has been this increase within the last two years, and certainly at the Housing Corporation I could say that the increase in employment was done with little cost to our budget, because we were getting slightly more in 1978 from Government for our programmes than in previous years. 1979 of course has seen a dramatic increase where the Estimates are providing for $8 million, and we would hope at the Corporation that we can supply the quantum of houses to satisfy the public that its money is being properly spent.

The thrust in housing, if I may follow the theme set by the hon. member for Christ Church East, has been deliberately programmed for 1979 and in the future for a very simple reason. It is not that the Government, the Ministry of Housing and the Housing Corporation do not appreciate the contribution which massive housing can make both to the quality of social life and the enhancement of the social environment as well as the unemployment position in Barbados, but it is a fact that before great investment can be made in housing at the Housing Corporation, a job of re-construction has to be done both administratively and at other levels before the Housing Corporation can feel itself capable of dealing with a massive injection of capital. We have not yet completed the job of reconstruction, but we have got substantially towards its completion and the two years that it has taken to clean up, restructure and so on in my submission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, were well spent because the lessons were there for all of us to learn.

Tourism has made a significant contribution to the health of general revenue in this country. This has not been haphazard. In other words, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the increase that we have got from tourism cannot in my view be equated with the increase from sugar prices of 1975. I think those were fortuitous circumstances, the high incidence of tourists which we now have has been the result of a deliberate attempt, if you like a deliberate attack on untapped markets, for example, I am thinking of Europe, by the Ministry of Tourism and the Tourist Board, and that the benefits which are now seen to accrue from tourism in the last couple of years have to be related to some positive decision on the part of Government to launch an attack on those areas which have hitherto not been traditional tourist centres from which tourists come to Barbados.

4.00 p.m.

The increase in revenue, Mr. Speaker, cannot be explained as hon. members on the other side may wish us to believe, in terms of an accidental increase. The increase in general revenue has been the result of careful planning, a deliberate policy and a recognition of the realities of public expenditure which determine the manner in which the people's money is spent in their best interest. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that even though the headline tomorrow may show "Government Records Surplus on Current Account $22 million; Capital Expenditure being Financed partially from Current Revenue; Government Foreign Reserves at $144 million." These would make very interesting reading for the public but it would be all loss if at the same time steps are not carefully taken to disburse some of this surplus in areas of greatest need.

I am not going to single out any at this stage. I am not going to trespass on the function of the Minister of Finance in looking at areas of the Budget except to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the electrification of every home of Barbados and the running of water to every home have been put up in two years where some of this money could be usefully channelled for social benefits but I would like to say that the level of taxation is not cripplingly high but is in need of overhaul because I believe that you reach the top a little too quickly and there is a disincentive because of the level of taxation for over-productive work.

The level of allowance needs over-hauling. There are other areas which I will not mention at this stage. There is a Resolution or Question before this House and at that time members will have a chance to deal with it. All taxation has not been the work of this Government and I would like to see this Government take positive steps to reduce certain levels of taxation or to provide certain eases in the system. I am not suggesting, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that taxation must be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion. I do not believe that anybody, even on the other side, would wish the Government to take three or four bites at taxation. It would be better if we could revamp our own system but I would do it fairly quickly because the burden of taxation is presently heavy on the broad masses of people in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, before I conclude, as I said at the beginning it was going to be a short contribution, I believe that there are areas in Barbados where the question of the Government's measures have not been able to reach because there has not been enough responsible public discussions on Government's position over the last years, but then you see, if the Government Information Service carries a programme you are accused of being partisan. What ever apparently is done to elucidate difficult matters, to established difficult economic ideas and concepts for the people is made by a criticism of partisan political broadcast. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I feel that the Government has the responsibility to let its citizens know its policies and I am not going to make any apologies if the people of this country through the media which they themselves help to maintain by their contribution in taxes, if they are given Government's

position in respect of economic matters and told what is the position of the country.
4.10 p.m.

In terms of balance of payments and foreign reserves, it is amazing to what extent the man in the street has little conception of what these things mean; and I think it is unfair to politicians to seek to deny the right of the public to receive information on technical matters purely because it comes from the Government side, because in seeking to deny the people that right we would be seeking to maintain the people in a state of ignorance and doing nothing to uplift their education and knowledge about what Government is doing. So I am not surprised that today there have been swipes made by members of the other side about the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. It has a public function to perform. You, Sir, are the Deputy Chairman of that Corporation and I am not going to attempt to tell you how it should be run, but I would just say that you can ignore some of the criticisms coming from the other side so long as we accept that the mass of the people have a right to know what is happening in the country.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps I should begin by saying that the year just past has been one of undoubted success for the people of Barbados in the economic management of this country's affairs, and anyone but the prejudiced, the purblind and the strictly partisan critics would congratulate the Government that has had the courage of its convictions to stick to measures that have brought success to the country as a whole. And it is but right that one should look at all the economic indicators to see whether or not this statement is correct, because it is very easy for people to make broad general statements based on hard economic indicators and come to conclusions which might sound rather high-falutin and convincing, but when examined against hard facts are nothing else but the restricted view of partisan power seekers. And it is because of this that I want to state some things that are undoubtedly true and backed not only by independent economic indicators of this country but also by economic analysis.

The first point that this country has to remember is that Barbados passed through a period of no growth, to the extent that the economy stagnated – the then Minister of Finance referred to the position as an economy besieged by stagflation. And anyone who would take the care to read the statements of the hon. member for St. John in 1974, 1975 and 1976 in particular, will see that he acknowledged that during the last three years of his management of the economy, what he described as external forces had resulted in a position of no economic growth in this country. If there is no economic growth, people cannot be better off, and it is a figment of the imagination of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to believe that between the period 1973 to 1976 – the first two quarters of 1976 in particular – that this country was better off. Indeed, it was worse off.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I believe that the burden of my argument was that during the period 1974–75 there was not a balance of payments crisis but that on the contrary there was a balance of payments surplus of $35 million in 1975 according to the Central Bank of Barbados. And in respect of growth in 1976, I quoted from the 1977 Budget of the Minister of Finance who indicated that there was growth in 1976 both in respect of the GDP and real output. Unless the hon. member is suggesting that that was due to the last four months of the year, he must concede that there was some element of growth in 1976. I took the chance – the only chance I have ever taken – of quoting the hon. member for St. Thomas.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The hon. member can well rely on the economic sense of the hon. Prime Minister, because since he has taken over the affairs of this country we have had three successive years of economic growth. Let us get that fact straight. The hon. member may look at any of the reports put out by the IMF or the World Bank and he will see that for 1976, particularly the last quarter, the economy performed, and he would see that in 1977 we had a growth rate of just under 5%. He will also see that this year we have had a growth rate of just under 5%. And the fact remains that, outside of Trinidad and Tobago and the Bahamas, Barbados is the only economy in the Caribbean that has shown real growth between 1976 and 1979, and no amount of ranting and misrepresentation will wipe out these facts. They are historical facts, not judgments, that the economy has continued to grow under this Government, despite all the prophets of doom in this country: And it has grown for several reasons, some of which are economic, some of which are psychological, and some of which are due to management. I will revert to these later. But the problem with the Opposition is that last year when the Opposition saw Estimates that were not in a deficit position, the then principal spokesman began by saying that the Minister of Finance had introduced measures that had worked. He said if the measures introduced were such as to reduce the deficit down to $6 million, he would have said that we took the problem of structural deficit firmly in hand. These measures have had a full year to work and the result is that they have brought down the deficit to a position where on Capital Account we are now showing and approaching a surplus; and on the analysis last year of the Shadow Minister of Finance, there should be congratulations to this Government that the measures which were considered necessary if we were to keep out of the hands of the IMF have worked; and they have worked for the total benefit of all Barbadians. That is why we go back to economic indicators, not merely shouting and ranting and trying to stir up emotions based on no proper analysis. The hon. member is trained in a

profession and should know that the people who eventually win arguments are not those who deal with emotions but those who can show hard facts.

Now when we took over the Government the per capita income was just under US$1,500; it is now just under US$1,800, on the basis of IMF statistics given to me only a couple of weeks ago.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. My understanding is that the figure was given by the IMF but there are certain local authorities who would put the figure BDS$100 lower.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I do not know what are the local authorities, but even admitting or assuming that the hon. member is right, it shows that there has been an increase in the per capita income in this country within two and a half years of the Barbados Labour Party taking over the Government, and with that knowledge he should never come in here and talk about people being worse off if he had any knowledge at all about economics.

There is a third factor. If the hon. member would follow international publications he would see that a recent World Bank survey of the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean shows that Barbados has the fairest distribution of income of any country in this Hemisphere, including the United States and Canada.
4.20 p.m.

So, that the disparities between those at the top and those at the bottom are not that great. Hence the Government's policy on wages to give more at the bottom and less at the top in order to bring the classes nearer together. Do not get up and shout. You are not outside on the political platform where there is no one to rebut your argument. You are here in the House of Assembly arguing with people with as much, if not greater capabilities than you acknowledge in economic affairs. That is the position that you are in. If the hon. member understands the first principles of economics, he would come in here today and try to find the areas in which he is going to make constructive criticism, and suggest to the Government the areas in which we can improve the economic growth at a faster rate.

Not those hon. members, Sir. They are so intent on wresting power regardless, that we can hear about Iran and about Koemeni. The next thing we will be hearing is about Bishop. Next you will be hearing as we were hearing from the People's Pressure Group; and the trend is quite clear in this country. They do not want performance or good management. Power is what they want, and they do not want to do it in the way that we understand. They quoted Iran as an example. It is very significant, Sir. The hon. member must understand that we will go forward with democratic institutions by the democratic process; and whatever differences there are between the two parties, we should never get to the stage where we quote examples that are most unfortunate if we are to have a true economic development and growth in this country. It is less than a week ago.....

Dr. HAYNES: If the hon. member would give way. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. I think that the hon. member is being a bit unfair in his construction of what I said. What I said was that the Hon. Prime Minister recently made the statement that you can have a poor Government in a rich country, and referred to the State of New York. I simply said that you can have rich Governments in poor countries and I referred to States like Iran. That has nothing to do with any revolution or anything of that kind.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I would be glad if the hon. member would assure us that he does not believe in revolution.

Dr. HAYNES: You have my full assurance.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am glad to hear that, and I hope that he will tell his supporters and his misguided adherents to follow that line too, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let us get back to the debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Before I move on to the next point, I want to puncture a few of some of the thoughts that the member has given here. The whole interest of the hon. member's speech was to try to say that the rule of the Democratic Labour Party was one characterised by no adverse economic conditions. Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was saying that the whole tenor of these statements of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central in this House is that during the period of the Democratic Labour Party rule there were no problems, no economic inequities, if you like; no serious economic deficits, no economic crises; not even in balance of payments.

The hon. member has not really read the document. If he would look at the statement of his present leader for the year 1974, on page 7 when he brought in the mini budget, the supplementary budget, he would see that the hon. member said that the primary purpose of the supplementary budget was because of the overall deficit in the balance of payments; and that while he had estimated the deficit on balance of payments at $3.4 million it proved wrong, and the actual deficit was $17.1 million and he was then forecasting $30 million for the year 1974. Let us deal with it. The position was that in 1973 and 1974 because of outside financial circumstances and internal financial management the Democratic Labour Party Government found itself being forced to come with a

mini budget because of balance of payments problems and the Barbados economy had started to reach crisis proportions.

The hon. member has not been in this House long enough to have at least at his finger tips a quick recall of some of the debates in this House, Sir, to be aware of the crisis that was mounting up in the Government. This was the time when the hon. member for St. John went on a sabbatical leave for a year at Yale leaving the Ministry of Finance in the hands of Mr. Philip Greaves, of whom whatever else you may say about him, you cannot really compliment him for an understanding of basic economics of a country, or indeed the Ministry of Finance.

He was warned then, that the balance of payments problem was getting out of hand, and if it was allowed to build up, in a few years Barbados would be paying the price for the lack of urgent measures. Read the debate and you will see what was Mr. Philip Greaves reply. He said that there was no problem. He said that we could not do anything about foreign exchange because we are part of the East Caribbean Currency Authority. He said that there was no necessity to amend the Exchange Control Act; and the other packages of measures that one would have associated with the proper management of the economy did not occur in 1973. It was only in late 1974 that the Government scrambled to bring in some measures.

In 1975 the Government was fortunate in that there was an extra windfall; but the measures had not been taken. It was not a question of good management. What good management? Sugar on the World Market had gone up in prices because there was the failure of the harvests in Cuba and Brazil; and anybody, even the worst economic manager at that time could have made some money out of sugar. It was a windfall and the Government then found itself with $28 million more. That is why it came out that year with a surplus and that the balance of payments was in a better position than before. It is not true to say as the hon. member was saying that as regards balance of payments no problems occurred in Barbados until the last quarter of 1976.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that I was most careful to point out that in a country that exports and imports.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it a point of order on which you rise, or to elucidate the point?

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member would give way.

Mr. SPEAKER: A point of order would be fraudulent. The hon. member will take his seat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member must know that they left the economy under strain. Let us come to the public debt. The hon. member gets up in here and makes a song and dance about the public debt. The public debt in this country is now being serviced with debt charges in the region of $10 million which is approximately 9% or less of the current revenue. Again I am going to quote from the hon. member's mentor, whom he hopes one of these days to succeed, other members on his side willing, and God allowing, Sir. This is what the hon. member said in 1973: "The cost of servicing the public debt....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please state what is the document for the benefit of the Hansard Reporter.

4.30 p.m.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: International experts and institutions in their official reports on the Barbados economy have observed that our debt servicing charges are well below acceptable levels for a developing country. It has been suggested that there is considerable scope for increase in the public debt. I want to start on that now. Here is the then Minister of Finance accepting that public debt of $8.7 million was very low. He accepts the recommendation of international experts, but when this Government seeks to follow these recommendations to their logical conclusion, in order to give some boost to the economy in the developmental aspects, we are being criticised that the public debt is going too high. Now the hon. member should understand that one of the things you have to do in the country if you are not generating enough surplus, and it is admitted that there were several areas in which we did not generate surplus, is that we must borrow from outside within acceptable international levels in order to finance development and stimulate economic growth in the economy, and therefore more jobs and better income for everybody. When the Government takes this measure, it is under fire. We are being told that we are mortgaging the country away. How is a country that is still servicing its debt within manageable proportions and well below accepted standards today for developing countries making a mistake by borrowing in the areas in which we have borrowed, particularly where some of the projects are projects which will continue well beyond the life of many of us in here and well beyond this century to the benefit of future generations? It is a mistake in basic public finance for any Government to believe that it can finance development completely out of surplus revenue because if it is doing so it is denying the present generation a higher economic standard and making them carry an undue burden of sacrifice to the benefit of future generations of their citizens. If the hon. member would read Press on Public Finance, and I will give him the volume as well because I sat at the feet of Dr. Press at that great Institution Christ College in the University of Cambridge in his lectures on public finance, if he would read an elementary textbook on this, he will see that the measures taken by the Minister of Finance in the last two and a half years has the blessing of well recognised

economic experts both at international level and at the regional level as well. Look outside of the IMF. I am talking about the authority on public finance in the western world, Dr. A. R. Press, a well recognised expert, and if the hon. member wants to come nearer home, he can read Mr. William Demas' book on The Economy of Small States to see that one of the basic points made is that it is politically cheap, it is politically inept to go ahead recommending on public platforms that we should not borrow in order to finance future development and present development for future generations provided you are within acceptable levels. So when the sound and fury of the hon. member's speech is analysed for what it is worth, it is taking up a series of things together, throwing them together as though they are worth anything, but when you point to the economic indicator they are really purely partisan, purely emotional and purely calculated to create an atmosphere in this country that people will believe that the Government is doing nothing so that the hon. member can ride his well known hobby horse of wanting power in 1981 or before, because they have this idea that they will get it before. That is all it is and they have been speaking of this on the platform, but I would have thought the hon. member in here would have been able to make a better speech.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain features of these Estimates that one has certainly to commend the Minister of Finance for, and it is that he has managed to get almost a perfect mix between social measures and true social developmental measures and economic measures which will show a growth in the economy, increase employment and at the same time provide whatever additional infrastructure that is necessary for the Government to go forth. I am not one of those at all who believe that in the year of surplus because you have some money you should take it and spend it on all of the good things of life and forget that there are other days which may not bring forth a surplus in their turn, and one of the things we have done in these Estimates, Mr. Speaker, is to try to find that true mix, for instance between providing $2 million in these Estimates for a seismological survey of this country to determine the true petroleum and gas reserves of Barbados and to place the accent on the development of the petroleum industry of this country, to cut down on the spending of foreign exchange in order to bring in additional exchange whilst at the same time promoting economic growth, and contrasting that, Mr. Speaker, with the provision on the other side, for example, of $400,000 under the Ministry of Education for free uniforms for children, something that the Democratic Labour Party keep telling people we will never carry out in the country.

Look at the balance of the Government. The Government on the one hand has its eye clearly set on the long term strategy for Barbados and the Government on the other hand is humane and firm enough to its promises to know that as soon as the country gets better, that when better days come better comes to people as well. It is important. There are other areas of these detailed Estimates that the policy of the Government in this respect can be clearly seen. Admittedly there are some constraints. There are constraints on the pace at which this Government can go in pursuing that policy. The hon. member for Christ Church East spoke of one such restraint, and he spoke of the absorptive capacity of the country to spend the money voted within the time allotted for spending that money, and he cited as the reason for this the lack of absorptive capacity of the civil service itself to respond in time, but with respect I would like to suggest that there is a constraint that is not only related to the civil service; it is the constraint of the country as a whole, a lack of perhaps enough experts, sometimes the provision of experts who may be the wrong experts, and Mr. Speaker, from these Estimates I will give you one such example, the sewage project which the Government made adequate provision for in the last Estimates to start; but what does the Government find it is confronted with? It is confronted with a feasibility study done by outside experts in the past administration that was so grossly incorrect that it had to be done all over again and causing already cost over-runs and extra cost on the whole project and a delay in implementation of the project as a whole.

Now that is a situation outside of this Government's absorptive capacity to spend the money provided if you want me to put it that way. Besides this, there are also other internal constraints. One of these internal constraints, Mr. Speaker, may not appear on the face of the Estimates as they stand very obvious to people, but one would be the state at which we can maintain in Barbados law and order, and that is why the Estimates for law and order are also important, because although by their nature they may not appear to be developmental, without the provision of adequate law and order no amount of spending in other sectors of the economy can go forth, and it is in this vein – I am sorry the hon. has gone because he is one of the closest friends of some of the people who today in this country are preaching in the way that they do not want basic fundamental stability to remain in Barbados and are getting very near to the line where they are calling for the overthrow of the Government and civil disobedience in the country.

I appeal to the hon. member for St. Michael North Central too. He gets carried away by his rhetoric sometimes, and I am appealing to him too in the interest of Barbados as a whole to make sure that his party has a clear understanding that any economic growth that will come to this country under us or under them or under anybody else will only come when there is basic stability in this country and respect for democratic forms of Government.

4.40 p.m.

No amount of preaching at this time will help to dissolve the capacity if they are preaching against maintaining basic stability. It is wrong for the Democratic Labour Party knowing that this Government has been democratically elected and they won their seat of power in a free and fair election to even want to condone anyone who would be preaching to over-throw a Government before 1981 by non-democratic means. There is no way that I would be so partisan in my view if I am a true lover of Barbados and a true patriot. There is no way that I could be reduced to that state of politics and I am appealing to them again that if they want the people to get the true benefits for this country on economic growth regardless of who it is, whether it is their legacy or credit we must both be firm in the view that we settle our differences by the Ballot Box, by our actions, by our acts, duties and persuasions and not by preaching to over-throw the Government prior to the year 1981.

Remember the slogan – I do not know if the hon. member for St. Michael North Central takes any credit for that slogan, but the slogan at the time of the by-election has some economic consequences relating to these Estimates too, Sir, and I want to bring them in. That type of politics should cease in Barbados for good and forever, Sir. We have 15 years in which to cross the Floor of the House of Assembly and properly on the platform. It is about time that I hear some support. I want the hon. members when they get up to talk on the Estimates dealing with the Police, Law and Order, Sir, not only to say what a good Police Force we have but to say that they will persuade some of their adherents that there is no way they should try to subvert the Police Force if we are to get a true economic development in this country.

I want to hear that loud and clear that they will stop their adherents preaching racial differences in the country to divide people on the basis of politics and race to the extent that the country cannot have an economic foundation to go forward. That is how I want to hear them debate the Estimates. I do not want to hear them merely talking about whether you should have machinery or toilet paper. I want to hear them on the fundamentals of Government and in what way we can protect the fabrics of our society if we are to make progress in Barbados. I want to see when there is a surplus we use that surplus not only with cogent measures but measures which can bring in stability as well in Barbados.

So, Sir, in coming to optimism, Government is optimistic about the future of this country. We are not prophets of doom or pessimists, Sir. Even under the strongest pressure and most unfair attacks that we have had since we have taken over the management of this country we have remained optimistic about the future of Barbados because we believe basically that anyone, one who is courageous enough to put his country first as against putting his Party's political interest first should be optimistic about Barbados. That is one of the reasons why we are optimistic. We are conscious enough to know that a drastic change in the external force or in the internal force could upset that balance. Let me give you an example, Sir.

Another rise in the price of oil before we can develop our own petroleum industry here can be very off-putting for this country. This year we will have to absorb the cost of an increase in petroleum prices and I would expect that on a subject such as this the hon. member for St. Michael South West would be talking about measures which would conserve energy and not trying to score political points to get a vote talking about there is no gas or even contemplating increasing the charges in this country.

Firstly, we have to tell the people that Barbados produces about 25% of its own oil needs. Secondly that the cost at which we buy oil is cost dictated by conditions outside and thirdly that we must therefore have a realistic local domestic price for it in the interest of not subsidising something which is not in many instances, not for everybody, a real necessity and fourthly in the interest of teaching people conservation measures, but that is not the politics of the Opposition. The politics of the Opposition is that 1981 or before, and I stress *before,* is critical for them. They are not interested in after 1981 but I always say, Sir, that they must understand one thing quite clearly. They must understand clearly that not only one person could set a fire and the moment they introduce into this country the sort of politics that we should never have heard of they would now be seeking to spur on people who are not as restrained as this Government has been, who are not as dedicated to the democratic process as we were in Opposition and who misguidingly might take them at their word and find themselves setting the second fire. That is all I want to say. I want to tell them quite carefully that they must understand that these are the advantages that we have in the Caribbean.

Sir, a significant feature of these Estimates that I would also like to draw attention to is the position on the increase in revenue and in particular I want to talk about the increase in revenue that has come from drilling in this country. This has not been highlighted. Under the Government there has been a significant increase in royalties being paid as a result of the increased activity in the petroleum industry. Hon. members must watch that this growth will continue because of the mix of policies which the Government has been pursuing.

Sir, I do not wish to go through in any detail any other aspects of the capital projects but anyone who reads the Estimates will see that in the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education, to cite two examples, that

you have a mixture between development and welfare, the mixture to which the hon. member for St. Michael East has mentioned and I would like to congratulate the first lady Minister in this country. I would like to congratulate her for the efficiency with which her Ministry manages projects. Within two year she has built two Poly-clinics, particularly the one in St. Peter is an outstanding example, Sir, of improving health conditions in this country and which is also a credit to the member who holds that seat, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael West most ably made those same points which the hon. Attorney General is now trying to enunciate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am sure that Your Honour will welcome from the position you have there a development which has taken place in the constituency which is so near and dear to Your Honour's heart, Sir. Even without these Estimates, Sir, one has again here a definite indication for further development in the field of health in education and the primary schools. There is a tremendous amount of money being voted for starting construction of new primary schools in this country, not only providing basic education for the future development of this country but at the same time providing part of the mix of welfare and so it is throughout the whole of these Estimates instead of hon. members getting up trying to say that they cannot accept figures from this Government, instead of they getting up and querying whether the Trent School is in Zone 1 (that is all they can say) and instead of getting up and saying that there is no new thing in the presentation of the Estimates for next year, I believe they ought to get up and say that we are thankful that we are Barbadians, let us all now join with the Government in constructive suggestions in improving what we have so that Barbados can go forward with the basic democratic stability, economic growth and equality and distribution of income which all of us want for our Island.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is there any hon. member who wants to exercise his right in contributing to this debate today? The Minister of Finance may wind up.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his modest but distinguished contribution to the debate. At one stage I thought he was saying that reducing expenditure had led to unemployment but I realised that what he was saying was that reducing expenditure leads to unemployment but he was conceding that it had not led to it in this case.

4.50 p.m.

Honourable members have said a great deal about expenditure and its reduction. I think that although it has proved in the past to be a superior tactic to tell civil servants over and over that they are an army of occupation and to explain their shortcomings to them at some length and with much abuse, I would prefer on this occasion to eschew the politics of brutality and adopt the politics of praise, because I think that the most remarkable thing about the surplus that has been achieved on this occasion is the reduction of expenditure without any reduction in services. You see, Sir, it is very easy, especially if you have the sort of personality that allows you to convince yourself of fundamental falsehoods, to make yourself believe the most outrageous lies and then repeat them with conviction to an audience. It is one thing to be like that and to say in such a context as the debate today that the services of the Government have been reduced. The current services of the Government have not been reduced. We have paid an upgraded old age pension and yet achieved a reduction of expenditure; we have paid the civil servants an increase and yet achieved a reduction in expenditure. I have seen the Ministry of Communications and Works, except in the area of roads where they are held down by materials rather than human resources, complete a post office, clean and drain ten times as many wells as last year and still reduce expenditure. It was an astonishment to me when I realized that public officers in the Ministry of Communications and Works were so uplifted by the progressive leadership which they had got from the two Ministers during the financial year that they could point to areas where services to the public have been increased and yet less money has been spent. I pick out drainage because that was the most spectacular of all. They reduced expenditure by 40% and multiplied their output by 60%. They have carried out flood control works all over Barbados. I could hardly believe it. It was only when they told me that they had employed a contractor from St. Thomas to do the main part of the work that I appreciated the effort they had made.

But it is not only that Ministry; there are other Ministries where a serious effort has been made, and in statutory corporations. The Ministry of Housing was constantly tormenting the Ministry of Finance for the first six months for money for loans etc., but we have seen a transformation. For twenty years there were no new houses built in St. Thomas, but go to Bagatelle now and see the houses going up there.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to see them going up in St. Peter too.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I have no doubt, Sir, that major works will be carried on in St. Peter. And when we hear about a reduction of services, where have these services been reduced? That is the trouble, picking on a phrase, true, false or in between and repeating it as if it is part of the external truth. The statements are delivered in exactly the same amount of

conviction, and I would advise a certain hon. member that you can get respect a long way on conviction alone, but you will never get the respect of colleagues who understand if you insist on repeating with all the force at your command things that are not true. You will never get anywhere unless you add a little truth to your conviction and a little honesty to your judgements – I am speaking of political honesty.

But getting back more particularly to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He raised particular points and I want to deal with them, that is, points about the Public Service. I would join with him in praising the good quality of the staff of the Ministry of Finance. Certainly in the matter of the Estimates I have been marvelously served by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Finance, by the brilliant team of young budget analysts we have, and by everybody in the Ministry of Finance who has contributed to the expenditure control system that we have instituted this year. But the hon. member seems to be saying that if you have good quality staff no more need be said. But the hon. member misses one point. He also had the good quality staff but what use did he make of it? If the staff is the same good staff but the performance is better, to whom should the praise go? I say no more on that.

On the unemployment levy, the hon. member is premature. Claims for refunds of the unemployment levy only had to be submitted last week and therefore it is impossible for me to say that the unemployment levy has not achieved it purpose. If I was like the hon. member for St. Michael South Central I would say that there are several financial authorities in this country who have told me that the firms in Bridgetown are going to get back all of the unemployment levy, and I challenge the other side to deny that. If I was the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that is how I would deliver the information, and the difference between his delivery and mine would be that my information would be correct, because many people are not going to make returns. A major firm a conglomerate which deals in manufacturing and has a car agency, has indicated to the Ministry of Finance that it will call for the refund of the entire levy. There are several retail businesses in Broad Street that have also indicated their claims for the refund of the entire levy. I do not believe I will have complete figures by Budget time, but certainly claims are coming in now. The date for claims is March 15 and therefore none of us can say – I am not even going to speculate – I have already set this year's targets for the increase in employment that will be required to get a refund of a levy; it will not be as much as 8% for the year, but it will be cumulative to 1977.

5.00 p.m.

The full report on the levy cannot be dealt with at this stage and therefore I think that the hon. member's remarks are premature. He spoke of the Sugar Industry. It may very well be that employment has declined. I have not got the figures in my head; but the point which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition perhaps missed is that the Employment Levy deals not only with employment *per se,* but with under-employment. The crop last year was a short crop. This year will be a longer crop. If you employ a smaller number of people for many more weeks, as is likely to happen this year, in all probability will be able to make a claim for a refund of the levy, although that will apply to the Sugar Industry next year.

The hon. member dealt with new equipment and vehicles for the Police and matters such as that. I am as aware as the hon. member is of what he said. However, Sir, in Government over the years the rules which regulate Civil Service procedure have become very adverse to productivity, and indeed to discipline in some cases in certain departments of Government. Charges are made to me, that for example, in the workshop of the Ministry of Communications and Works there are drivers who deliberately report their vehicles damaged and they choke up the workshop's facilities because, Sir, there is no penalty whatsoever attached to driving a damaged vehicle. If you bring in your vehicle and you know that it will have to wait four days to be repaired, it means generally that the senior drivers sit down and draw pay for those four days.

I heard the former Minister indicate that people have been known to do it for as long as three years. I do not know how that was arrived at, but I understand what the hon. member is getting at; but an effort has to be made on this business of vehicles which are said by their drivers – you cannot lay them off. You cannot lay off a driver who brings in a vehicle when all that it needs is a kingpin. If you could lay him off until the vehicle is repaired, he would get it repaired quickly; but if the vehicle takes its turn for a minor repair with vehicles which need major repairs that driver has an interest in reporting the vehicles sick. He does not have to do his own sick out. He has a truck to sick out for him.

In the circumstances we are trying our best to improve conditions in the workshop of the Ministry of Communications and Works; but I think that to take away the real grievance, we must replace that part of the other trucks which the senior people say are no longer working on the road, even though somebody may buy them who will spend more time and trouble on them. That is possible under the conditions at the vehicle workshop. We have to replace them.

As far as the Police vehicles are concerned, we have been giving some thought to the question of Police

vehicles, and indeed the Ministry of External Affairs has made a request for a VIP vehicle. We have had a lot of difficulties in Barbados when there were two state visits recently. We had the President of Venezuela, and no proper car to put him in. We had Mr. Callaghan, and again no proper car to put him in. At one stage, Sir, the present Datsun which bears the number M 50 was handed over to Mr. Callaghan. My private car, a Granada, was called into service, and the private car of the Minister of External Affairs had to be called in to drive the members of Mr. Callaghan's delegation and I had to borrow a car from the President of the Barbados National Bank to drive, Sir, because both M 50 and my personal vehicle were being used for other purposes.

That was when the other car, Austin Princess, broke down. I know, Sir, that people in Barbados are against ostentation; but there is no doubt that we need a VIP car. I am not talking about a Rolls Royce, the landing cost of which in Barbados would be a $1¼ million. I am not talking about anything like that. I am not even talking about perhaps a Jaguar or even a big Mercedes, Sir. What we are currently thinking about is looking to the United States where large motor cars of a suitable sort are available at a much lesser price. We are looking to see if we can get them converted to right hand drive. Perhaps we could buy Plymouths or Cryslers. We have quotations of $5,000(US) where we have been voting $20,000 for ordinary Police cars and $30,000 for VIP cars; and indeed I believe that there is to be a move in vote to bring up to $45,000 for VIP cars. We are thinking now, I believe of a Plymouth or a Cadillac for VIPs because people do not seem to realise that it costs no more to bring in a suitable Cadillac to Barbados than to bring in a Peugot; and certainly much less than to bring a Mercedes or a Jaguar.

I think that the hon. member for St. Michael South West would be aware of the economics of what I am saying. Therefore it is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition should raise the question of Police vehicles. We are seeking to buy Police cars which would come much cheaper, the same type of cars that are used for Police work in the USA, perhaps Cadillacs or Lincolns which again would be no more expensive than some of the smaller cars which have been bought by the Government. That is something to which hon. members will know that their words are falling on fertile ground.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West – I only wish to take issue with him a little bit on the question of solar cooling. Someone told me that the hon. member for St. Michael South West was out for a "duck"; but I was too engaged in the heat of the day to realise that the scorers had not credited him with even one nought. On the question of solar cooling, the hon. member must realise that the question of solar heating does not depend only on technology; it depends on the cost of electricity in the country where you sell it cheaper; and in Arizona the electricity is still cheaper than all the bricks and mortar which is what it comes down to.

The scheme of the Minister of Agriculture, when it came out, it was an integrated scheme because we were advised that we were still purchasing types of solar cooling collectors which could be made right here in Barbados because the foundries that exist the technology is familiar to the foundry worker. These are the things that we are aiming at. We have one type at Graeme Hall, another type at Flodden and yet a third type was demonstrated to the Training and Priorities Committee on Friday morning. It ran a little fan for the conference room. It played a cassette and it burned a light – a solar power unit which again apparently with the electronic knowledge that we have already in Barbados – can be made here for the purpose. I have one in my house and if any hon. member wants to see me put it in the sun and see it turn a wheel, he can do so. These can be made in Barbados, and I deprecate the statement by the hon. member that we should avoid research and technology here in Barbados. Barbados, for example, has a proven record....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I never indicated that we should not do research and development in Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, I am sorry that I misunderstood the hon. member; but I was going to say that in the field of sugar technology Barbados led the world for 70 years. The USA sent to Barbados for assistance when they were planting up St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands before the First World War, and that was because there were Barbadians sufficiently talented in the condition of those days to concentrate on something that it was important to do well; and they did it well.

5.10 p.m.

They did it well and I believe that something like solar cooling and especially the combination of solar power and wind power for which I am told Barbados is exceptionally favourably placed, because we may not have the sunshine of Saudi Arabia or even Arizona and we do not have the wind of Scotland or Tierra del Fuego, yet we have a combination of both which gives some promise of technological advance for the non-petroleum power field in the future.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central.... as I say you really have a difficulty when somebody talks economic nonsense with as much conviction as the hon. member because the difficulty is this: there are always people including the hon. member who will

think that because he is a Barbados Scholar, because he has attained a certain position in a reputable profession that what comes out of his mouth on other subjects must be of some importance, and at any time when he has wound himself up I fear for his health sometimes, and I think he should consult his colleague on his left, but when he has wound himself up, anything he says no matter how outrageous comes out with the same force as one or two of the statements he slips in between which are accurate, straightforward and of some weight. I did not hear any of these today, but I have heard them upon occasions. But on what possible basis can the hon. member say, as he says in here over and over again and on platforms that Barbadians are worse off than they were? Does the hon. member want to tell me that a maid who in 1975–76 in the Government Service was getting $2,412 a year which is $41.50 a week, who is now getting $84 a week, an increase of more than 80% at a time when the cost of living for over the same period April 1975 to March 1978 has gone up 25% is worse off? He would be jumping up and down and it is nonsense to say so. You know that this argument is faithfully parroted by a gentleman whom I understand claims that he talks for three people every day: he says he talks for Cameron Tudor, Branford Taitt and Richie. I believe by Branford Taitt he means the hon. member for St. Michael South West and I believe by Richie he means the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I am referring to Mr. Eric Sealy. You see, Mr. Eric Sealy repeats these words as though they are true.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, did the hon. member say that the gentleman tells him that he speaks to us? Is that what he says, because I do not myself know that he speaks for me every day or any part of any day, but obviously he must speak to him because he said he tells him that he speaks to three people.

Mr. SPEAKER: It may not be every day, so let us get on with the debate.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Before the cock crows twice thou shalt deny me this night, Peter. Remember that, Mr. Speaker, before the cock crows twice. At least hon. members are aware of the fact that their names are Richie, James and Cameron, but no part of their names include Peter.

Anyway, Sir, I myself am prejudiced in this matter because I am in the Government, but it does seem to me that none of us is doing a service to Barbados to try to make people believe that they are worse off than they are and that they have discontent when they may really not have a discontent. But there is another area too in which I would wish that those responsible for dealing with the debates in the House and presenting them to the public could analyse very carefully the speeches by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. If I contradict him I can pick up the Central Bank Report. He may not pick up one: he will get up and say, as he said today, that an unnamed financial authority told him in a document which he does not have in the House today that something is a fact, but it does not matter that he does not name the authority or produce the document. I can name him, I can produce the document, the man himself can say "yes, he told me so and gave me the document", but the public will say that is one politician quarrelling with another and the public will not give the same weight to denials of nonsense which come from this side as they will give to a sober outside analyst who takes on these things. I have never seen Mr. Wendell McClean, for example, deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. The reason is that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central does not say anything serious enough for it to be worthwhile an analysis of an economist at the University, but it is a pity because those economists who have taken a political role in exactly the same way that they kept us on our toes and the Leader of the Opposition on his toes when he or we talk economic nonsense in the days before 1976, and all of us make a slip sometimes, in the same way that they kept us on our toes and in the same way the other University economists deal with this, I believe that they should start looking at the utterances of some hon. members on that side. The impact of the University has modified the utterances of the hon. member for St. Michael South West, one can say muted to some extent, where he no longer makes any statements far less false ones. He makes no statements either true or false, but we have to go through this. .

Can the hon. member for St. Michael South Central really say that a year ago we all agreed that we were seeing Government poverty in the midst of public prosperity and a year later we are seeing Government prosperity in the midst of public penury? Does anybody in here really believe that Barbadians are worse off than they were this time last year? I heard about rising prices, but under the hon. member for St. Michael South West when inflation in the United States was 11% he made it 40% in Barbados. It is 10% in Britain at the moment, 11% last year; it is 9% in the United States, it is 10% in Barbados. In other words, we have brought rises in prices down to international levels and still we hear rising prices. Do you tell me that a maid who in the same 1975 – get back to her – if she wanted to buy rice it cost 55 cents a pound, it is down to 46 cents now. If she wanted to buy stew beef which was costing $2.20 it can be bought for $1.80 now and she has twice the wages. Do you honestly mean to tell me she is worse off? What kind of madness are we indulging ourselves in in taking this kind of argument seriously? At least the young man who has gone to the

University now who used to work in the Central Bank who conclusively proved in the Advocate that the entire fault for the decline in the foreign reserves in 1976 was the fault of Dr. Courtenay Blackman at least had a thesis which was developed, and at the end of it, as I said in here, you had to admire him. It was a remarkable piece of work to produce I think a fair amount of nonsense and to print so successfully at least. Now at this time onions were costing 80 cents under the hon. member. They are price controlled now 50 cents part of the season and 40 cents another. Sweet potatoes 75 cents; they are costing 35 cents now.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the Hon Prime Minister is perhaps inadvertently misleading the House. Onions were price controlled during all the time I was a Minister and if he would check in 1975 the price of onions came down from 40 cents. It is in the Statutory Instruments which he may ask somebody to bring for him. To say that the price of onions was 80 cents would be to mislead this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not like to disagree with people on questions of fact. When the price of onions began to skyrocket about two years ago I called in the Price Control Officer, it was still Mr. Grosvenor then, and I said this is a lot of damn foolishness; I had made a speech on the air and I said I was going to insist that locally produced foods be price controlled, and I was told then that onions were never on control and it could never be done, and I said just get it done by next week for me.
5.20 p.m.

This is something that happened. Whether they were ever price-controlled in the past and Mr. Grosvenor lied to me is a different matter. I know there was no price control when we came into power and they told me they could not price-control them and I made it more or less an issue of the Price Control Department or me and in the end I won. The same was true with sweet potatoes. I do not want to clarify if this is a fact because I do not want to go and read back the things now but I am going to have what the hon. member said checked and out whoever put it out in print that they were not price controlled before, if that is so, and I do not think the hon. member is right. The hon. member may be speaking of a guaranteed price for farmers which is a different question of price control to consumers but it will be checked.

I know there were no price controls in September 1976. That I am sure of, but anyhow, Sir, that may be onions. There is a whole set of things. The ten fundamental things which the Department of Statistics publishes in the List of Items, in all the Abstracts of Statistics if you search them you will see chicken was down in price from five years ago. The same maid was paying a $1.80 for chicken in 1975, she can go to Goddards's Supermarket, Kensington Food Fair and other Supermarkets and get it at a $1.59 per pound this weekend. Corned Beef that the *Advocate* never bothered to comment on when the price was reduced but they put it on the front page when the price control was taken off, we came in and we found Corned Beef controlled at the maximum price of $2.60. We reduced the maximum control. There were a number of brands for the spread but that was the maximum. We reduced the maximum to $1.60. You cannot tell me that a maid who if called upon to buy the best Corned Beef in 1975, I do not think it was $2.60 in 1975, it would have been $2.20, but she had two full years to buy Corned Beef at $1.60 under the Barbados Labour Party and she has had an increase in salary to buy it with so do not tell me that prices have gone up so as to drag down people.

The hon. member said that the National Debt was $14.5 million a year over a 15-year period. That might be true. I do not know, but, Sir, the sort of statistics that he used he cannot then contradict me when I tell him that it is only $16 million a year over an 18-year period. The National Debt could go up now. The National Debt is $365 million, or whatever it is, divide it by 25. I could well say it is only $13 million over a 25-year period. That is a question of the misuse of statistics to make a furious point. Let me go back to the beginning of the century. Let us go back 19 years. The National Debt was only $4 million a year over a period of 19 years. All of that are ways of using statistics to inflate people.

I see something else. What is this? "The major component in planning had to go on in getting the sugar prices of 1975?" Many claims have been made for the Leader of the Opposition. Many claims have been made for the hon. member for St. John, but for the first time in my life I have heard a claim made for the hon. member for St. John that he created the weather conditions which ruined the sugar crops in Europe in the winter of 1974/75, which caused difficulties in Cuba in the same 1974 and which therefore sent the world's sugar prices skyrocketing. I never thought I would live to hear the hon. member saying that major planning had to go into getting the high sugar price in 1975.

I know the hon. member for St. John has at times stood to his Party like a Moses but Moses only received the Ten Commandments. I did not know the hon. member has been elevated to the stage now where he is actually writing the Ten Commandments. Greater love has no man...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. member will give way. I believe that I immediately clarified that statement to say that "a major component

of planning of the marketing of the sugar had to take place in order to get the full benefit of the increase in the prices in that year." Any Government could be faced with that and there is nothing harmful about that. At least you can grant the former Minister of Trade some intelligence in every way.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The former Minister of Trade is appealing for light from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Alright, I will give him some light, but you know something, Sir, if I felt that the sugar planters in this country were so incompetent that they had to be a major exercise in planning to get them to sell sugar for the best price they could get for it then when I look at it that they would be no sugar estates left. If the hon. member for St. Michael South West cannot understand the nature of the flattery that may be brought to bear on him by the Commission Merchants, and the Sugar Producers – I will never forget one afternoon seeing them all trying their best to reach a certain part of the section at the opening of the BARPAC Factory in St. Thomas, but honestly, Mr. Speaker, I saw all these gentlemen, I may be wrong in thinking that they had anything to do with the Commercial and Mercantile Community but they all appeared to me to be very fair of skin and they were 20 or 30 of them all in one place and when I looked I saw a tall, commanding, dark figure in the middle of them and it was the hon. member for St. Michael South West, but he did not understand that the fair words which were being given to him at that moment that perhaps their respect for his intellect, qualities and capacity as Minister of Trade were less than his own respect for himself.
5.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, I really do not want to deal with these personal matters so I will go on. In 1977 the Government was forced to introduce a series of economic measures. Wage restraint was one of them. Wage restraint was never set at 5% permanently; it was 5% for a year, and it was always said that this limit would not apply at the bottom, but I have been in politics too long to expect one's opponents to respect the truth of statements which are made.

The hon. member said that the surplus resulted from an increase in taxation; the hon. Leader of the Opposition said it did not; the two of them will have to have that out between themselves. I think there is little doubt that the surplus partly results from what the Leader of the Opposition used to call the general buoyancy of the economy. Yes, we did not draw down the IMF compensatory facility; yes, we did have more foreign debt, almost as a matter of deliberate policy: I will not run away from that; if you use up your domestic funds in financing your deficit; you will find you are withdrawing from the economy what could be used to finance economic activity in the country. There is always a very grave danger in doing that and you will find that you are creating deflationary conditions in which unemployment will grow. There is little doubt that this was the situation back in 1974 and 1975; the funds were being withdrawn from the economy when there were no funds available for credit purposes for many years. The Central Bank in 1976 allowed $12 million or $13 million to go into the economy by financing the sugar trade.

As I said, some people argue that the balance of payments crisis in 1976 was caused by the Central Bank injecting this money into the economy at the beginning of the year and creating inflationary conditions; others have argued that the consumer boom at the end of 1976 caused it. What I know is this, that by 1976 people were fed up with austerity, with not having money in their pockets to spend. Public officers had just got a 35% increase and there was a lot of money in the economy when we came into power in the form of an immediate salary increase. But the economy had underlying faults and the Government was in a particularly weak financial position because the Government had taken its money and put it into circulation. But not this Government. And to imagine that the foreign reserves position in September 1976 could have been caused by a Government coming into power on September 2nd, 1976 would have to be the imagination, because there is nothing I could have done to bring goods into the Island that were ordered before I was Prime Minister; a motor car does not come into the Island overnight; it takes three, four or five months.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, if the hon. Prime Minister would look into the economic and financial statistics he would note that it was in November and December of that particular year.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What documents are you referring to?

Dr. HAYNES: The economic and financial statistics of the Central Bank of Barbados for February 1979. The hon. Prime Minister would see that the major problem with the balance of payments was something like minus $19 million in December that year, if my memory serves me correctly.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's memory is not correct. In September, 1976 the reserves fell $11½ million; in October a further $10½ million; in November $6 million; in December $9 million. The months that the reserves really fell in 1976 were September and December; I don't think the hon. member can really blame me.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, Sir. I am talking about imports, exports and re-exports for that period that would be reflected in the fall of these reserves. If you look at page 65 you will see what I am talking about there.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Page 65 does not itemize the months for 1976. There are no records on page 65 for November and December; you are not telling the truth; you are referring to page 61. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is mistaken. The hon. member is talking about page 61; I have the volume in my hand. But no matter what was the situation with the actual import, imports increased in the third quarter of 1976. The hon. member cannot believe that the change of Government could have made motor cars come into the country in 1976. There is no motor car sold up to February 1977 that was ordered while this Government was in power. Does the hon. member think that because of a change of Government something happens overnight? If the hon. member has some other statistics other than those at page 65 or page 61, I shall be happy to look at them.

The hon. member earlier on was talking about imports and exports generally. Somewhere else I have read of the hon. member for St. Michael South West making a point about the movement on Current Account and that the balance of payments current account – the visible balance – was still deteriorating. I do not know if he used those exact words but that was the burden of what he said. Those are the terms in which people who have a little understanding of trade figure argue. They do not invent figures and give you false pages to read from. Where the hon. member for St. Michael South West may have fallen down is that he fails to understand that we can afford a little deterioration, that is, you can afford more imports if you have more tourists. If tourist spending goes up you can import more goods into the country because the tourist spending is not part of the visible trade balance; it is invisible. As I say, it can be dealt with in those terms but not in the terms being put forward by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

So I do not believe any useful purpose will be served by my going on to discuss a speech which quotes from an anonymous adviser and from documents which are not there, or at least quotes what is not in the document. I do not think any useful purpose will be served by pursuing the crisis of understanding. Honourable members have had an opportunity to see which of the twenty four members of this House suffers most seriously from a crisis of understanding.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a long debate on this matter and I would like to thank all hon. members who contributed to it and I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I believe it is customary as we are about to go into discussion on the Estimates to get an indication of the working hours which we can anticipate. I wonder if the hon. Leader of the House can give us some indication how he proposes to operate during the next four or five days; for example, what time we will begin, the usual arrangements for work, etc.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, when I am ready to suspend the Sitting members will be informed how I plan to conduct the business.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with how Government plan to indicate how it will conduct its business. I am dealing with a convention in this Honourable House; it has nothing to do with Government. It is a convention that when we are discussing the Estimates we are informed what the working arrangements are.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have been in here twelve years and there is no convention. I am acting Leader of the House and I will say when we will come back and when we will stop it is as simple as that.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I accept what the hon. member says, because it falls into the same category as the starvation mentality.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Give me a moment please; I just want to check this convention in terms of last year's procedure.
5.40 p.m.

I do not find on Page 567 of last year's debate for Tuesday, 14th March, any such indication of a convention.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that the Clauses of the Bill be postponed.

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

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

HEAD 1 – GOVERNOR GENERAL

Head 1 – Governor General was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to move that Head 1 – Governor General for the sum of $121,583 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Before you put the question, Sir, there is a small point under this item of Library. We see, that for one person there is a substantial amount of money in relation to what one considers is voted for large numbers of children attending schools in this country. You will find if you look at the question of schools when it comes down to the amount voted for large numbers of children in the schools for library purposes, it is rather small; and in the case of one individual we see a vote of $2,000 being voted for library purposes. Could the Prime Minister explain to us what is the reason, or what is intended to be obtained by this sum of money? I ask that because I would like to believe that there are enough books already at Government House; and we would like to know what other books, whether new books or replacements will be acquired by this sum of money.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Sir, there is a regular vote of about $1,000 a year for the library at Government House which includes subscriptions to newspapers. It costs quite a great deal to subscribe to overseas newspapers, and that is the main burden of the vote. Last year a sum of money was voted for a set of encyclopaedias; and these were not bought last year, and it is intended that they should be bought this year; but in giving this explanation, I would just say that it is unfortunate that this little query is couched in the form of a suggestion that a lot is being done for an individual while school children are being deprived.

The hon. member uses the words "purchased for an individual". When encyclopaedias are bought for Government House – the Encyclopaedia Britanica to replace other encyclopaedias at Government House, they are not being bought for an individual. They are being bought for Government House and not for any individual who happens to be living there. The Governor General has an office. He holds Privy Councils in his office. He has advisors who advise him on certain functions in which he has discretion to act under the Constitution. These matters require works of reference. I believe that you will find that most Government Houses throughout the Commonwealth are provided, not only with reference books and encyclopaedias, but they are provided with the Laws of different Commonwealth countries; and many of them I think, you will find provided with Law Reports even so that the Governor General's legal advisors can give him legal advice right there *in situ* without having to refer to other departments.

I do not think that in a year when we are spending $448 million that we should grudge the Government House of this country a set of the Encyclopaedia Britanica.

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

HEAD 2 – PARLIAMENT

Head 2 – Parliament for the sum of $745,176 was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 2 – Parliament – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question, I would like to begin by saying that one has to give some credit for the improvements which have taken place in this Chamber so far; but I would like to point out that in my estimation there is still room for a lot of improvements. I was passing up the steps today, Sir, and I was a bit disturbed by aroma which one runs into ascending the steps as you come into this Hon. Chamber. That aroma comes obviously from the lavatories nearby and I would like to draw this to the attention of the House because I think that something should be done about it. It is not nice. I am being told by a member on my left that there was no water available and maybe that was the reason why that aroma was pervading the air; but it was very disturbing; but it appeared to me that if the water got turned off some other action could have been taken to prevent this type of thing from going on.

Going a step further, Sir, I would like to say something where the office of Clerk of Parliament is concerned. For a long time we have been having an acting Clerk of Parliament, and I would like to know what are the reasons why no steps have been taken to appoint someone to this post; and at the same time whether or not they are going to make this post full time. I think that it is very important to the proper conduct of the affairs of this Parliament that someone should be appointed to this post and that the post be made a full time post. There are a lot of matters on which we need information and the assistance of the Clerk if we are going to carry out our responsibilities in the way that we should to the credit of the House and also to the people

of this country. I think that it is important that particular attention should be paid to this office.
5.50 p.m.

At this particular time I would like to hear from the Hon. Prime Minister in his reply what provisions are being made for further improvement of the House of Assembly, what steps will be taken to have the post of Clerk of the House filled permanently and things relating to the particular post.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a few words about one thing in particular. I think the Leader of the House spoke on it today already, but since I have been a member of Parliament, on more than one occasion we have come to Parliament to find that the amplifying equipment does not work and there does not seem to be any improvement. Who is responsible I really do not know, but I can tell you that if this had happened at the Hilton or at Sandy Lane or any other business house in Barbados with the directors, or they had a convention or seminar like how we assemble here this morning for the important matter of the Estimates to find that the equipment was not working, there would be very serious action taken. We in Parliament must not sell ourselves short. This is the most important office that any person can be honoured to hold in this country and to come in here on three or four occasions and find the equipment not working is an insult to the members of Parliament. Whoever is responsible, whether it is the Clerk or the Acting Clerk of the House, should make absolutely certain that this does not happen in this House again.

I am very pleased and I support the hon. member who just spoke on the improvements in Parliament. I would also say that I believe it is time that the arrangements for the bar and the dining room be separated because I am sure that many a member of Parliament would like to have someone visit him to have a drink with him, but not necessarily to go in the dining room. It is somewhat embarrassing to have a drink standing up; you can hardly sit. If you sit down then you are at the dining table. I would hope those responsible would make better arrangements for members of Parliament to be able to see one of their constituents or someone else on parliamentary affairs or business, and for those reasons I do hope that those who are responsible will improve these arrangements in the near future.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, just a few brief comments. I believe I was referred to as a neophyte or some similar thing at an earlier stage. I do not mind. The point is that perhaps someone who has recently been in here would probably not have got as accustomed to certain practices as others who may have been here for some time.

One of the things that has struck me very forcibly in respect of Parliament, Mr. Chairman, is the absence of research assistance particularly for members of Parliament on this side and back benchers on the other side. Ministers of course would have access to their staff, and I think that this is an area that we should look into for the future, the question of research assistance for members of Parliament, maybe allocating one or two such persons on a full-time basis to assist in that area. I imagine this would be a matter for the future.

There is another area that worries me. We are required to put in our questions and resolutions and so on by 12.30 p.m. on Friday, and not infrequently these things are still being processed at 12 o'clock or so on Tuesday when you arrive at the House. This ties in somewhat with the frequent late arrival of the Order Papers which often comes if you are lucky on a Friday or a Saturday, and I myself find that I usually require more time to properly research matters in order to participate in a debate on the following Tuesday. And I wonder whether this whole business of the time interval between the delivery of the Order Papers and the actual debate could not be extended somewhat in order to give hon. members more time to research and discuss these matters with interested groups in the community and so on. I believe that if these two steps were taken that that would make a major contribution to the standard of debates within Parliament.

There was one other point I wanted to make. I am not quite certain whether this is the appropriate time to make such a point, but there has been some considerable public disquiet over certain provisions of the Legislature (Privileges, Immunities and Powers) Act where one or two particular clauses of that Act affect the freedom of speech of individuals outside and also in terms of the acceptance of certain principles relative to this Parliament which in Barbados does not constitute a court, but person who commit an offence under that are tried in another jurisdiction, and there appears to be some conflict in that area. I am not a legal luminary in that area but from information received and from my own reading of the matter, it would seem to me that there is a discrepancy in relation to that particular section which I think is section 35(1), and I wonder whether the time has not come when that particular bit of legislation should not be looked at anew, because I believe that it is likely to lead to further problems in the future. I am sure that we have many lawyers in here better capable of elucidating on a matter like this, but I understand when such breaches are transferred to different jurisdiction, then such concepts as *mens rea* etc. arise. I do not want to get into that kind of thing, that is not my area, but you can see that I have been giving some thought to the subject and I hope that something can be done in that area if it is at all necessary.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak on Item 9 – Supplies and Materials. You will see that the explanatory note to Item 9 states that it provides for photo-copying paper, stationery, books and publications, first-aid supplies and incidentals for Parliament and the office of the Leader of the Opposition. I just want to make my position clear, because first I should like to say that the office of the Leader of the Opposition is open for inspection by any member of Parliament at any time to justify the expenditure which is supposed to be voted in here. Unfortunately I do not have a key to the office of the Leader of the Opposition. The key was last in the possession of the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance and he did not do like Brother Bruce and hand over the keys to the new incumbent, but I have not asked the Clerk of Parliament to change the locks or anything like that. The office is opened by a young lady who was also appointed by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. That does not bother me because although she hails from the Prime Minister's constituency, she too has to live and we have no intention of seeing that either that lady or her four children suffer the ignominious fate which has been sub-tended by the Acting Leader of the House for members on this side. Be that as it may, I am issuing an invitation to members to visit the office.

First, neither I nor the Minister of Finance I am sure hold any responsibility for the poor standard of furniture in the office of the Leader of the Opposition. 6.00 p.m.

What happened is this, Sir. When it was decided to place the Office at the disposal of the Leader of the Opposition we invited the then Leader of the Opposition to choose some furniture and the Hon. Minister of Finance would know that he was the gentleman who did not concern himself very much about the future comforts. I do not think he meant it for him himself, I think his predecessor in that particular office. The result was that the Ministry of Communications and Works were allowed as far as I can see to put in some very substandard artifacts which did not match anything which had been devised by artisans in this country or outside of the realm and there is an assortment of uncomfortable furniture in this office which do not do justice either to my predecessor, or myself or to the Leader of this House.

I think that the Hon. Minister of Finance will agree with that. The result is that I do not spend as much time in there as my constituents or my colleagues on this side would probably expect me to spend except on Sitting days of the House.

Particularly, I think that the note here is misleading because it gives the impression that the Vote which we are now being asked to pass is going to provide for photocopying paper, stationery, books and publications, first-aid supplies and incidentals, both for Parliament and for the Office of the Leader of the Opposition and I should like to state here categorically that I have seen no photocopying paper, no stationery, no books, no publications, no first-aid supplies and if by incidentals it would be implied that they are cleaning materials supplied to the person who looks after the cleaning out of the office, I have no complaint with the cleanliness of the office since it is never used and the door is always closed so the dust has no opportunity to get inside but the washbasin is usually reasonably clean so something like Vim or vigor must be applied from time to time for the cleaning so if that magnificent vote of some $8,000 is for Vim then I say that we are the beneficiaries of some Vim and vigor and that is all.

There is no photocopying paper – I would like to have some stationery – no stationery supplies but I should like to draw to the attention of members that although there may be some stationery in the Office of Parliament I feel that there should be some books and publications but the explanatory note is misleading in this respect because none of these luxuries is afforded to the Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see that there has been some measure of unity in the question affecting Parliament. Quite often in the past, and all too often, we have been seeking to divide on every issue in the hope of realising some sort of political advantage. We have attempted to demean our standards of Parliamentarians and I am very encouraged to see at least we can agree that the facilities that are offered us are far below the acceptable minimal standard.

I do not want to compare our facilities for example with the position of the Canadian Parliament, or compare the facilities of a poor struggling country with those of well-to-do countries, but in Canada, for example, Federal Parliament, they have a Library last time I was there about 18 months ago, and they were some ½ million volumes for Parliamentarians. It is a very good Library indeed. Substantial additions are being made to them from week to week. They have some 17 Research Assistants. All of them are at least at the Masters level whereby any member can go to the Library and say in two weeks I have to make a speech in my constituency or elsewhere putting a case against Family Planning. I want in that speech to have a review of the literature of Family Planning. I want to have a statistical presentation of the arguments against it and so on and that speech is prepared quite often by a chap who has a Masters in Demography and as a result you can go and equip yourself very well indeed whether it is within Canada of outside.

We have a situation here where it would be a misuse of words to say that the collection of old, outdated, worm-eaten, dusty books that we have around here could be called a Library. As far as I know no recent additions have been made to it, not even on a subject like the British Parliament. We would still be reading volumes that were published 20 and 25 years ago. As far as Magazines and Journals are concerned there seem to be little or none around.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are one or two things we must do as the first step. It is virtually impossible to get a private line in here whether you are the Leader of the Opposition, or the Prime Minister, or a Minister or just an ordinary member of Parliament. It is impossible to get a line out there in the Lounge unless someone is on the line listening in all the time. Everybody around here uses the same line that Parliamentarians have to use to get out. Not even the facilities of three or four lines to be used by Parliamentarians. A Lounge is supposed to exist but there are no chairs so if you go into the Lounge you have to sit on the floor. You cannot have anything worst than that. No Library and I am not even going to go into the other minimal facilities which we would need as Parliamentarians.

The important thing is that we must stop demeaning our status as Parliamentarians. This is the highest court in this land and a lot of people outside there through jealousy will be cursing us and parting our burial ground but we have to be in here and set ourselves high standards and we have to ensure that these facilities are provided. I very much hope that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance will be kindly disposed to a Supplementary later in the year to ensure that all of these services are provided at a very soon date.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking under Item 7 — Communications. Generally the whole question of the kind of reporting which emanates from Parliament, Hansard, as no doubt you will hear, has shown some improvement although there is the absence and a remarkable coincidence that there are times when just what you are looking for has not been brought up-to-date as yet.
6.10 p.m.

There is one aspect of the dissemination of information of what goes on in Parliament which is of some concern to me. I hasten to point out that in making this observation I am in no way attempting to cast aspersions in any direction; but it has been of some concern that the area in Parliament provided for the Press has not always been filled in recent months, and I am told on very good authority that the reason for this absence on the part of one of our major publications in the country is a decision which they have taken with regard to the inability of one of their reporters to visit Parliament in the capacity of a reporter. I do not know the details of this and I do not know if any hon. member on the other side can enlighten this House on the detailed information regarding the matter of this professional reporter who is unable to come to this House, or if indeed it is true that the reporter cannot come to this House of Assembly. I have not seen any official document or seen any ruling that would bar any reporter for any period of time or for life. I would therefore hope that someone on the other side knowledgeable in these matters would explain to us what has happened and why it is that one of the reporters in this country has difficulty in coming into the House of Assembly. I think, Mr. Chairman, you will agree with me that the inability of the Press to report factually, fairly and frequently from this Honourable House is in many ways a diminution of the fundamental right of all the people of Barbados to be informed as to whether their representatives are doing what they are supposed to do. As I say, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter on which we have no information but I am hearing from one of the representatives of the Press that there is some prohibition of this particular officer coming into Parliament. I would be very grateful for your guidance on this matter, and would merely say too that in the case of one journalist whose name I am prepared to call — young Cecil Foster — that for a number of reasons it apparently has been decided that it would be in his best interest if he did not come into Parliament. I do not wish to go into any great detail on this but wish to make a broad statement that we as Parliamentarians have to be extremely careful to guard against any infringement not only of our rights in here but the rights of those whom we invite to be present. The Standing Orders make provision for invitations to the Press to come to these open meetings of the people's business, and I think we have a moral duty, if no other, to ensure that they are able to carry out that responsibility in an atmosphere of freedom from fear and without the necessity to feel that they have to exhibit favours.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. Minister speaks, I have just received information from the Clerks' table that the matter on the reporter has been referred to the Debates Committee and is being investigated.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, with great respect to you, I must confess that the hon. member did not pose that question to the Chair but to the Acting Leader of the House, and therefore it was for me to give the answer. I think the Clerk's duty was to give me the answer.

I would not like, Mr. Chairman, for you to be too involved in the debate and I just draw this to your attention. The question was posed that he would like the Minister to give this information. Let me first start with the Press.

Life plays some very funny tricks. I have never heard so much defence of the Press in my life, and talk about human rights and freedom until the past year. It was the practice over there not only to stop the Press from coming in here but to manhandle and beat the Press as they did at Combermere School in 1976.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is misleading the House. As Chairman of that Party.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I asked you to withdraw that statement first.

Mr. TAITT: I happen to be President of the Democratic Labour Party. I was present at all times during the meeting at Combermere School and I say categorically that at no time was any member of the Press beaten and manhandled at such a meeting, and you may check that with any member of the Press corps.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, first of all the hon. member said I am misleading the House. I am saying categorically that the Press in Barbados was thrown out of Combermere School by members of the Democratic Labour Party attending their convention at Combermere School in 1976. That is one. Mr. Jimmy Cozier, a Journalist in this country was abused and thrown out of the then Prime Minister's office somewhere in 1969 and Mr. Ricardo Blackman, was repeatedly embarrassed on television by the then Prime Minister of Barbados. Now all of a sudden we are hearing about the Press. The Press likes to write sensational stories, that is all. You may hardly read about what the Prime Minister said in here today, but you may hear the nonsense of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central about his claim that he can buy the whole Press.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I think it is unparliamentary to refer to the erudite contribution which I made on the economy and the relativity to the present Estimates as being nonsense. I think it is unparliamentary and think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I rule it is not unparliamentary.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Press publicly abused in this country by members of the Opposition. But as I said I know Opposition politics; I had ten years over there. You will never agree. The first thing to do is to oppose, the second thing oppose, and the third thing oppose. You walk out, you push down the microphone; all these things I am used to.
6.20 p.m.

Now, we are hearing about a key. The Leader of the Opposition raised a point about not having a key. He cannot blame us. He was Leader of the Opposition earlier and had two. I think that he has three or four now. There was a man called Frederick Gladstone Smith who you should ask for the key, not us. So it might be Smith who wants to get in at you. I do not want to get in at you. You have nothing to offer. When the Office was first given to the Opposition, the late Sir Grantley Adams was Leader of the Opposition; and I recall the present Speaker almost with blood in his eyes asking to get somewhere for the Leader of the Opposition and some proper furniture. Do you know what we were told by Cameron Tudor who is now writing a lot of nonsense which I am going to deal with during the debate? *(Asides).* I can take care of myself. He is only a nuisance.

Now, Sir, when the late Sir Grantley Adams – when the present Speaker – asked with almost blood in his eyes – Mr. Cameron Tudor said that he was old enough to go home. That was the reply when the late Sir Grantley Adams asked for furniture. Now the wheel has come full circle. You have another old man in there. Now they want somewhere for that old man to rest his back. Do not wink up your eyes at me. Do not encourage me to beat anybody. I would beat you too.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish that the hon. member would address the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I know all of these old tricks in the Estimates. Cameron Tudor used to do it when he wanted to lick the former Speaker, Mr. Brancker. I know these old tricks but I am going to lick you too. Now they want furniture. They want a couch and furniture from Rattan. They want a goblet and a big refrigerator to put some drinks in for the other old man. We believe in helping people. I worked in the Labour and Community Services and I am always sympathetic towards old people and that is why I do not want him to expose himself repeatedly to the night dew because he does not like political meetings. But we are providing $8,000 for the old man, and we want him to feel comfortable. Let him rest in peace.

A question was raised about the Clerk. You said that it is before the Debates Committee. I am told that this matter went to the Debates Committee before and there was...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If I can just correct you, what I said was before that the Debates Committee meeting was on the question of the Reporter and not the Clerk.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: The Reporter what? You are talking about Brandford? That is not an issue in this country. People are looking for food and money and not for any Reporter nonsense. We are talking about the whole office of Parliament. For a long time until the new Post Office is built, it is foolishness for members to get up in here talking about proper facilities. Let us face up to that. The new Post Office is going to relieve Parliament. I am informed that the building of the new post office by the Ministry of Communications and Works will start sometime in July. Until then. You will not have a proper lunch room and that kind of thing.

What I would advise is not to put lard oil on the floor because it may be the cause of some sort of problem. That is a cheap set up putting some lard oil on the floor to make the floor shine is real cheap. We must be disrespected by the people all the time because we repeatedly sell ourselves short. Now, I hear that we want all of these things in Parliament. I hope that they will go on platforms and tell the people about the nice things that they want for Parliament; but when it comes to money which they know that they want themselves, they make it a political football. It is hypocrisy on the part of the Opposition Party. They want Parliament to be a nice place. They want proper facilities and proper furniture. You should have proper people in them and pay proper salaries and not have hypocrisy about salaries. Most of them over here – I checked out the day – were the first to go and draw. Some of them have spent it already, and yet they go out at night on platforms talking about who is getting $3,000 and who is getting $4,000 and what the Prime Minister in New Zealand is getting – $X – and making parliamentary salaries a political football. Therefore, I am saying that if you treat parliamentarians' salaries in that way, the public will treat the whole of Parliament in that way.

Someone was making a toilet paper speech today, and he should get some foil paper speech. Now, Sir, I have tried to explain that until we are in a position to get the new post office built, we will not have Parliament properly adjusted. I would hope for better facilities in Parliament at all levels. About the key, which was one of the contributions of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, he can ask Sleepy Smith about the key.

As regards the Clerk, Sir, I am told that one person applied and I am told that experience was against the person; and I am told again that it was felt that the person should be sent abroad to have some training. That is because, do not care how brilliant you are in the university class room, when you come into Parliament that is another education. So no matter how many degrees lawyers may have, when they come in here they have to be in a position to advise Mr. Speaker, or you, Mr. Chairman, on certain matters relating to Parliamentary procedure; and therefore, it is difficult to take a very green person and make him Clerk of Parliament; but I would wish to say that I would like to see us have a Clerk properly trained, to have a library, to have a proper dining hall with proper food and proper salaries for Parliamentarians and to have Parliamentarians treated in the way that they are treated all over the world, and to stop reducing ourselves to being political nuisances, as they do on platforms at night, Sir.

I beg to move that Head 2 stand part.

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

Dr. HAYNES: In my contribution I did raise the question whether Government intended to do anything about the Legislature Privileges and Immunities Act under a particular section of the Act. I would like to hear the Government's response on that because in my layman's terms I see problems arising if something is not done about it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member has mentioned this, I would say that I understand that the Hon. Attorney General is looking at that Act very generally. It was passed a little bit hastily under the previous regime. I am not blaming the previous regime for passing it in 1963. We accept that there are things in it which perhaps are better dealt with in other language; but I would also say that there are one or two other things.

Sir, we need to define the precincts of Parliament and set out more clearly the authority of the Marshal. I do not believe that members of the Royal Barbados Police Force who attend Parliament are aware that they are here not as policemen. They are here as servants of Parliament, and that the Speaker can tell them what they must do and how they must do it. I say that because I remember one day seeing a Police Sergeant at the top of the steps carrying on to the Speaker, Mr. Hoppin, very roughly indeed. Then Mr. Hoppin told him to do something. That is a different matter.
6.30 p.m.

That is a separate matter. *(Asides)* No policeman who is here now. That is the same policeman who was trying to drag Eric Sealy out of the Chair and he was a disrespecter of all persons. But the Act definitely needs general revision and examination, and I know that the Attorney General is giving it his mature consideration, and I hope very soon that we will have an Act dealing with privileges, immunities and so on that we can handle.

Just in passing I will add this finally. I read in the press allegations that the Standing Orders of the House are to be amended in a certain direction. I know not of any of the directions which may have been contained in a document that I understand has been circulated because I have not seen the document. I am aware a document was

being prepared, but the finished one I have never seen circulated. I am not commenting, but I will point out to hon. members that it is an offence and a very serious offence indeed to convey to any person and an offence by the press to put in a paper the proceedings of a Select Committee before that Committee has reported to the House. I just pass that out for members' information. I do not know if the reports that I have been seeing are based on the document or not, but I really beg hon. members do not give the Committee of Privileges any trouble in this matter.

The question that the sum of $745,176 under Head 2 – Parliament – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 10.00 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, 20th March, 1979.

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

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

RESUMPTION OF SITTING

On Resumption:–

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

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

HEAD 3(1) – SERVICES COMMISSIONS

Head 3(1) – Services Commissions – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move, Sir, that Head 3(1) – Services Commissions – in the sum of $251,036 stand part.

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

The question that the sum of $251,036 under Head 3(1) – Services Commissions – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, *(Pause)* I think I will wait until we get to the appropriated Head.

HEAD 3(2) ESTABLISHMENTS

Head 3(2) – Establishments – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of amendments to Head 3(2). They have been circulated, Sir, and I beg to move that Head 3(2) – Establishments – in the sum of $1,704,200 as amended stand part.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Members, I ought to point out to the House at this stage that on my set of the Errata there is a note on page 4, Head 3(1), but the copy of the Estimates does not show Head 3(1) on page 4. Head 3(1) appears on page 3.

In respect to Head 3(2) – the question that the sum of $1,704,200 under Head 3(2) – Establishments – as amended stand part, of the Schedule.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just a few preliminary remarks. I am sorry the Hon. Prime Minister who is responsible for this Head is not here. *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order please.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I think we are going to have to get some understanding that when we get up to speak we can speak freely.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are now implying that I am disallowing free speech.

Mr. TAITT: No, Sir. No, Sir. No, Sir, not at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well if that is not the intention please refrain from any such connotation.

Mr. TAITT: Under Head 3(2) I should have liked to hear what is the specific position on personnel practices at the moment. I see that there is no specific Head for Personnel as such in this Head 3 so one has to assume that the Personnel Department is being dealt with under Establishments. Can I get this to be corrected? Unless something is wrong with my copy.

I believe, Sir, there is still a Personnel Department in the Government. For what it is worth, Mr. Chairman,

I should like to know what are the number of vacancies which currently exist in the Service, the number of acting appointments which have been filled and conversely have not been filled during the past year? It would seem to me that failure to fill such posts might result in an actual saving of money but in truth it would have meant that the particular agency or the particular department might have been under-utilised. I am told that persons now under the new policy are able to act for as many as 50 days without receiving.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I believe the hon. member has missed the boat. We are now dealing with Head 3(2) – Establishments and not Head 3(1) – Services Commissions and that is the Head under which the hon. member is obviously trying to speak.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will continue to be guided by you in this matter. As I said, I am now told that it is possible for persons to act for periods in excess of 50 days under the new arrangements without actually receiving emoluments for such acting and I should like to hear from the Minister what is the specific policy in this regard because, Sir, if it is true that persons now can find themselves acting in a higher position for say 50 days, revert to their previous position for two days, resume acting the following day for another 50 days, you can begin to see, Sir, that it is entirely possible for a person to act for a period of over six months with intermittent breaks in the six months' period of one, or two, or three days.

Secondly, I have been led to understand that all appointments to acting positions now have to be confirmed, or decreed, or decided, by the appropriate authority, the Establishments Division. I believe it would be the Establishments Division. I do not know and I wish some clarification on this prior to the person taking up the acting position. It has resulted, for example, at places like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. There are vacancies for higher positions in the Service which normally would have been filled by the recommendation of the Head of the Department and the acting would begin almost immediately and the Services Commissions, as the regular standard, would confirm the position subsequently.
10.15 a.m.

I am now told that that is not the case and that in fact a person can find himself acting for a fairly long time and in some cases actually receiving emoluments for acting, only to discover later that these emoluments have to be repaid. I know of one situation where a poor woman in one of the departments finds herself having to repay some $3,000 or $4,000 because the particular department behaved as it is normal to behave in an administrative situation and placed the person in a supervisory position, only to be told subsequently that that person was not the person the Establishment had in mind and therefore that person had to repay the money advanced as wages and salaries. This is a very serious matter Mr. Chairman. If you receive money for performing a particular task which you genuinely believe to be a task for which you were correctly appointed, only subsequent to be told that you have to repay the money, and told in such a way that someone calls you in and says to you "You have been overpaid" and ask you to sign a letter; and when you sign you later discover that you have agreed to repay two or three or four thousand dollars. I would like a statement from the Minister clarifying this particular matter, because I think he will agree that while it might redound to the benefit of the Government to show up as saving under a particular head, it is being done at a price to the officers and other persons who work in the various departments.

I have other questions to ask but these will depend on the answer I get to the matter I have raised, and I will wait to see if the Minister will shed some light on this particular area.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there are several matters of concern to us in the Opposition and this matter specifically relates to general immunity on the pattern of employment in the public service in this country and to statutory Boards. I think the Democratic Labour Party set an excellent example in this regard, and I believe that one of the more progressive measures taken despite objections within certain elements of the party was the appointment of the person in the Other Place as Chairman of the Public Services Commission, because in many areas, for example places like CBC and the Public Services Commission, we feel it was of necessity an area that should be non-partisan in all respects. However, in pursuit of an erroneous and misdirected policy of victimization which has characterized this regime over its period of office, not only in respect of dismissals but also in respect of transfers, promotions, appointments and retirements from the Public Service, these matters have resulted in considerable public concern and I feel that it is our duty at this time to draw to the Government's attention that whatever their initial anxiety may have been in regard to the political allegiance of people in the public service, it is their duty to disregard this, because I feel there are agencies in this country such as the Royal Barbados Police Force and the Public Service in general who transfer - and rightly so – their loyalty at all times to whatever political party forms the Government of the day, and I am calling upon the Government and the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance in particular to stop any interference in the processes of appointments, in particular in relation to temporary

posts in this country. I know of a classic example where there were four vacancies in the public service, four applicants all equally qualified and recommended by all levels in that department, those immediately in charge of them, then the person immediately in charge of that sub-department, and by the head of the department, and there was an assumption that they would have been automatically employed. All four had actually started to work, but to the thorough disgust of everyone involved in that department three were appointed and one not, and the only reason was because she was the daughter of a Democratic Labour Party supporter in my constituency, although she doesn't vote in my area but only conducts a business in my constituency. That incident has had a traumatic effect not only on the young lady but also on the department as a whole, and this is a matter of very grave concern. I also want to know whether it is true or not that the situation still exists where persons who have applied and have been recommended for temporary appointments have their names and addresses sent to the Hon. Prime Minister and Minister of Finance. This is what I have heard, I am not stating it as a fact, but I am asking for information whether this is so or not.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that we have reached a stage in Barbados where we must recognize that this society is relatively equally divided in terms of party adherents, etc, and whether the accusations are true or not the fact is that there is the general feeling in the community that there is excessive partisan intervention in appointments in the Public Service.
10.25 a.m.

This of course, Mr. Chairman, started with the widespread dismissals of people from certain areas of Government and the Statutory Boards; and the Minister of Agriculture was one of the main people responsible for this kind of activity in relation to what he did at the Ministry of Communications and Works, not only in terms of massive dismissals, but also in terms of clearly vindictive transfers of people in his constituency.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am going to deal with the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Are you on a point of order?

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Yes. What the hon. member says reflects on me and I am asking for an immediate withdrawal.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will have to withdraw the allegation that the Minister was acting in a vindictive manner.

Dr. HAYNES: I am very happy to withdraw that remark; but I would like to bring to the attention of this Hon. House that there were transfers and dismissals within that department. For example, I know of one particular case where a gentleman who has no transportation and lives in St. Andrew was transferred to work at Golden Ridge in St. John. I think that he succeeded in borrowing a bicycle; and fortunately he could ride a bicycle.*(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have some order on the Government benches, please. Let the hon. member be heard in silence.

Dr. HAYNES: Even if you borrow a bicycle and you have to travel from St. Andrew to St. John you have to do a lot of walking in order to get to work. Now, that particular individual was faced with a serious problem because of the number of children he has and his family commitments. Therefore he could not afford.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if we can sit down here and listen to all of this. I want to get it clear. Are we on Head 3(1) or Head 3(2)? I ask that because I cannot understand what this has to do with Establishments. For the last few minutes we have been hearing a debate under Head 3(1), and I was of the opinion that we had already passed Head 3(1). I would like your ruling on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We are on Head 3(2) – Establishments.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We are on Head 3(2) – Establishments. The Standing Orders provide, Mr. Chairman, for a certain relevance to be in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am well aware of that.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, as I said, the time has long come when we must try to reintroduce some elements of humanity in respect of the working people of this country, and in particular those who are employed by the Government of Barbados; because the Government of Barbados has a responsibility to demonstrate in its attitudes towards those people who work for them certain sympathetic approaches; because the Government is the major employer of labour in this country; and if it resorts to practices of this kind, this will automatically be reflected in the private sector; and it is fair to say that it has been reflected in the private sector in many cases.

I would also like to advert to the very unfortunate situation that existed, not only in the Ministry of Communications and Works, but also to the very unfortunate situation created for a lot of people in respect of dismissals at the Parks and Beaches Commission. I will not now deal with this matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I am listening to a speech which should have come under Head 3(1). I am not worrying with the hon. member. I am Prime Minister. The hon. member's party has already provided a Constitution to give the Prime Minister the right of appointment to temporary posts. I am to make the appointments. He cannot dictate to me. If he wants to tell me the name of the young lady from his constituency, I will investigate the matter. I make the appointments because they amended the Constitution to say that I must make the appointments; but Parks and Beaches is so far from this subject. The matter of appointments is far away from the subject, too, Sir,

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I understand the Prime Minister's point of order which I have taken. I hope that you will reply suitably.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will have ample opportunity when the time comes to reply; and there is no doubt that he is exercising his constitutional authority. I am only asking him to exercise it in a humane and non partisan manner. That is what I am asking him to do. I am not calling any names because people have been so severely victimised, that I would not like to be a party to any further victimisation. I will not take chances like that unless I had the very clear assurance and had time to think about it. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman,....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am taking into account the interruptions, but the hon. member has one more minute.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, there has been at least 5 minutes of interruptions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not doing the counting for me. I rule that you have 1 more minute and it will be that.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, I am quite sure that the opportunity will arise again; but I will once again call upon the Prime Minister of this country to put an end to the kind of victimisation that has been taking place in this country; because if he does not do so, then the divisions in this country will continue; and as a member of this Hon. House we have a responsibility..... *(Asides).*

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would expect your advice on this matter. To refer to members of this House in a way of executing victimisation, can this be accepted as something that members in Parliament are doing? Victimisation?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already ruled on the question of "vindictiveness". I do not believe that there has been any direct reference to anybody, to any member in particular alleging victimisation.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the obvious tactic here is to use all my time in interruptions. Anyhow, I would like certainly just to warn the Government that there is still time to depart from that kind of approach in respect of appointments, transfers and dismissals.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member is appealing to the wrong Minister. He must appeal to the Minister of Education for victimising members of the Democratic Labour Party – those members that he has not employed in the Ministry of Education like the hon. member for St. Michael South and the wife of the hon. member for St. Michael South and the daughter of the hon. member for St. John. Tell the Hon. Minister stop victimising them by employing them in the Ministry of Education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order. *(Asides).*

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, If that is a point of order, I do not know what a point of order is. Now, I do not deal with matters relating to Education in this Hon. House; because I feel that other members on this side will deal with the Minister of Education at the appropriate time. I will not be dealing with the Ministry of Education.
10.35 a.m.

I will not deal with the Minister of Education.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must now conclude his speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL and Hon. L. S. CRAIG rose.

Dr. HAYNES: Let them all get up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask you now to resume your seat. You will have an opportunity again.

Dr. HAYNES: I would just like to conclude by saying that in the interest of this country the Government must change its attitude and make sure that that change of attitude is communicated to the masses of people in this country, otherwise they are going to be heading for trouble.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At that point you must conclude your speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am not at all surprised at the continuing rush of responsibility that

we hear in here from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He made a pledge when he first came in here that he is not going to have anything to say to or about the hon. member for St. George South. Well he now made a mistake because I am going to deal with him right away. He talks about victimisation and I.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, the hon. member is saying that I have broken a solemn pledge that I made in this Honourable House. In other words, that is accusing me of bad faith and I believe that I made and I make the point again that I will not be dealing with him. That is an accusation of bad faith.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. member is begging off, but whether he is begging off or not, I am going to deal with him and I have made no pledge in here or in public not to deal with him. I have already run him out of the district in which he was born and I will run him again. The hon. member has got the nerve to get up here and accuse people of inhumanity and victimisation. Shortly after we came into power and the hon. Minister of Health was out of the Island, the Prime Minister asked me to hold as temporary Minister of Health, and that hon. member resigned from his job at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital the same day that I took up the temporary appointment in the Ministry of Health, because the hon. member knows quite well that if he remained on the Staff of Queen Elizabeth Hospital for one more day he would have wanted a job...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order,.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am not giving way. We have the whole day in here. You and I will fight the whole day, so just wait on me. The hon. member knows that he would not have been victimised, he would have been fired, because he was working as a doctor at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and he was so irresponsible that he walked about and talked about his patients. He is a man who hands out the private notes of his patients to other people and it is for that reason that if I was temporary Minister of Health that he would have been fired. If you want to get up, get up now.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, to start off with, I resigned from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a point of elucidation, therefore it is a fraudulent point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: There are two components. Let me deal with the point of order first. The hon. member says that I take around the notes of my patients and show them around to other people. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would think that this is a grossly improper remark, and I think the hon. member should be asked to withdraw it. Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I resigned from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I believe, in March, 1976 or thereabouts.

Hon. L. R. TULL: He cannot even tell the truth if God comes.

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: I withdraw that. His lackey now gets up to defend him. I have said nothing about the handsome, elegant hon. member for St. Michael South West. I am talking about his lackey. If the cap fits him, let him wear it.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, there are only two of us on this side. If there were three he would probably get away with it, but obviously if there are only two of us and he refers to the lackey of the hon. member, he could only mean the one other member over here, and I would ask if he would find another word and withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw because he said his lackey would get up and you got up.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I withdraw. Mr. Chairman, I do not mind the intervention of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. I am standing by what I say and I am prepared to go out on the public platform when I am not protected by privilege and do it again. All that nonsense about challenging. I have said it already on the public platform and I am prepared to say it again that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central walks about and tells people about the private notes of his patients. I say that. He knows why he does not want to tangle with me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I wish the Hon. Minister will now confine his other remarks to Establishments.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am dealing with Establishments and I am dealing with someone who was in the establishment of the public service of this Island. He comes in here and makes all these irresponsible statements about victimisation. I am challenging the hon. member to get up and give the names of those people who were victimised because it is impugning the integrity not only of the Minister of the Public Service, but he is impugning the integrity of everyone of us who sit in Government. I do not know of any victimisation. Every time he gets up he talks about victimisation and tries to steer away from the Ministry of Education. Why don't you stick to the Ministry of Education? You talked about Parks and Beaches, you talked about other departments of Government, the Police, about the girl

whom you know so much about in Brittons Hill; why don't you talk about the School Meals Department? On the 1st August, 1973 some 73 people were employed in the School Meals Department in Barbados. From the 1st August they were paid although they never started to work until September and all 73 were handpicked by the then Minister of Education, Frederick Smith. The 73 people had a free ride off the taxpayers of Barbados. It is the first time that I have heard that anybody has been employed and started off with a month's holiday. These people started off with a month's holiday paid for a whole month by the Government of Barbados, handpicked by the Democratic Labour Party and Mr. Frederick Smith got in this House and said that he did not care and if he had to do it again he would do it. He admitted it and said if he had to do it again he would do it, and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central gets up in here and talks about victimisation every time he opens his mouth.

I have challenged the hon. member on more than one occasion to come up with the names because I am not going to be any party to victimisation in this country. The hon. member for the City did say that the ex-Prime Minister's daughter got a job teaching at Springer Memorial since I was in the Ministry. My own colleagues want to know what is going on. (Mr. TAITT: Why?) I wish the hon. member for St. Michael South West would not ask me that, because I am reluctant to drag him into it. The hon. member for St. Michael South is teaching at the Community College, to such an extent that he finds it difficult to debate on education in here because he cannot get in here and attack the policy of his employer. I do not want to get into all these details because I will talk about the whole front bench and their connections with the Government.
10.45 a.m.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, what is the big noise about temporary appointments because I remember taking part in the Constitutional Debate at which the hon. member for St. Michael South West was present and where those very points I am hearing about were aired. They felt in 1973 that the Prime Minister of the country should have some say in who comes to work in the Public Service. I put it as loosely as that, and the hon. member for St. Michael South West stood up on his feet and he tried to deny it, in his usual sweet language, a lot of talk, signifying very little, but he stood up and he denied it. Now he sits down there and allows his colleagues to get up and make criticisms of the very amendments that they thrust down the throats of the people of this country.

Let me just tell the hon. member for St. Michael South Central something. Not only the Prime Minister has to have a say in whoever is appointed to a post, I want to have a say on who is appointed in my Ministry too. I am not going to carry the blame and the responsibility in my Ministry when things go wrong and have no say as to who I have to go to work with and I do not believe that the public of Barbados expect that. I must have a say about who works with me no matter what any hon. member on the other side says.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I think, raised the question about acting appointments. He will see that a considerable number of appointments have been made in the Public Service since this Government came into power in a whole lot of areas. In the Ministry of Communications and Works, and in the School Meals Service a lot of people who have been acting for many years and a large number of clerical workers, a large number of people who were acting in the Public Service for many many years under the Democratic Labour Party were appointed in their positions since the assumption of this Party to power in this country and still we hear all those blatant comments and the irresponsibility of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and he better not challenge me because if he challenges me I will wash everything out clean.

He made his comments about other people will deal with me during the course of this debate. I will deal with one person and one person only for the rest of these four days of Parliament. Every day as he turns, I am going to expose the hon. member for St. Michael South Central for what he is. I believe I know him better than anybody else. I have been keeping quiet out of decency but there comes a time when a man has to be a man and I will have to deal with him before the end of this debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: But establish yourself as a man.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Yes, establish myself as a man. I am finished, Mr. Chairman. I have just sounded my warning and I am finished.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am going to appeal to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central to choose his subjects very carefully. He has been getting on in here - from the time he came in like Mother Hubbard, covering everything and touching nothing. It seems to me as though he has set out to establish himself as the chief hatchet man of the Democratic Labour Party in public life in the country but I want to tell him a few things and I want to tell the hon. member for St. Michael South West a few things as well.

They talk about appointments. Shortly before the Democratic Labour Party went out of office, the Centre at Lancaster, St. James, the area in my constituency, was brought into being for the purpose of the School

Meals Service preparation of food and a number of appointments were made to that establishment and from the constituency of the then Minister of Education. The Minister of Education, as you heard before, said that he had no apologies to make. He went further on to say that he would do it again and if he did not do it he would not have won his seat.

The constituency of St. Andrew runs through the same very area as the School Meals Centre at Lancaster and not a single person was selected despite the fact they were well qualified, had applied and were recommended by the authority. Not a single person from St. James was selected for service in the School Meals force and I want to ask the member as well, and he was then a member of Government, if he is aware of a Mr. Brandford who was the Auditor General of this country and if he is aware of the circumstances under which he left the Service in this country. He was virtually hounded out by you and your Government. He could not take it.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member while pointing at me said he was hounded out by you and your Government. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that. I have never hounded out Mr. Brandford. I have always been.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is a point of order. You are imputing motives to the hon. member for St. Michael South West. I ask you to withdraw.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw if you are saying I am imputing dishonourable motives to him. A member of the Democratic Labour Party hounded out Mr. Brandford of which the hon. member was part. Is he denying that he had to do with the Government and there was collective responsibility? I am not going to shudder from my responsibility here this afternoon. Any attack upon this Government is an attack upon me. I will tell you, you are like a drowned rat who catches for its own life. There are some people on that bench who will try their utmost best to protect themselves no matter what is said. They want to be free from the action. When it is good going, yes, it is for me. I want to be part of it but when the going is rough, I want to have no part of it. If you are going to adopt that attitude, you adopt that attitude but we are not going to adopt it.

I am going to deal now specifically with charges made against me by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He seems to have the capacity for coming here and imputing ill motives on members of this side. I want him to choose his subjects very carefully. He referred to mass dismissals and mass transfers and he quoted one instance of a transfer but he did not come in here and tell this Honourable House anything about the mass dismissals. I would like him to tell me who I dismissed during my time as Minister of Transport and Minister responsible for Communications and Works.

I am willing to resign my seat if the hon. member is willing to get up now, and I challenge you on the Floor of this Honourable House, by getting up now and say who I dismissed. I am going to take my seat if you are willing to do so. Do not sit down there smirking and believing that you have scored a point. I am going to deal with the instance which he referred too. The question of the man which he is talking about, a man that was transferred because he would not work. He never worked, a Democratic Labour Party yard-fowl of the first order, Lawson Bovell from Walkers in St. Andrew. I am going to deal with him. He is from my constituency. *(Asides)* That is his name and I will call it.

Mr. Chairman, he was transferred because he refused to work and complaints were made against his work. I will tell him more. You have to speak for him and you have to protect him because he never worked for 10 months. Ten months he never worked. From the time he was transferred to St. John he never drove a stroke of work. Everyday he is in Bobby Clarke's Office planning with him and with all of them what will be the fate of his Government. We are quite aware of that and you want us to condone a situation where a man up to now, for over 10 months, has been drawing Government's money without driving a stroke of work.

You know what happen? It is a young lady who has to do with the elevator at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The *Nation* recently commented upon her a young Democrat, who has been making life extremely difficult for people who have got to work there and people who have got to use the elevator. What have we done to those people? You should not cry if something goes wrong with them. You should not cry. I will tell you why you should not cry. For 15 years you only appointed people to the Public Service and to the Statutory Corporations who carried a Passport of the Democratic Labour Party. It is a fact that it is so.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. The hon. member is deliberately misleading this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister must take his seat. Let me hear his point of order first.

Mr. TAITT: The hon. member said for 15 years the Government with which I serve did not appoint anybody to a Statutory Board or to a Ministry unless he had a Democratic Labour Party Passport. That is what the hon. member said.

10.55 p.m.

I said that it is a fact that everybody in Barbados knows that there are hundreds and thousands of people in this community who are members of the Barbados Labour Party who are still working in the Public Service who were appointed before, and I think it is deliberately wrong for anyone to come here and make such a categorical assertion.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot take a point of order on top of a point of order. You can intervene after the Minister finishes his speech.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, we have to say a few things in here that will hurt. Take the BMC. When we came into office it was so heavily overstaffed that it had more construction workers than the National Housing Corporation. And another thing...

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. The hon. member is a Minister and the Minister has responsibilities to the country. That is so obviously a lie to say that the BMC had more construction workers than the National Housing Corporation...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw the statement that it was a lie, because in the absence of any evidence I cannot determine whether it is a lie or not.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: When this Government came into office it had to cut the fat from those Statutory Corporations and departments of Government. And I will say more: At the Transport Board the hon. member for St. Michael North Central employed over forty persons on the eve of the elections to sweep and clean the buses when he was advised that they did not need such a number of persons. Those are the problems that we faced when we came in and those were the decisions we had to rectify. Within the BMC it was the result of the bad decisions made by you as Minister responsible and your Government. You are asking for it, you will get it. Take Soil Conservation: A number of people have been employed there for years and you have never appointed them despite the fact that they were all your friends.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. Prime Minister drew to your attention that the Statutory Corporations were a little away from Establishments, and I find the hon. member is now straying into IDC, BMC and other Statutory Corporations. I am sure the time will come when he will have a chance to speak on those.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, when the hon. member interrupted I was dealing with Soil Conservation. When we came into office the people there were not established and we established them despite the fact that they were your people and all of them Dems. In those days no person of a different persuasion from the other side had a chance and they are now talking about victimization and unfair employment practices. There is no truth whatever in those allegations, and I challenge any of them to come forward with facts. I want them to show how many persons were transferred and how many dismissed. Until they can establish these facts the statements made by them stand condemned and cannot be accepted by this country.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, from October 6, 1976 every time there is to be major business such as the Estimates or the Budget to be discussed – I have marked off pages in the Estimates of last year, pages 682, 634 and 601 – and if you go through the debates you will see the same old story: Parks and Beaches workers chased away, victimization – and I am not going to allow it in here. As Leader of the House I am going to put the guillotine and will not allow you to waste time here talking a lot of nonsense; I am going to show you how to deal with nuisance values. I do not know how you attend to your cases. You are always talking about somebody's husband or somebody's wife or daughter, all you do is walk about looking for information, like Brother Lally – give him some money and he will go into the village and curse any man, talk about his wife and family. That is what you are doing, the Brother Lally type. The question, Sir.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, as far as I can gather from the debate there was one matter that concerned Establishments, and that matter relates to a question asked by the hon. member by St. Michael South West about acting allowances. The situation is that eighteen or twenty months ago we negotiated new arrangements with the National Union of Public Workers and it is now provided that if you act for two months in a senior position you get the full difference; but there are certain schedules of which the most important is the Permanent Secretary, in which case you get it from the day you begin to act. Honourable members may feel that in many instances where acting allowances have been paid – one of the grievances politicians have is that they can act in positions superior to those they hold salary wise for long periods of time and not get the acting allowance at all. Parliamentary Secretaries can act as Minister and not be paid as Ministers. We have had a situation for example, of the hon. member for St. Philip South acting during the course of the last Parliament for I believe as much as three months at a time and neither getting the salary nor qualifying for the pension. I mention this to show that it does not only apply to civil servants but also to politicians. As far as politicians are concerned this is being

looked at but in the Public Service I am instructed that the matter has been settled with the representatives of the public servants.

I cannot possibly say anything else about the rest of the debate except to say that it is difficult sometimes for the Opposition and members of the Public Service to realize that we in the Barbados Labour Party have been under the lash for fifteen years and the fact that one or two Labourites managed to slip through the net extended and manipulated by those passports in previous years does not amount to a fair system.
11.05 a.m.

I am not ashamed to say that when we took power I asked Establishments to make some effort to restore political balance within the Public Service. I have heard it said in here by the member for St. Michael West that we had to do it in respect of statutory corporations. I realised from the files that for years no representations were going up. I made it clear that the practices of the past were not to be continued and if in the course of the non continuation of the practices of the past, Head 3(2) had been compromised, I can only tell the hon. member that I am Prime Minister, and we are the masters now.

The question that Head 3(2) – Establishments stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 3(3) – TRAINING

Head 3(3) – Training – in the sum of $519,244 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that Head 3(3) – Training – in the sum of $519,244 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: I wonder if the Minister could give some indication of what progress have been made, if any, in the area of the Civil Service College which was mooted some time ago. He will recall, I think that the United Nations had withdrawn its financial support; but the Government, as I understand it, has determined that some substitute for the Civil Service College would form part of the training of the Service.

I just wish to make the very brief point, that I believe that training in the public sector has a future which has been expressed to some extent by the hon. member for Christ Church East when he attempted to raise the question of having a look at the public Service relating to the levels of training.

We have an Institute of Management and Productivity. We have a university campus in Barbados. We have an institution at Codrington College which is being under utilised. We in Barbados will have to work out a policy for training especially at executive level, and especially in relation to management training in the private sector and management training in the public sector. I remember that there was a Bill passed in this House allowing members in the public sector after serving, for I think, 10 years, to leave the public sector and go into the private sector and subsequently return without loss of pension rights. I think that the policy then was an inter-marriage between the public sector and the private sector. There was a time when public administration was divorced from management training when management training in the public administration and the private administration were two separate fields. The point that I am making is that we in Barbados should devise a strategy through which we are able to get the maximum from our human resources especially out of the executive level relations in the areas of the private sector and the public sector. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us now his feelings on this matter; because if we continue for the next 10 or 15 years from now at the rate that we are, we will never produce a people capable of filling management courses in the Government sector and the private sector; and despite the statements made from time to time about the need for more productivity, it is now a fact accepted by all and sundry that there is a relationship between productivity and the quality of management which goes into private enterprise as well as in the public sector.

We have the Government participating in a number of projects which the private sector will not, or are not participating in; but these are projects that are clearly part of the economy, not only to ourselves but even in the area of socialist countries and so called capitalist countries. I hope that the Government will give serious consideration to the training of people both in the private and public sector so that there can be not only a shared responsibility with teaching personnel, for example, but a real integration between private and public sector management administration. I look forward to hearing the Minister's views on this matter because I think it has a great significance for Barbados over the next 20 to 25 years. It has a significance for the direction in which Barbados will go in that period.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, this whole matter of training is, in my view, one of the very critical matters not only to Barbados, but to the Caribbean and the less developed countries.
11.15 a.m.

One of the major problems that has become more and more evident over the past twenty years in Barbados is that Government has got involved into more and more areas, and rightly so, as attempts have been made to socialise this economy in which one important component

is effective management, and this efficiency is seen, Mr. Chairman, not only within the service itself but also in many of its statutory corporations.

Now I remember years ago I met a certain gentleman who was on a training course in Scotland and at the time he was assigned to various posts. When I came back here in 1967 I discovered that on arrival back in Barbados he was assigned to another department that had absolutely nothing to do with the area in which he had spent some time having further training, and I do not think that he ever went to the area in which he was trained. So it is not only a question of providing further training and further development of management skills, but another more important component is that when you have the trained people the structure of the service itself often prevents these people from giving full expression to the management techniques which they have learnt over the years.

Now there is one particular area in Government which I believe most management experts would consider to be perhaps the most difficult area of management in terms of training and experience that is normally required in most developed countries to occupy such a position, and in point of fact if you look at the role that that person has to play within the Civil Service structure, he functions as I would say probably as a postman passing on recommendations to a particular Ministry and then recommendations and directives coming back to him, so that his input into the management structure of the institution for which he is allegedly responsible in fact is minimised because of the structure.

Now there is also another area to which I should like to draw attention. I believe and I have always felt for a long time that there is a need for a technical stream in the Civil Service. I believe that there is a need for a distinction between the administrative stream and the technical stream, and that in those areas where the technical component is the important one, then it is the technician, it is the technologist, it is the man with the expertise in management and otherwise who should be in ultimate charge of that operation, and I believe that we have to look at these things because you can train a whole lot of people, you can spend a whole lot of money in training, and unless they come back and function in an environment where they can give expression to what they have learnt and increase the productivity in that particular area consequential on the training which they have acquired, then you are wasting a whole lot of time. The whole question of training, the whole question of management within the public sector has to be intimately related to some concept of re-orientation and a restructuring of the service itself, and also a further definition of the relationship between Statutory Corporations and I believe, Mr. Chairman, you will know well what I am talking about, and the appropriate Ministry because you can have a whole lot of experts attached to the Statutory Corporations in Barbados, and yet the work of those Corporations can be totally frustrated because of the particular relationship with certain levels within the Civil Service. I am not blaming either this side or the other side for that. It just happens that is the way things have evolved over the past fifteen years and it is time it has got to be looked at.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending more and more money on personal emoluments every year and I think some time ago the hon. member for Christ Church East brought this matter to the attention of this House very forcibly, and you will never get productivity if you get a whole lot of untrained dead weight sitting on top of people who are adequately trained and capable of producing and yet they cannot function because of the system in which they have to work. There is no point spending large sums of money in training, there is no point having the best managers in the world if at the same time you do not change your system in such a way that the knowledge, experience and skills that they acquire can be brought to bear in relation to greater productivity within the Civil Service or any of its agencies.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, this Head 3(3) — Training, is a Head that can consume a lot of attention. I only need though to touch on a few small points which I feel are of crucial importance when we are dealing with this topic. The hon. member for Christ Church East had a Resolution in here some time ago dealing at some great length with the need for a revision of the Civil Service, and I do not think we need to debate that Resolution all over again, but however we need to draw attention to the fact that in drawing up the vote for training we tend sometimes to follow the old established norm and do not explore enough the need for more critical training in areas of great national need.

I have heard over the last two and a half years in here a good deal of criticism levelled against the press because of what is generally regarded as inaccurate reporting of the proceedings of the House. I should like to feel that any inaccuracies in the reports coming out of the House of Assembly are inaccuracies that reflect not so much political wickedness, but reflect rather a need for the Government to pay more critical attention to the training of journalists. It can be said, for example, that journalism in Barbados relates to the two print media that we have, the tabloid newspaper and the daily. The people who work for them are working for private enterprise, but Sir, I think a case can be made out to the effect that these gentlemen and ladies who work in these areas are very much involved in the national effort and whatever they say or do has a great deal of effect upon what the Government is attempting to accomplish. If because of a

lack of sophistication in reportage they do not slant news in a direction that reflects what the Government's policy is, or if somehow accuracy suffers because of an insufficient grasp of the intricacies of effective journalism, I believe it is with the Government's responsibility to start looking very critically at this need.
11.25 a.m.

I would submit too, Sir, that when we start thinking in terms of training that the Government should pay attention to the possibility of making Scholarships available for people who work in the Media so that they can go overseas, and complete a Course in Journalism and people who come in here, Sir, to report, should be effective Reporters in political journalism, people who know how to report on matters political, and I believe that if we begin to put our energies in this direction we would be able to see that there would be, in my opinion, less occasion for criticism on the efforts of Journalists.

I do not rule out altogether that some people because of a lack of this same sophistication that I talked about may allow their own partisan inclinations to supercede the broad journalistic criticism, but I would think, Sir, that if you train them we can then be able to demand from them a level of reportage or sophistication of reportage that is beyond condemnation. This, Sir, would also go for the Caribbean Broadcasting Service although I believe that will be coming up under another Head. I would like to extend the comments I have made to include the electronic media as well.

Speaking of training generally, Sir, I recognise and appreciate the difficulties which any Government will face when it comes to restructuring a Civil Service which has been in existence for many years as the structure which we have been working in has been in effect in Barbados. Change will come very very slowly indeed but I believe that it is time to emphasise what has already been said in this House. We have to start at the top of the Service to train people in Management so that they can effectively administer the portfolio which falls to them. It is impossible, and it is foolish to expect that a man who has never seen a Training Institution and who has never taken one course in Management can effectively look after the portfolios of say the Ministry of Education. It cannot happen, Sir. He is going to do it based upon what he has managed to learn through on-the-job training techniques over the years but modern Government is so complex that we can no longer realise that a man's capacity to absorb a little snack of this and a little snack of that is limited as he goes along.

We have to start training measures to run the Public Service effectively, perhaps a Masters Degree in Public Administration. Perhaps we can influence the member for St. Michael South West for one of these posts because he is trained in Public Administration and I think we need to put people in there who are going to be able to deal with these Ministries more effectively. We will get more work done rather than piling ineptitude on top of ineptitude because you always hear, Sir, that there is inadequate staff in the various Ministries. The reasons why, Sir, that you hear there is so much need for staff in my view is because those persons who are there do not know in Management terms how to exact the most from the efforts that they expend.

I think, Sir, that it is time as well that we start letting our Permanent Secretaries start setting objectives for people who are subordinate to them so that when you go back a month later it would be possible to evaluate the performance of say a Senior Assistant Secretary or somebody like that to see exactly how much he has been able to accomplish in that period of time rather than for them to be buried constantly under a pile of files and with nothing concrete being accomplished.

I suggest, Sir, that we do whatever we can think of in terms of training for the Public Service. We need to think in terms of training in Management so that we would be able to get constructive results and would be able to realise far more benefits for our national efforts.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I will be very short in this contribution because I believe that a lot of what I would say has been covered by my colleagues from this side. Let me say that the question of training, Mr. Chairman, is something which is one of utmost importance for any country and if we are going to be talking about training and particularly at this time we are concerned with the training within the Public sector, I think that our sights must be widened to look at the whole approach and attitude towards training which exists in this society so that I think that the question of the attitude which comes from the private sector is something which can easily be brought into focus here on this occasion.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that what is of utmost importance to the Government is that the Government has to provide some very clear and definite decisions on the question of training and obviously must established some sort of leadership in this particular area.

Now there have been in the past a number of incidents which seem to cause some doubt and some kind of insecurity as to the whole attitude and approach of Government to the question of training. The hon. member for St. Michael West in the course of his presentation made reference to the question of training in Journalism. I want, Mr. Chairman, to just devote a little bit of attention to this and particularly in view of a particular incident relating to the CBC which was involved in training in this particular instance. I think it must have been some time in 1977 that one of the employees of

CBC was awarded a Scholarship to attend a mass communication programme at Mona and in addition to this he was also awarded a CTFC, but as I understand it the money for this grant was not coming through until about January, 1978 and an approach was made to CBC with a view to getting leave for him to go to Mona to attend this Course and this was bluntly refused.

Now this is tied in with another instance which I will give you in relation to the *Advocate News* and where we had a situation where the Management for that Newspaper seemed to be totally opposed to the training of their staff members and particularly to their Journalists. I recall, for example Gairy Scott, who was awarded a Scholarship and applied for leave even without pay from the *Advocate News* to go to Jamaica to pursue a Diploma in Mass Communications and the attitude of the Managing Director of the *Advocate News* was that as far as he was concerned that was not the kind of course that he would want to see his workers going on that the kind of workers that he wanted was that they could get their training from working in the *Advocate News*.
11.35 a.m.

So that when you get that kind of attitude coming out, one has got to establish some very important principles and try to impress people that training is of the utmost importance; and from my experience I have come across a number of people in the Public Service who find considerable difficulty in convincing the heads of their department when they get scholarships or when they are interested in particular courses of training which would be of benefit to the person and the service. I believe that all training in some way or other goes towards development of the human personality and tends to make the person into a more competent and productive worker. I think therefore that we have to get very serious about this question of training and we have to have a very clear position on it, with a great deal of leadership coming from the Government.

I am glad to see that we are devoting some money to this particular area, although I see in the Training vote that there is a reduction of $50,000; however I think that any amount of money spent in training is important, particularly at this stage of our development.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may just take the final point made by the hon. member for St. Lucy, the question of an apparent reduction in the vote for training, let me point out that the Government has established as a fixed policy the localization of training. In the past a lot of money was spent in training of Public Servants overseas. We have taken a close look at it and find that the principle of training the trainers and doing the training locally not only saves a lot of money but helps to get the type of training more relative to the needs and circumstances obtaining in Barbados. It is also necessary that the hon. member look at the reduction in the training vote to appreciate that what is taken from one department is given to another department, because there are a number of Government departments that are involved in training at all levels. Only recently the Ministry of Education signed an agreement with the World Bank for an education project and one of the components in that agreement was for the extension and upgrading of the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity. In fact, a specific part of it is being spent in upgrading the Institute and development of the Institute itself in better and more modern management techniques; and it is part of its role to extend this to public officers and people working in private business, so that we expect to train hundreds more per year at the managerial level. And we go further, we expect to train no less than 1,200 people a year on the job through BIMAP; so that instead of a diminution of funds for training in 1979–80 there is a considerable increase of funds that will be devoted to training at all levels, both public and private.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael West made a point about training of journalists. Only this morning before I came to the House I had a meeting with two journalists who are interested in a mass communications course in Jamaica. As I pointed out to them we have already granted scholarships in journalism. There are people who have had National Development Scholarships to study journalism. We are very conscious of the important role of journalism in the community, and as I pointed to one of these gentlemen this morning, I would do anything I can to help him get to Jamaica for this course for two good reasons: One is that Barbados would be spared his reporting for one year, and secondly I believe that Barbados would be blessed with better reporting from him at the end of that year if he takes in the teaching in Jamaica.

One of the first precepts in journalism seems to be that if a dog bites a man that is not news, but if a man bites a dog that is news, and the journalist is always looking around for a man to bite a dog. So for his own benefit and the benefit of the whole community I am willing to do all I can to get him out of Barbados for a year. *(ASIDES)* I am not going into the question of names at this stage.

We are also in the Ministry of Education giving assistance to people who are taking the Mass Communications Course at Mona. It is not a field of study for which the Government of Barbados pays the economic cost, and I have given my undertaking to this gentleman that I will be taking steps to have the Government of Barbados pay the economic cost for

people taking the course at Mona because it can do nothing but good for the society as a whole. I will also point out that people taking the Mass Communications at Mona have been benefiting from the Enabling Grant Fund. Only last year one of the journalists who were in Jamaica had the benefit of this. So we can appreciate the need for the training of journalists and we will do what we can to upgrade it.

But I want to go further to another aspect of this matter of training in Barbados. The employers must understand that they have a duty to train their employees. It is not the responsibility of the Government to vote large sums to train journalists to work for the Thompson newspaper or other private firms up and down Barbados. It is also to the benefit of profit-making concerns that they should spend some part of their profits in training their employees. There is a lot of training in Barbados, both public and private. And that brings me to another point: There is need for a rationalization and harmonization of training courses and training techniques between the Government and private agencies. I know in my own capacity as Minister of Education that I am besieged by private concerns and business places – the Rotary Club, Jaycees, Chamber of Commerce – I am badgered with requests to open a training course or lend some of the expertise of the Ministry; all this literally cries out for a harmonization of methods and techniques, and indeed the content of courses. And I believe it is a responsibility that Government must undertake, because we cannot afford to squander our scarce resources in a multiplicity of efforts that can often lead in opposite directions.
11.45 a.m.

There is one other point Mr. Chairman, that I would like to make before I sit down. I do not share the view of some of my colleagues and hon. members on the other side that the Senior Civil Servants – to use the words of one hon. member, are untrained dead wood on top of the people. I think that that is how the hon. member for St. Michael South Central described them earlier. That is the typical language for that hon. member – untrained dead wood sitting on top of the people.

I do not share that. I work in a department, Mr. Chairman, where I have a number of Senior Civil Servants with a multitude of political persuasions against me or for me but with whom I have had very good relations. I am satisfied that by and large – I put it no further than that – I have been getting the utmost co-operation from my senior staff; and indeed among them are some of the finest public officers in Barbados. I do not want to overstate my case. That is becoming the weakness in this Hon. Chamber. I do want it to go on record that I am publicly expressing my appreciation for the assistance and dedication that I have had from a number of senior officers in my Ministry.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to touch briefly on other aspects of training that happen to be neglected when one is talking on this Head of the Estimates. I am talking about the training of people at the lower level, artisans and so on. I have found that now that we in Barbados are on the threshold of a construction boom, so to speak, and we are at a stage where there is an increasing demand for people to work in the electronics industry, and there is in Barbados an acute shortage of skilled artisans and technicians for the computer and the electronics industries.

Only yesterday I was reading a letter from the architects who were working on a construction job for the Ministry of Education; and they were complaining that after the crop started this year that they lost a lot of their skilled workers; and they were finding it extremely difficult to replace them. That is the answer to a lot of people who say that people cannot find work. Some cannot find work; but I am sure that a lot of them are working. The contractors said that we want to do your building on schedule; but if there is one thing that might prevent us from completing our schedule it is because we are finding difficulty in getting skilled workers to work on the site.

I mention this, Mr. Chairman, to point out the skewered way in which training has been tackled in this country. I know that they say that a lot of emphasis should be on the training at managerial level in the public sector and the private sector; but I am firmly of the view, based on empirical evidence, not the evidence I heard at least from one hon. member on that side, facts that cannot stand up to scrutiny. I am talking about the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Put that in the record. I am speaking of facts based on empirical evidence that no proper manpower survey was done by the previous administration for a projection of the country's needs of 10, 15 or 25 years. So that we do not know what we will need for the future; and so this is now coming home to us in a lot of areas in which there has been no training for the future and there is a dearth of trained people.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that before the end of 1979 – let us put it no later than that – the Government will have to give serious consideration to the importation of skilled artisans for the construction industry in Barbados. It has already started. One construction firm is asking the Government to let them import skilled labour because sufficient people are not trained in Barbados to fill that need. Then we hear these beautiful speeches made by members on the other side that there is a pressing need.

The hon. member for St. Lucy is headmaster of a college up in St. Philip. The Government of Barbados makes a subvention to that college. The hon. member for St. Lucy can tell you that only last year he approached me on behalf of his college for a larger subvention. It was granted, and yet the hon. member does not in his capacity as Senior Assistant Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union, and indeed as the headmaster of this college, has not yet got together with me as Minister of Education whom he is asking to give a bigger subvention to this college, and to work out some strategy for the peoples' college in St. Philip to be better used for the training of workers at all levels. That college operates below its maximum capacity. I do not want to say most of the time because I want to be sure of what I am saying. I will say that a lot of the time that college in St. Philip is not being used. I challenged the hon. member for St. Lucy to get up and say now. All of that money was spent on that college in St. Philip, and a lot of the time it is not being used. So I had better not challenge the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would like to challenge the Hon. Minister to wind up his speech.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I will wind up in another minute. I am inviting the hon. member to let him and his people at the Barbados Workers Union sit down with me and the Minister of Labour who is responsible for training to see if we can put our heads together and work out a programme by which we can properly utilise this expensive building at St. Philip, paid for by the workers of this country. I am not challenging him. I am inviting him.
11.55 a.m.

I hope when we come back to the Estimates next year and we talk about training the hon. member for St. Lucy would be in a position to tell this Honourable Chamber that he accepted the invitation I had given him today and that a proper, well thought out programme has been worked out for the training of the workers of this country, the ones whose money is being poured into the B.W.U. and the training in the School up there, that that place is now being fully operational and used to the benefit of all the workers in this society.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to be rising again on this particular Head, but the Hon. Minister of Education has issued a challenge. He says he is not a person who overstates his case, but far from overstating the particular case relative to the Labour College, I think that he is obviously misinformed as I will demonstrate. The Minister seems to be rather peeved and hurt, it would seem, at what he has described as the Barbados Workers' Union not sitting down with him and discussing the programmes at the Labour College, and secondly, he indicated that I approached him for an increase in the subvention for my college. Let me just make this position clear. The Barbados Workers' Union's Labour College which I have the honour to head is not my College, but it is a College which is owned and operated by the Barbados Workers' Union for the benefit of the workers in Barbados, and I want to say that the Government gives a subvention to the Barbados Workers' Union for the benefit of the Labour College, because people who go to the Labour College are taxpayers of Barbados and it is our view that those workers are entitled to some of the money which goes into the Government coffers being devoted to their training.

Now I could go on on this for a long time, but just let me say that the whole question of training and the question of Workers' education is something which is of fundamental importance and one which we have carefully worked out. We have our objectives and we to a large extent achieve those objectives.

I want more specifically, Mr. Chairman, to reply to the charge which has been made by the Minister of Education because I believe that only a person who is misinformed or who is not aware of what is going on could make such an outrageous charge as the one that the Minister of Education has made. He stated that for a lot of the time the College at Mangrove in St. Philip is not being used. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to categorically deny that statement and to say that every week there is something going on at the College and the College is in use. As a matter of fact, the Barbados Workers' Union's Labour College has a programme and the courses run from January until the end of November.

I was looking for one of our Annual Reports which I thought I had. Anyhow they run from the beginning of January until the end of November and anybody who examines the programmes would know that the College goes on a continuous basis. Right now there is a regional seminar type conference which is going on there and there are people from Barbados and people from other parts of the region, so that I do not even need a report to demonstrate this. For example, you take the last report from the Labour College which is contained in the Report of the Barbados Workers' Union, you would see that there is an appendix which sets out very clearly all of the courses which are run at the College, so for anybody and particularly for the Minister of Education to get up and make such an outrageous charge about something which he knows nothing about, or if his problem is that we have not sat down and discussed a programme with him, that is a matter for him, but what I am saying is that from January to November of every year that College is open and

programmes are conducted in there every day and every week; so I do not know where the Minister of Education has got his misinformation from because that just cannot be information.

Mr. Chairman, one has to recognise that whereas the Minister of Education has the gumption to accuse the hon. member for St. Michael South Central of being given to overstating and exaggeration, that he is far more guilty of that as far as this particular matter is concerned, and I can assure the Minister of Education that what we are doing at the College I am convinced has oriented the workers of this country towards....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, my colleague is trying to follow exactly which page of the report he is referring to, and since I could assist him with the report, I should just like him to tell us which page it is so that we can assist him. *(Asides)* You said you wanted the report, so I am only asking you to tell us which page it is so that we can follow you; and stop bluffing. You are bluffing all the time. I play poker you know!

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I do not play poker so I do not know much about bluffing, but the hon. member who is an expert poker player would know more about bluffing than I would.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: That is exactly why I gave you the report because you cannot bluff me. I can see your hand.

Mr. GREAVES: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, I just make the point that it is very clear and it is there for anybody to see and examine that the programmes of the College are run on a continuous basis. This is a matter of record. For example, if I remember correctly, in the year which we took from September to the middle of August 1978, we had over 707 people who passed through the College and who did programmes of one sort or another at the College. Talking about capacity, our programmes are generally on a residential basis. This is another point. We can accommodate at a maximum 38 participants in one particular course. You have to understand the whole concept and the way in which the College operates. It is not a situation where you would expect to get 200 or 300 people in one particular course, because we do not have the capacity and we are not organised to do that on a continuing basis, and with it goes too another very important aspect. I am very glad, for instance, that a Minister of Education has given me this opportunity, because it gives me a chance to raise the question of educational leave with pay for persons who attend the Labour College.

12.05 p.m.

Now this is a matter which has been exercising our attention. It has been the concern, for example, of the International Labour Organisation and so much so that the ILO has passed a Convention entitled "Paid Educational Leave" for the specific purpose of enabling Trade Unions and workers generally to attend courses organised by Trade Unions around the world because Trade Unions have been experiencing a number of difficulties in trying to get leave with pay for people to go to the various programmes which they are offering from time to time.

We in Barbados are also experiencing this and if the Government is serious about this they can adopt that particular Convention, Convention 140 of the ILO relative to Paid Educational Leave and I would call on the Government at this stage to give some very serious thought and consideration to adopting it and accepting that particular Convention, the Convention of the ILO 140 on Paid Educational Leave. That would also be of tremendous assistance because the resistance which we at present get from employers who do not really understand and generally appreciate the role of the Labour College the resistance which we get from them as far as allowing their workers to go to the Colleges concerned, that particular response would be met in a way.

It goes even further, because we have been noticing that there are a number of employers in this country who adopt the attitude that their workers do not need any exposure to Trade Unionism, to leadership, and to communications. They do not seem to train workers in safety and health. There is no need to have their workers exposed to the kind of programmes which we operate at the Labour College from time to time and this is the difficulty, but in spite of that difficulty, we find that there are lots of workers who brave those difficulties and those problems and who come to the Labour Colleges for courses of various lengths.

We have courses of, sometimes tentative one-week courses, sometimes tentative two-week courses and we have at least once or twice a year a one-month's course whether it is to deal with Industrial Relations or on matters relating to current issues facing the Trade Union Movement. Sir, our programme of training broadly is designed to develop individuals. It is designed further to give the individual a greater appreciation of the Trade Union Movement and to develop skills and leadership in the Trade Unions because we recognise that there is need in any organisation for leadership at all levels and certainly it also develops the individual into a citizen who can appreciate and understand the problems of Government and the problems of the society and that is why I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that the kind of buffoonery and the kind of chicanery that used

to be involved and certainly that has been practised by the Barbados Labour Party will be seen through very clearly by people who have been exposed to our programmes at the Labour College because we are able to expose people in a very broad way and we can analyse the problems of the society, the problems of Government, and that we are having a new workman emerging within the society and I daresay that the entire impact of the working of the College and the appreciation of workers for this society and an understanding of what is going on will be felt and indeed is being felt at the present time.

Sir, we have nothing to be afraid of. We have nothing to be ashamed of because we understand very clearly what we are after. We understand very clearly what we are doing and we have set our goals and we have set our objectives and we are moving in a new direction of achieving those goals and objectives.

If one is going to talk, the Government gives the Barbados Workers' Union Labour College $20,000. It gives BIMAP – if you are going to talk about comparisons – the Government as far as I can recall provides about 75% of the cost of administration of BIMAP. When one is going to make comparisons one has to be aware of what is involved in those comparisons and as a matter of fact, I think that one could easily, from our position in the Barbados Workers' Union, make out a case for an even greater subvention from the Government and maybe the Government could give some consideration to this instead of talking about $20,000. We should be talking in terms of about $75,000 or $80,000 and that would be the kind of money which the Government should be considering in terms of putting aside for assisting the training of workers in this country.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, when one is talking about Industrial Relations we hear the Government often talking and the former Minister of Labour – I believe one of his departing shots that he made when he was removed from that Ministry was that we have a good industrial relations climate in this country. How do we expect, Mr. Chairman, to have a good industrial relations climate in this country if you do not have workers who do not understand and who do not appreciate what is involved in this? Do you want to have a situation.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will wind up on the point that the workers must be properly trained. Come back to training.

Mr. GREAVES: Yes, I am winding up. You see having a good industrial relations climate of which we can boast and which we can project to investors who are coming into Barbados, has to do with training. It has to do with an understanding of workers, of their roles, and of their responsibilities, and this is of tremendous importance. The case cannot really be overstated. The fact that we have insisted that we must get a subvention from Government and the fact that we have even indicated that $20,000 is not enough is an indication that we are concerned about the whole level of training and understanding. We want to raise the heights of workers and an appreciation of it.

I will tell the Hon. Minister of Education that he must not get too peeved and up-tight and should not be guided to exaggeration to which he says he is not prone.

Finally, I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I want to emphasise that we are designing our class sizes around 25 to 30 and we are dealing with that particular size group because we find that working with a group like that is one which you can really do a lot to and they can benefit a lot more from that size.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Finally, Sir, I am rising to say something on what has been said so far. I really want to deal. Sir, with the two speeches made by the hon. member who has just sat down. I must say I took a number of notes on what he said. I presume that before he made his references to the Managing Director of the Advocate that he had written to the Speaker under Order 28, Rule 10(b).

12.15 p.m.

I am the only person who has ever written a letter to the Speaker in here, so hon. members are making an error if they think that I do not make myself aware of the rules and follow them. When I think on my feet I am not easily distracted and when I am making a speech I do not carry myself away as the hon. member for St. Lucy.

As regards the matter of CBC that there has been some refusal to allow someone to go away for training, what in fact has happened is that a respected member of the staff of CBC had applied for training leave and was granted training leave on full pay to go to Jamaica. He then wanted a loan because he did not think that his salary would allow him to maintain himself in Jamaica and his family in Barbados. He was not given a loan, but had his assignment restructured so that he could attend Cave Hill without any disturbance to his income or any serious inconvenience. Nobody would think that the person concerned is perfectly happy attending Cave Hill and as far as I know has made no complaints about the arrangements that were made for him.

On the point of paid educational leave I wonder why the hon. member who is the Assistant General Secretary of the Barbados Workers Union has never managed to put this seriously to the employers in this country. As far as I

know, the only politician who has ever picked this up with any force was myself when addressing the University recently at a graduation ceremony. I said then that the Government was carrying too large a share of the load in granting training leave and the load in supporting the University of the West Indies, because the overwhelming majority of people at Cave Hill, if not all, who are enjoying training leave are government servants. Teachers form a large proportion of this number and there is constant pressure on the Government and this has its effects on the personal emoluments bill in granting leave to people to go to Cave Hill. We are constantly being asked to give leave with full pay for at least two years for people to go to Cave Hill to get degrees or diplomas in public administration, and I have recently been advised that the present number of people studying for the Diploma in Public Administration at Cave Hill will now exceed the number of positions available. Government is carrying the burden of bringing university education to people who because of the shortage of university places when they left school could not get such an education. All over Bridgetown there are firms which I think could, with benefits, employ graduates. Barbados Shipping and Trading may have one or two graduates from Cambridge at its head, but it has a very large number of employees who have no other training than that provided by the day to day experience they get on the job. Many of them are very good managers, but I daresay many of them also, had they had the opportunity to go to university would have discovered the intellectual capacity to do so at an early stage and perhaps might be better managers now and more able to take a proper view of the commercial and economic imperatives in Barbados than they are able to do at present. I certainly agree with the hon. member for St. Lucy that some effort should be made to persuade employers other than Government to give paid educational leave to their employees. This is in fact something about which I feel very strongly and the Government is in the process of taking the initiative of approaching employers in this connection.

But before I sit down, I do hope that no other point would be added comparable to the one heard from the hon. member that the buffoonery and chicanery of the Barbados Labour Party will be seen through as a result of the programme to which the workers will be exposed at the Barbados Labour College. I cannot believe my ears that I have heard an official of the Barbados Workers Union announcing that the purpose of the Labour College is to canvass against the Barbados Labour Party, because that is more or less what his statement means. Unless I can get the assurance – not from the hon. member but from the man who really matters – that this does not represent the policy of the Barbados Workers Union and the Labour College, he can be assured that the position of the Government vis-a-vis the Labour College will be reviewed. If the Principal of the Barbados Labour College can announce in Parliament that the purpose of the College is to see through the buffoonery and chicanery of the Barbados Labour Party, he will see whether an educational institution with such an announced political purpose will continue to be treated as an educational institution by the Government. Fortunately, I believe that Mr. Frank Walcott has a little more sense than the hon. member for St. Lucy. The Union has a request before the Government right now. Fortunately Mr. Walcott knows a boy in the yard when he sees one and will tell me not to mind the boy. We hear a lot in here about the hon. member for St. James saying something about the workers and now we are sitting down and finding it a matter of amusement that the Principal of the Labour College can announce that the programmes there will allow the workers to see through the buffoonery and chicanery of the Barbados Labour Party. I congratulate hon. members opposite on their amusement. They can get up and complain about one of their canvasser's daughters not being given a job, but hon. members on this side must sit down and hear that the Labour College, supported by Government funds and enjoying exemption from taxation as an educational institution and seeking Government aid in other areas, is there to enable workers to see through the buffoonery and chicanery of the Barbados Labour Party. I say no more than that; treat it as a matter of amusement.

The question that the sum of $519,244 under Head 3 – Public Service Divisions (3) Training – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Am I to take it that we are going in a different way? I see in my book that Head 4(1) follows Head 3(3) and Head 4(1) is Cabinet Office.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Head called is 8(1), Direction and Policy Formulation in respect of the Ministry of Finance and Planning.

Mr. TAITT: I just wanted to be sure that the Clerk had not made an error.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is the Government's prerogative to call whatever Head it chooses.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,606,975 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (2) TREASURY

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (2) – Treasury – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $227,355 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (2) Treasury – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 8(3) – DATA PROCESSING

Head 8(3) – Data Processing in the sum of $550,121 – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 8(3) – Data Processing – in the sum of $550,121 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat concerned about the whole question of Data Processing and the dissemination of information and consequentially the storage of such information. We have seen recently the introduction of a series of so called surveys done by the Government of Barbados, and which, presumably would have submitted to this kind of data processing exercise. Many of us in the community have been concerned about several aspects of such things, and in particular I would like to refer to one or two of these studies and the publications resulting from them.

Now, I believe that if data is being collected from the community, that it is important that the criteria used, that the selection of personnel, that the methodology used, that the materials used, that the techniques used, that the format of any questionnaire used, that the numbers of geographical distribution of persons involved in such an exercise should be free of subjectivity and bias, which are very important in a small community.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I know that it is always very difficult to follow the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. We are at Head 8(3); but we know that "Brother Lally" has always to say something.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Dr. HAYNES: I want to deal with this Head. I feel that the Government has an obligation to let the public know about this process and how they are involved in this kind of exercise, because not only is it of importance to the public, but it is even of greater importance to the members of this Hon. House who ought to be able to have the benefit of such information. However, Mr. Chairman, what ever kind of data is produced, whatever are the criteria and the various factors I think that this information should be made available to the hon. members of this House. It makes it very difficult for us during elections, and we do not want to go out to the public and damage the creditability of the Government on what might be a properly conducted data processing exercise; but if we do not have the information, we can only rely on the inputs given to us from the community; and I would suggest to the Government that since this matter can be of such great importance, not only for the structuring of their programmes, but also in the structuring and attitudes and programmes on this side, I hope that we will be in a position to carefully evaluate every aspect of Government; because we have heard in the speech made previously in this Hon. House by the Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. Thomas, that this exercise of data processing will have an increasingly important effect in this society, not only on financial structuring, not only on the financial structuring of the Estimates in the future, but also on many areas of life.

This brings me to another question – the question of storage and security of data. I was not here, but I understand that an hon. member on the other side on one particular occasion got up in this Hon. House obviously having obtained information from the Rates and Taxes Department and the recently established Registration of Rentals Department and was able to point out all properties owned in Barbados by hon. members on this side; but hon. members on that side will probably realise that the same hon. member will have the same information on them; but what is more important is that the general public of Barbados must be concerned that politicians have that kind of access to information of that nature, and will be prepared to divulge that kind of information.

Mr. BRADSHAW: What I know is that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was able to give me accurate information from the Income Tax Department. When I asked him how he got it he said he got it from an officer who was in his party.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if the hon. member is referring to me because I never had any conversation with him on such a matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Dr. HAYNES: I was most interested to hear the hon. member intervene in this particular matter; because I remember that it was the Hon. Prime Minister and member for St. Thomas who made a statement on people who have a net taxable income of over $100,000; and that was the first time I heard any disclosure on matters relating to Inland Revenue.
12.35 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, there is great danger when hon. members make accusations in here that the Press takes down these accusations as though they have substance in them. If the hon. member was familiar with the income tax reports, he would be familiar that every year the Commissioner of Inland Revenue does publish details of tax brackets, how many people are in which bracket. There is nothing whatsoever wrong in any hon. member ringing the Commissioner of Inland Revenue and asking him how many people earned less than $10,000 last year and he will be told. Well maybe the Commissioner would ask me and I would tell him of course to give the information. There is nothing wrong in it and on the question which the hon. member is referring to about what properties are owned the hon. member must read the Laws of Barbados. I believe he is referring to the fact that somebody commented on two properties which he has registered as a landlord and which rent for some amount of money. If he reads the Landlord and Tenant (Registration of Tenancies) Act, 1977—44 Section 4(2), he will see that the register of tenancies shall be open to public inspection during office hours and may be examined by any person upon payment by him of the prescribed fee. It is a matter of public knowledge. You don't have to be an M.P. Anybody can go to Rates and Taxes and look up any one of the 11,000 tenancies. You will see Haynes, you will see John Michael Geoffrey Manningham Adams, you may even see David A. C. Simmons.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You would not see me because I do not have any property. I do not rent out.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know, but you pay a small fee and get it, and the same is true of the tax records. You are entitled to know who owns what piece of land in Barbados it is no secret. I do not know why the hon. member wants to hide it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister did rise on a point of order and he had exceeded the privilege. He is starting to make a speech.

Dr. HAYNES: It is quite clear to me, Mr. Chairman, that you will have to go to the Register of Companies to find out the ownership in certain areas. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter. *(Asides)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Hon. Minister of Education to speak in a *sotto voce* if necessary, but I heard the word "idiot", and as I had to warn the other side last week, I do not like taking notice of asides but I want to be fair to both sides, and I am not going to entertain language like that in tones other than *sotto voce.*

Dr. HAYNES: Now, Mr. Chairman, there also comes another matter of the suppression of information so collected that could be made public. For example we have heard a lot about savings in the consumption of electricity as a consequence of the introduction of daylight saving time, or the expectation of savings. I happen to know that data is available to Government which indicate clearly that the number of kilowatt hours of electricity consumed in this country has steadily increased through 1976, 1977 and 1978. In other words, the 1978 figure was greater than the 1977, and there is information available to the present Government that the domestic component of the total volume of kilowatt hours consumed in Barbados is so negligible that even if there was a marginal effect on domestic consumption which it did not have, it would be insignificant in relation to the total increase particularly with the increasing usage of electricity for manufacturing and other purposes. That information is available but did not come out though the results of the survey came out but no other aspect of the survey, and that information is available through the appropriate data-processing facilities of the Government of Barbados, and I know, and I cannot be challenged on that fact, that that kind of information can be suppressed. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we have to look in a small society at this whole question of data processing very carefully.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, is he accusing me of suppressing information acquired through Data Processing on the consumption of electricity in this country?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He accuses the Government, not you.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am the Minister. The hon. member has used a very interesting technique there. He has said something 90% of which is true but the 10% which is false is the interesting part, because the Electric Company's survey did show that there was some saving of domestic electricity through the daylight saving period, but it is no part of either the Statistical Service or Data Processing. He has said that it showed there was no saving. That is not true.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member would give way, I accept the point of order. I think you have made the point and you can reply at length later on.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I was not accusing the Hon. Prime Minister of suppressing anything. I am just saying what can happen as a consequence of the suppression of information when you are looking at the attitude of an innovation, the only innovation by the present administration, namely, daylight saving time, and I believe this was referred to by a columnist not so long ago in one of the local newspapers.

However, Mr. Chairman, this matter of course is going to come up again when we are dealing with the whole question of the registration of all persons in Barbados and the information that would necessarily be tied to not only electoral information but other information and so on. Indeed I would call upon the present Government and in particular the hon. member for St. Thomas who even before effective data processing and computerisation had his own computer up there knowing so much about so many people in Barbados, and God knows now what he will know about people in Barbados, and I want to see that secrecy and privacy of this information is properly protected in relation to any administrative efficiencies that may be gained from an increasing use of data processing. It is of fundamental importance to this society. We are a small society and the significance is different on a small Island from what it would be in a country like the United States where the information could be stored in Washington and the information stored might be on persons living somewhere in California or something like this, and these are considerations that are very essential when you are dealing with the whole question of data processing. I hope that this innocent contribution that I have tried to make, although it appeared to the hon. member for St. Thomas to be in some way not innocent, would be of some help to the Government of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are a few matters which as the hon. member said will be borne in mind. Unfortunately the hon. member has a sense of secrecy that seems to be more highly developed than those of us who assist in framing legislation. The hon. member seems to believe that giving details without naming any body of persons earning in excess of $150,000 a year will somehow identify him. The hon. member seems to be worried that the properties which he has registered with the Rates and Taxes somehow reflects ill on him, that because somebody has gone and looked up his properties that some mischief has been done. I do not think it should be anything to be ashamed of to be owning properties which you rent out in a property-owning democracy such as ours. I am quite convinced that the Leader of the Opposition would not say for example, that his affairs should be kept under some obsessive wrap of secrecy. Certainly I do not believe I would say so and I heard no hon. member during the debate on the registration of tenancies argue that the register should be secret so that nobody should know who owned property in Barbados. I have never before heard it suggested that you are not entitled to find out who your neighbour is if you have a land problem.
12.45 p.m.

I am very glad to be able to say that when I wanted to build a wall I thought about the convenience of my neighbour and myself. The coral stone wall which I proposed to build along the boundary, I went and had it looked up at the Tax Office and wrote to the gentleman and asked for permission and he and I agreed. That is a facility which is available to the public.

Dr. HAYNES: If the hon. member will give way for one moment. I think he does appreciate that there can be legitimate and reasonable reasons for seeking that kind of information but it can also be used by irresponsible persons for a completely different purpose. It is that aspect of the use that I am talking about.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member is not now saying anything that I see should be a matter of political partisanship. It is a matter of attitudes. He must bring a Bill to amend the Landlord and Tenants Registration of Tenancies Act amending Section 4(1) to restrict the right to inspect the Register. We all agreed in here it should be inspected. If he does not want his inspected and he thinks as a principle that you can find out too much about people, he can bring in a Bill. He can also bring in a Bill to restrict the right to discover who is the owner of a parcel of land in Barbados.

I wonder what the hon. member will do when the Integrity Legislation comes before the House and he has to declare his assets in and outside of Barbados. I wonder what the hon. member will do when he discovers that it would not be enough to declare that he has an interest in the Cayman Islands Property Company but he has to declare what property the company owns. I wonder what he would do when that happens, or forfeit the property.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to let this Honourable House know that I neither have, or have ever had at anytime any interest in any company in the Cayman Islands or in any other tax-haven.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I congratulate the hon. member on his confidence that his affairs will continue to be strouded in secrecy. But of course I was speaking figuratively. Nobody will ever accuse the hon. member of owning property anywhere. He is not a rich

man. He never seeks to conceal what property he owns. He always tells the truth. He has never made a statement in here which can be contradicted whether by reference to the Central Bank Report or otherwise. Obviously I was not referring to the hon. member. He is a person whose word is his bond who can be believed on and off his Oath on all occasions. We can take anything the hon. member says for granted.

I say all of that, Sir, although my dear, old, departed father always warned me not to be sarcastic, that you will make a remark like that, somebody will pick it up and read it out as if it were serious. Based on letters I have seen signed by the hon. member I know that there is a very great advantage in this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would be very glad if the Hon. Prime Minister will now add all of that data to the Bill and process it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Thank you, Sir. We are aware of the difficulties involved in keeping population records to which unauthorised persons can have access but an important point which I will draw to the attention of hon. members is that the Government can keep only such records as are authorised by law. We cannot keep a man's credit rating on a Government Computer. We cannot keep a man's criminal record on a Government Computer. Certainly not as far as I know. *(Asides.)* Yes, the medical records are already handed out.

I am of the impression that the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act does contain certain provisions relating to the keeping of records, certainly fingerprints and so on. I heard the Leader of the Opposition saying why not. It may be best for me to say at this stage that the Government has no intention of keeping criminal records or credit ratings, or security records of that sort on the Computer where access can be had to them because the objective of the United States is not that national records or vital statistics are keep on the Computer. That is not the objective.

Some people's personal business find themselves on to private Computers and security records find themselves on Government Computers and what goes for security at one time might not go for security at another time and in the very interest of security sometimes it prevents you from knowing what is the nature of the record.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way, Mr. Chairman will the hon. member tell us then if it is the intention of the Government to bring legislation to preclude the keeping of the kind of record which in fact creates the difficulties which the hon. member is speaking about? I think his point is at present not to speak out his intentions but I think it would make the number one system much more palatable if in fact there is legislation to deal with it as the criminal records are now dealt with. I wonder if he will advert to that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I know that the Ministry of the Attorney General is preparing records relating to the dissemination of information. A number of documents are under circulation relating to it but I really would not like to be led to say that, as in their case, there is a lot of controversy in the Public Service at the advisory level at the present time. I am giving the hon. member the assurance that the problem is under consideration. That is why I said it is a matter of Government intention because I myself am not sure how securely these matters are dealt with by legislation.

I did take precautions of checking the Statistics Act which is found in Volume IV of the uncorrected Volumes, Chapter 192 for the assistance of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He is asking for us to expose the methodology, and the details of these services and so on. The Statistics Act does specifically say "that except for the purpose of prosecution under the Act no individual return or part thereof may in the purpose of the Act" and there are other things. "Not necessarily given to any questions put for the purpose, nor report, abstract or other documents and so on should be published, admitted in evidence or shown to any person not employed in the execution of duty under this Act".

Now the hon. member speaks of the methodology and so on. I am not aware that any survey has ever been conducted by the Government in which the methodology – sorry to keep using the word, Sir. I prefer to use the good old simple English word method. Unless the methods used have not been put to the public. I do not particularly know of what surveys he is speaking about. There are 18 or 19, may be more classes of surveys which may be carried out by the Statistical Department. It covers a wide area. They particularly carry out surveys on retail prices and I happen to know that they are so strict with those that they do not even tell me what supermarkets they go to.

I believe the former Minister of Trade will agree with that. What supermarkets they go to obtain their prices I do not know because sometimes I see a price in the list they circulate and I know it is higher than the price in the supermarket I go to.
12.55 p.m.

They do not tell the Minister of Finance where they have obtained their information. Now at a different level different officers not bound by the Statistical Act and not receiving information in consequence of their duties under the Statistical Act – Statistical Officers have to take an oath, they are sworn officers and they take an oath of secrecy – people who are not concerned with

that go to the supermarkets and prepare surveys. I think the surveys have been very useful in keeping down the cost of living in this country. I would like to offer a word of congratulation to the Statistical Officers who go to the supermarkets, and I would like to thank the hon. member for St. Michael West because they base their work on the BMC. But the statistics themselves are not allowed to be published.

As far as the Daylight Saving Time questionnaire is concerned, I am under the impression that the Cabinet ordered the report on Daylight Saving Time to be circulated to members of the House, and as far as I am concerned they can see it, but I will have to ask the advice of the Director of Statistical Services because there is a breakdown showing what electoral districts were visited and how many people were questioned, and he might consider publication of such detailed material as beginning to infringe on the Act. Anyway I do not want to go into details now; the Attorney General would have to advise me on this. But there is no objection to disclosing what the statisticians would call the methodology. I do not know if hon. members have had any exposure to Statistical courses, but according to the statistics taught me at Oxford it did seem that every conceivable precaution against bias was taken in this instance.

We have had some difficulty with the unemployment survey with what the Statistical services call pollution of the sample, and they have applied to me for a pause and they have asked for permission not to collect any unemployment statistics from April to June of this year and start again in July. They want this pause for several reasons I appreciate this is what the hon. member was drawing to my attention, but let me assure him that that aspect of his speech has not fallen on deaf ears. We are as concerned as anybody else not to have misleading statistics. Lloyd George said during the 1916 debate that brought down Asquith during the first World War, in connection with the statement made by a General called Morris, that he agreed with General Morris that the Imperial General Staff was keeping three sets of statistics – one to fool the Germans, one to fool the British Government, and one to fool themselves. I do not wish to be in the position of keeping statistics for fooling myself. It is no use suppressing unemployment statistics if the people out there know that they are unemployed. Perhaps the last Government fell into that error. Mr. Philip Greaves got in here and said that there was no report showing that there was 22% unemployment, that he knew of one showing 13%. We don't want to fall into that error and perhaps the reason why we do not publish certain things is because we do not have confidence in them even though they might appear to be favourable. The hon. member for St. Michael South West will recall that before the last Budget I told him of the Government's lack of confidence in some of the figures appearing in the Government's Economic Report, and I give the assurance to all members opposite that the mere fact that the computer grinds out statistical material will not make the Government put it before the public as if it was graven on tables of brass or delivered from the top of Mount Sinai.

I beg to move that the sum of $550,121 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (3) Data Processing – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting until 2 p.m.
1.05 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply and to that it now reverts.

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

HEAD 8(4) – CENTRAL PURCHASING

Head 8(4) – Central Purchasing (Ministry of Finance and Planning) in the sum of $1,220,351 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 8(4) – Central Purchasing – in the sum of $1,220,351 stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, *(Asides)*. In spite of that, I have a few remarks to make on this Head which I think should be of some value. In the first place, I do not think that after a number of years the Central Purchasing Department has been used to the great advantage of Barbados, not through any fault of those who work there, but because I do not believe that the Government has

given it sufficient attention. I am told that the revolving fund at Central Purchasing is in the area of a quarter million dollars, and added to that it gets a vote of $100,000 to buy supplies.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to work a purchasing department for a Government on a spending power of $2½ million is ridiculous, if you want to do bulk purchasing; and in a community whether it be medical supplies, whether it be furniture or other supplies $2½ million would not allow the officer in charge to place all the orders beyond a matter of a few months; and to do bulk purchasing you have got to start about a year, 18 months or two years. A simple little firm like A. R. Tempro comes to my mind which would have a greater finance than $2¼ million. The Barbados Shipping and Trading Company would have $50 million; and you are asking the Central Purchasing Department of Government to get the best advantage of purchasing, then giving them $2¼ million.

That is totally ridiculous. I believe that medicine and drugs alone would absorb that if the officer was getting permission to go ahead and order for the various hospitals under the Ministry of Health. Take a simple thing like cement. When there was a shortage of cement in the private sector, the Government sector also had to stop working. The Government of Barbados should bring in one of those ship loads of cement for themselves, and they would have enough cement so that work at the Ministry of Communications and Works would not have to close down, and work on roads and so on come to a stand still. In this respect the Government is losing money because if you cannot build roads, the road builders are also in trouble.

Take a thing like air conditioners. The Government of Barbados I suppose, would buy 200 or 300 air conditioners a year. You could go to any of these companies that produce air conditioners and buy them through an agent in Barbados at a special price; and having got them through an agent, the five year guarantee would apply. There are many other areas that can be developed; but I must say at this time that I think that all members of the House would be glad to know that under Central Purchasing in the Capital Estimates there is $3¼ million voted for building a warehouse. I wonder if you ask any member of Parliament where the Central Purchasing Department stores certain things they would be able to tell you. If they sent me to Central Purchasing to pick up a bucket of money, I would not be able to find Central Purchasing because there is no proper building for it; and I think that the Government should be congratulated for voting $3¼ million for Central Purchasing; but having said that, I must also draw attention to some of the problems that can come up with purchasing.

I myself had a background in Commerce; and a purchaser in any business who is usually referred to as a buyer, holds one of the key positions in his company. I have met buyers working for Montgomery Ward, Sears Roebuck and so on. These people can make or break a business. They can make tremendous profits by knowing where to buy the goods and when to buy them and to be able to bargain for them; but when they make a mistake they can also cause the company a fortune.

Therefore, Sir, the personnel in this department must have experience in knowing the markets, where to get certain things from, certain items or certain commodities. For instance, Mr. Chairman, I will give two examples. A big company in Bridgetown, with an electrical department. The buyer was not reading on development when he place an order for about $200,000 in ordinary electric cables, lead covered and rubber cover cables. He was unaware that PVC was already on the market. As a result, the company had to write off the lead covered and the rubber covered cables and throw them away – a total loss. I am giving this as an example so that members will understand that a buyer in the Central Purchasing Department will have to be a man very highly trained. There is also another case which I can recall and of which I know very well. I met a man who was drinking and enjoying himself, and I got into conversation with him. He told me that he had just managed to pull off a great deal with the airport staff, something to do with electrical equipment and what have you for the tower. He said that although it was brand new equipment, it is now one year outdated. What we are now producing is in advance of that by about 10 years.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, if you have a buyer he must know what he is buying; and if you are going to start talking about buying hospital supplies, mattresses, furniture or what have you, these things can be bought at bulk cost. These are things that are used in many departments of Government in this country – hospitals and many other departments, the Psychiatric Hospital and so on. If you get a good buyer, you can save a tremendous amount of money for the Government; but by the same token, if he is not a good buyer he can throw away millions of dollars for the Government. I do not know if it is legally possible, but I believe that the Central Purchasing Department should be a Statutory Board where you would have members of that Board who are pharmacists, doctors, Government employees, people who know about the hardware business, the construction business, all working for the Government and giving proper advice. I believe that when you get a Government department like this, it is too rigid. It does not have the flexibility of a Statutory Board.

Perhaps I will hear later that it is not legally possible; but I believe that a statutory board with a

central purchasing capital of $10 million to $12 million, with a proper staff – I am not being critical of the staff at Central Purchasing. I do not know anybody who works there. I am just saying that you cannot employ one person at Central Purchasing and start talking about building supplies, furniture, drugs and so on. He would have to be a young genius. Therefore, if you had a Statutory Board we would have doctors on it and pharmacists on it, and construction people on it, and it would be overseeing the affairs and therefore the Government would have information on changing trends on the markets; but by the same token I am not being critical of the present Government. I think that it should be seen where $¾ million is being voted, although I do not know what is the size of the warehouse that will be built. With the cost of building today, I would have thought that $2 million would be more adequate, because you have to think of refrigeration for medical supplies and what have you.

So Mr. Chairman, I am just throwing out a few thoughts. Perhaps the Minister of Housing has some better ideas. I leave it to him. He did not seem to appreciate my standing to speak; but we all have to learn; but he can get up and add anything to what I have said; but no member of Parliament is going to stifle me in what I have to say, and that applies to this side, that side and all sides. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, over and over again during the past years there has always been some comment on Central Purchasing. Up to today one is still not clear as to what extent is the role that the Government wants Central Purchasing to play in reducing the cost of supplies to the Government.

2.15 p.m.

There seems to be some reluctance to have an organisation which will turn out to be competitive with private enterprise. What has been occurring today in Central purchasing seems to be just a totalling up of the requests for supplies from the various Ministries and Departments and then somebody in Central Purchasing contacting the local agent or business person and getting the supplies and then distributing them. It is doubtful if this approach will accumulate any great benefits to Government if there are small benefits in that, rather than having a large number of Ministries sending in town to buy, say, paper, you now get all these requests for paper channelled into one central organisation and then that organisation passes the order maybe to Geddes Grant or DaCostas as the case may be for supplying paper. If one is serious about reducing costs, and I do believe that costs can be reduced in some of these areas, not in all of them, this organisation must be permitted to be more dynamic in its operations and approach to business in meeting the needs of demands of the various Government departments.

One of the factors which one has to bear in mind and already touched upon by the previous speaker is that you need the correct personnel in this Department. To what extent you have the right personnel in that Department is a matter of speculation. When one says that you do not have the correct personnel in a particular department, it does not necessarily mean that the people there are so efficient or that they are incapable of performing any job, but what we are trying to state is that in relation to the particular task they have to perform they may not have the necessary expertise or knowledge or experience in doing the type of job that is required.

Another factor which has been mooted around for a very long time, up to last year, is that the Central Purchasing requires a warehouse. This is a matter that has been discussed in the previous administration, it was discussed last year, there were proposals at one time to buy some place in Dayrells Road or so and that has not seen the light; but one would have to welcome the decision to set up a warehouse, but at the same time you have to be aware of the fact that the requirement of goods by Government are varied and Government will have to take a firm decision about the areas and about the type of goods which they intend to purchase through Central Purchasing. Some goods, for example, medical supplies will have a certain self life; they have an expiry date. If they are not used by that particular time you may find that you are ending up with a problem of loss, and in the long run you may find that rather than decreasing cost to Government you may actually be increasing cost.

Another very important factor that one has to bear in mind is the behaviour and attitude of the Barbadian towards things owned by Government, and repeatedly over the years in this country, whether we like to admit it or not, or we like to bend it to suit the tone or shade of political conviction, Government tends to lose a lot either through supplies or some other areas due to inefficiency or sometimes downright stealing, and this is an area which Government has to be very concerned about in that in setting about to establish central purchasing on a more effective basis to supply the needs of Government, while they may achieve that from the point of view of administration, you may very well be increasing the chances for loss by Government through inefficiency or through theft, and this is a matter that should be borne in mind at all times by the Government. We do not have to go through the various departments where it can be shown over the years that material bought by Government has been permitted to deteriorate or become lost and cannot be traced, and if you are going to put a lot of money into one organisation such as Central Purchasing, you do not want that type of

situation to develop so that at the end of the year you will hear that $2 million worth of material has been permitted to deteriorate, cannot be traced and has to be accepted as lost. One has to be very careful about this factor, and one of the things we have to be concerned about in Barbados nowadays is the high cost of Government. People seem to be concerned with the high cost of living, but a very important factor which also goes a far way in making the life of people difficult is the high cost of Government, and the high cost of Government comes about by way of taxation, the various taxes that Government has to impose on people to get money to run the services, and as these taxes are imposed time after time in different forms, they dig into the pockets of the individual person thereby making money less available for those persons in other areas; so one has to be very careful in setting about this matter. You have to look at all sides of the story, and one has to be very concerned that in the establishment of such an organisation on a more effective basis, in the long run you may not be preparing the way for Government to be losing large sums of money due to the factors which I enumerated earlier.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, let me first very briefly draw to the attention of my long standing friend and colleague as Acting Leader of the House I am not here to stifle him. You will have to do that, Sir. I am only here as the tactician of the parliamentary debates and it is my duty to move every tactical measure to get through Government's programme. That is the duty of a Leader of the House. If they observe an external facial expression of resentment, I may have my reasons for doing that.

I can inform him that the central purchasing warehouse and office is at the Garrison. In case he would like to know anything more he can find out from the Minister of Finance. I think it is numbers 45 and 46, the Lettings, Garrison where you carry in the tenders. I should like to draw to the attention of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central that Central Purchasing in Barbados started since 1971. Now I hate going back all the time to what the former administration did, because if we came in as the Great Combination, people expect miracles, and even though Christ performed some, they stoned and crucified him and pushed knives in him and all sorts of things. From 1971 until now 1979 I am hearing about all the defects in the armour of Central Purchasing, when I thought that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who was supposed to be a member of the Cabinet would have drawn these problems to the attention of the then Minister of Finance.

Dr. CADDLE: On a point of order, if the hon. member would give way, I should like to assure him that I have had my views about Central Purchasing and I have aired them and will continue to air them.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You air them now you are in Opposition when the Leader of the Opposition has no power to push you about now. You have a base to fight from now, but as a Cabinet Minister you could not get up and dare open your mouth. *(Asides)* You are not in this thing; you are like La-de-Da. You are a witness in that whole case. You are the weakest in that whole team; you are light weight.

I should like to assure the hon. member that we are doing everything in our power to make sure that at the Central Purchasing Department, and I think you will agree with me, we are even looking into the possibility of importing things into Barbados for the National Housing Corporation in bulk, because very often your work sites are held up because of problems in not getting windows, doors, lavatory ware and those types of things from the various manufacturers.
2.25 p.m.

We are examining that, the whole aspect of Central Purchasing and I will tell you this, Sir. If I get through with the importation of my stuff in bulk, I will have it like Fort Knox, well protected. I know all of you good, you know. I was around a long time. When the others are sleeping you are wide awake so I will have them well protected.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you as Chairman of the National Housing Corporation will use all of your legal knowledge to put it at the disposal of the National Housing Corporation to make sure that you draw up every conceivable method, Sir, not only as my fellow Parliamentarian, but a man who has the legal know-how. I believe you would have given me some idea if I was going wrong and you would discuss certain matters with me. I am not asking for a legal opinion, Sir, just put your knowledge at our disposal, Sir.

I beg to move Mr. Chairman, that Head 8(4) stand part.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in a very slight contribution that I would like to make on this matter. I think that it is most important that whenever Government gets involved in a venture either in terms of setting it up, revamping it, or re-shaping it, whenever Government is involved, it is essential to have a clear objective of what they want to achieve. Too often Government ventures are undertaken on the basis of philosophy and emotional basis, on the assumption that because Government is

undertaking it they are certain benefits which will naturally follow.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, the main objective of a Central Purchasing Department must be one that is cost-related. In other words a reduction in cost. Secondly, constant availability of essential supplies for whatever projects are identified and the elimination of shortages, and thirdly, hoping that the saving thereby produced would be to the benefit of the country as a whole. Now many physical and other factors are involved in this exercise and what is often not appreciated is that the question of acquisition, storage, and handing out of supplies is a highly professional activity and consequently you have to think of the management content that you are going to put into this matter.

Now it is not sufficing and one of the things that has often struck me is that even in a society such as ours where management skills are at a premium that in the private sector, these particular aspects of management, namely acquisition, storage and distribution of these supplies, that these can be handled on a profitable basis in Government, whereas your profit is not identified in that way and it should reflect in sayings. You can go through Government Department by Government Department and this never happens and my contention is that there is not enough attention being paid to the whole question of management of those exercises and due respect paid to the professional aspects of those who have to carry out that function.

There is also another area that I would like to touch on very briefly and that is the relationship of the process of acquisition of what goes on in Bridgetown in relation to the agents, the wholesalers and so on and I believe that the significant cost reductions in many areas of Government could be achieved if you go directly to the supplier, utilise him to the full and even if necessary increase the number of persons in the various trade sections of your Department in your missions overseas.

I think they could play a very fundamental role in assisting in identifying the cheapest and the best materials, using the word "materials" in the broadest possible terms, and I think that when you have a Central Purchasing Department you have to go right down the line from the point of acquisition, think in terms of the relation of the commercial activities that go on in providing the various sections, think in terms of the contribution that the trade sections of your Missions abroad could make to this exercise and to local management, and also of the distribution of the products that you may have stored, and I think that the whole thing has to be thought out right from the very beginning to the end and that the proper management and professional inputs be introduced at each and every point.

I think in this way I could see the Central Purchasing Department performing the kind of role for Government and for the people of Barbados which it can perform. I think it is a good idea. I think that the time has come when you should look at all of these factors that are involved and it applies right across the board in any particular area that might be handled by Central Purchasing or any section that it might be delegated to in the particular instance.

I hope that this very brief non-hostile contribution will be of some benefit to this Honourable House in considering this matter.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I would tell the hon. member that Central Purchasing gets its goods from the cheapest markets and follows commercial principles, if he would care to observe, as they have been doing since the Department was set up.

The question that the sum of $1,220,351 under Head 8(4) – Central Purchasing, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (5) CUSTOMS

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (5) Customs – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $641,096 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (5) Customs, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief on Head 8(5). As you are aware, Sir, new arrangements for the Port Department have been made and I believe have been or have almost been completed and some time ago the hon. Leader of the House assured hon. members that they would be given the freedom to enter the Port in the same way as they have the freedom to enter the Airport. The Leader of the House gave this Honourable House the assurance that hon. members of this Chamber would be given the requisite passes to enter the Port as members of Parliament.
2.35 p.m.

Since then, having myself written and having asked to be permitted to visit the Airport and having received

such a pass, I should like to get an idea of what is required under the Port authority. Even before the Port Authority came into being and the gentleman who is acting down there was in charge, despite what the Leader of the House says, it seems that it is impossible for hon. members to get a pass to go into the Port. Now Mr. Chairman, the Port happens to extend into the area that is my constituency, and I should like to know if Government's policy has changed; and if it has, I should like to know what is required by members of Parliament. There is no problem at the airport – one got a photograph and got a pass. So I would like to know what are the conditions at the Port in this regard because, as I said, since it forms part of my constituency it would be helpful if I had access to see what is going on. (ASIDES) I would say to the hon. member that up to the time the Government was changed all one had to do was to apply to the Comptroller of Customs and the Comptroller issued such a pass. I am merely asking the Government if that situation has changed, what is the policy now; that is all I am asking.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South West may have made out a good case for having a pass for the Port, but personally I would say that from the speeches coming from the platforms of his party about violence, it gives me second thoughts and I would have to ask the Deputy Prime Minister on his return whether he would not like to rescind such passes.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member will give way.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I want to draw to your attention that there are some members in the Public Gallery who seem to conduct part of the debates in the Gallery when members of the other side get up to speak. Let me draw to Your Honour's attention that you have the power to let them know that they are here on sufferance. I saw with my own eyes members of the Gallery indicating to the hon. member to sit down. I criticised it when I was in the Opposition and I am not going to condone that kind of behaviour now. If members of the public think they can come in here and do as they like I would suggest they pay $250 and contest a seat in this House. Anytime I see any person in the Gallery carrying on in a manner that he should not, I will draw it to Your Honour's attention. There are certain members in here when they get up to speak are indirectly shouted down by the Gallery and some are applauded. But this is the highest office of the land and the conduct of the Gallery must be such of which all Barbadians can be proud. I hope members on the other side will join in condemning that kind of behaviour. You may make your point of order.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. I would like to say to the Hon. Minister that if he feels that there is no need to give us passes there is no need to make a long speech about it. It is entirely up to the Government, and if the Government says no it is all right with me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: All I am trying to point out to the hon. member is that we have to determine if this assurance was given by the Leader of the House. This falls under the Ministry of Communications and Works and the Minister has the power for authorizing passes. But I do not think passes should be given under the present condition of so much violence being preached on public platforms. I believe there should be more and more security around the airport, the seaport, and public buildings.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear that I bow to no one in this country on the question of patriotism to Barbados, and I have grave doubts when I hear hon. members casting aspersions on other members on this question of security. It is the right of the 5,000 persons who voted for the member for St. Michael South West and sent him here to have their representatives given certain privileges, and it is the right of a member of Parliament to enjoy certain privileges including going to certain areas. It is Government's right to decide if such persons will be allowed to go. But I do not want as a member of Parliament to be treated to the hon. Minister getting up and making insinuations that one of the reasons for not giving a pass to members of Parliament on this side is because of violence being preached on platforms. I resent this most seriously and will not have anyone on that side or anywhere else suggest that I am advocating violence. I do not wish to overthrow this Government or any other Government by violence, and you can be assured that I will never be associated with the overthrow of any Government by violence. I will speak about the Government until it is not possible to speak in this country, but I resent the insinuation and will not take it from anybody, Minister or anybody else.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to get that assurance from the hon. member, and would hope as the debate goes on to get that assurance from all the other hon. members including the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I was elected to this honourable House for the first time in December, 1970 and came into this House as a member of the Opposition party. The Democratic Labour Party was the political party that then formed the Government of the day.

2.45 p.m.

Around Christmas, 1970 I had cause to go to the airport and I was rudely prevented from entering into the airport customs or arrival hall. The Estimates that followed in March, 1971, I raised the question about the privileges of members of Parliament in entering upon Government's property. There was a white Englishman, called Peter Morgan, who used to occupy this seat on this side of the House. He was a member of the Democratic Labour Party. An hon. member who has just gone outside was also a member of the Democratic Labour Party. During the debate on the Estimates from 1971 to 1976 members of the Opposition had to ask repeatedly for passes to enter the seaport and the airport and they said at the time – members of the DLP including Frank Walcott, denied us the privileges of entering upon Government property. Frank Walcott sat behind there and said that if he had his own way we could not even look in at anything that concerned the Government.

When we asked at one time to be represented at international forums as members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we were told no. They took Lloyd Smith in a roundabout manner to the United Nations, not as member of the Opposition, but as a special member of the Government. Now I can hear them today talking about passes to enter the port. I am responsible for the Port. Pass me if you can. *(ASIDE:* For how long?) I do not know how long or when. I hear them saying what they want now. I heard the Leader of the Opposition yesterday talking about the office of the Leader of the Opposition. When we complained about the security of that office, I heard Sleepy Smith stand up in here and say that it was not put there for us to sit down and discuss anything. If at any time you have to go there to whisper something, go up there and come back. I see the former Prime Minister sitting down over there and bowing his head. I heard them talk about giving something to the Opposition. The same Sleepy Smith, when I asked the Government about St. Joseph, he told me that he would like to build a wall around St. Joseph; that it did not belong to Barbados because they do not vote for the Democratic Labour Party. You did not hear about that. There were certain people who used to walk through the airport as they liked. You did not hear about that. Members on this side could not go into the airport. You did not hear about that. The son of the Treasurer of the Democratic Labour Party still walks through the airport as if the Leader of the Opposition is still Prime Minister. You do not hear anything about that. What right does he have to enter the Port? Is he the Minister for the Port?

I hear about guns moving about in the Caribbean. Do they want to move guns off aircraft and drive them down to St. Lucy again? Is that what they want? As far as I am concerned, while I am in command of the Port, that will not happen. It is about time. This morning I heard talk about victimisation in here. I told the Prime Minister long ago to act like a "true true" Prime Minister. They do not understand. In December one man at the Ministry of Communications and Works put 28 people on to work unknown to anybody. They talk about victimisation, but out of 74 people appointed by the Ministry of Communications and Works only one was a recognised member of the Barbados Labour Party. The rest belonged to the Democratic Labour Party. The Prime Minister had better act as a "true true" Prime Minister because if they think that they are going to run the Government from over there, I am quite happy to say goodbye, go back in James Street and do my own thing out there; because I would not be satisfied to suffer the indignities of being a member of Parliament for nine years and then come in here and then get told how to run the Government.

They want privileges? The former Speaker of this Hon. House, Mr. J. E. T. Brancker, was invited to Saigon. The Government paid for him and his wife subsistence, although the Chinese Government paid for them. He had to past through the port, through Government's property. What are we talking about? Neville Maxwell was invited, the Government paid; but when I was invited they said that they did not know anything about me. I had to go without a cent. They are talking about victimisation and privileges? As far as I am concerned I would say like Frank Walcott that when you are in power you had it. Now they are going to get it too. They are talking about passes to go through the Port? Through which Port? For what reason?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I really did not intend to join the debate on this particular issue; but it is debates like these which really raise some very serious questions as to how democracy in this country operates, and about the way in which those who hold power really exercise power. I say that because democracy is about the temper and the approach to the use of power. There seems to be some attitude on that front bench out there – I exclude certain members. I do not include the Prime Minister and I exclude my friend because this is not starving. There seems to be some position being adopted that if something was done by the previous Government, and it was wrong, they are going to do it now, double wrong. (Cheers). Let me repeat that. If something was done by the previous Government which was wrong, you are going to do it and it is double wrong. I do not subscribe to that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to find out from the hon. member if he was a Cabinet member in the previous Government and then go on to talk.

2.55 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: He always rises on points of disorder. He is a dishonourable member. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order,...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has withdrawn.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: No, no, Sir. To be dishonourable you have to be dishonest.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He withdrew the word "dishonourable". I thought he meant disorderly.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I completely withdraw it. There is no need to get hot over that. I am making a very serious point here because it is from these issues that problems arise in a country. Now I recall very well that soon after the change of Government a letter came out from the Prime Minister's Office – I am drawing on my memory – indicating that members of Parliament who wanted access to the Airport or the Seaport should contact the Cabinet Secretary or write to the appropriate person at the Airport or the Seaport. I remember that very well. I have never taken up the offer because I felt that I can be like any ordinary member of the public because I was not looking for any privileges, and I thought when I saw something like that coming from the Prime Minister's Office at that time that it showed the level of statesmanship which certain members on that front bench – and I exclude the Attorney General also, I will exclude them one by one – seemed incapable of rising to. (Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Statesmen have never won an election yet.) Statesmen stay in the Ministry of Agriculture a little longer than you.

Mr. Chairman, that indication came from the Prime Minister's Office and it has never been withdrawn, that is why I am surprised at my colleague, the hon. member for St. Michael South West, making a fuss about this thing. I have been given every assurance that if we want a pass, all we had to do was to contact the appropriate Permanent Secretary or the Airport Manager or somebody like that and it would be forthcoming. I did not count with Napoleon being at the Port in charge of the Ministry of Communications and Works. There is Napoleon in animal farms, and I did not count with him.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, the gravamen of my statement was that in light of the assurance which may have been given I first went to the Customs Department and they said they were not sure if they could handle it. I then contacted the then Acting Port Manager who was not sure that he was the one, and the point I raised was to find out if the policy which had been adumbrated very early in the administration had changed. I am sure the Prime Minister was getting ready to rise and tell us no, there must have been some administrative difficulty, and then with Napoleon the whole thing broke loose.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am positive that the Prime Minister and the Attorney General are not in this foolishness which is going on there from those other members on the front bench. They came from one of the other high-powered officers in this country as a procedure to be followed as far as entering Government property is concerned, and I make the point again that if there was something done incorrectly when we were in the administration, you have come in to improve efficiency in Government, you are the Great Combination and you cannot get away by coming and saying that because we did it and it was wrong you are going to do it and make it doubly wrong. You cannot get away with that because from this side we are going to oppose it. Let me say this: it is this attitude which causes serious problems when the Napoleons over there get up and identify themselves as though they are the owners of Government property or the owners of institutions in this country. (A VOICE: The Lord giveth!) The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. If that was the attitude then and it was wrong, that does not make it right when you are doing it. Let me make that point and make it clearly. It needed saying in this House for quite some time. For those of you who have a historical perspective, Louis XIV *l'état c'est moi.* When you identify yourself too closely with a particular institution of Government as though you own that and a personal piece of property, as you thought you owned the Ministry of Agriculture until you are down in Georgia...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Not me, I have never owned any Ministry of Agriculture. Address the Chair.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, there is a basic rule in the Standing Orders of this House that speakers should be relevant. I submit the hon. member is being irrelevant. We really should get on with the debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to make it clear that I believe some latitude must be given to hon. members on both sides when dealing with these Heads, and I am not going to encourage irrelevancies, but I am also going to be reasonably liberal in my interpretation of a speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The Attorney General is on edge. He likes he wants to be included in the group too. As I said, I do not have anything more to say, but I merely want to

stress this point. I do not believe in my heart of hearts that they are really saying they would deny members of Parliament who are the people's representatives from gaining access to any Government property which is not excluded on grounds of national security at any particular time. I believe it is the right, nothing that we have to beg for, of any member of Parliament to have access at reasonable times to Government property wherever it is, because we have to come in here and vote supplies and speak on these matters, and that is a principle which must be established. It was established very early in that new administration and when you get up and you do not know Government policy, you should really try and educate yourself in that particular area.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, I do not know Government policy, I would like to educate myself. Since I am not a schoolmaster, I did not go to school too high, I wonder if the hon. member would tell me what the policy is. I should like him to reflect back to between 1971 and 1976 when he was on this side what happened particularly with Government property at C.B.C. Ask the Hon. Prime Minister now what your administration did to anybody on that side and C.B.C. You ask him about Government property.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to make another observation for hon. members of the House. I want to be heard in silence too. If the Rules provide that member must speak on more than one occasion for fifteen minutes, I want it to be clearly understood that on a second speech. You cannot just rehash what you have said in a previous speech. you can raise new material in connection with the Head. I think the hon. member for St. Michael South Central wishes to speak.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member is going to deal with the same point, we have gone on so much about the Port and there is a piece of information that hon. members may care to have and it might assist. First of all I am not aware that the seaport and the airport were ever treated in the same way. The seaport through elements of security both from the Customs point of view and in the Defence and Security point of view do not exist at the same extent as the airport.
3.05 p.m.

As far as I know no member of Parliament or anybody has ever claimed access to the cargo areas at the Airport. The passenger area would be included with the Customs area, which really are the areas surrounding the Passenger Terminal. I am not aware that any promise was made in relation to access to the seaport. The Law relating to the seaport used to be that when you presented yourself at the gate your only duty was to tell the Officer truthfully what you were going to the Port for and under those circumstances the question of the pass would not arise although passes were obtainable very easily by obtaining a little slip of paper from the Port Department then.

The Law was changed, I cannot remember exactly when, but as recently as 1972 and subsequently the system of passes came in. The greater majority of passes were issued to people having business in the Port. I am informed that the basis for passes as far as people are concerned in the Government is that passes were issued to Government Ministers and Permanent Secretaries, not Parliamentarians generally. A directive has gone out to withdraw all passes at the present time and new passes are being issued because the Port Administration Building is now outside the Port and it should not be necessary for people having business with the Port to go inside the Port gates to the same extent.

I can assure hon. members that people who have business inside the Port, for example, the Chairman of the Board of Tourism apparently alone on this side among the non-Ministries, has a pass to go to the Port because he has to meet ships. I have no doubt that citizens and Directors and so on who have business with the ships could also get them. We do not regard the Port as the principle area of passenger entry and we do not therefore think that the same considerations which apply to the Passenger Terminal at the Airport are necessarily to be applied to the Terminal at the Bridgetown Port. I have no doubt that if any hon. member has reason to visit the Port, for example, it might be desirable that officials of the Barbados Workers' Union who include at least one hon. member will have access to the Port.

Entry to the Port itself contains an element of security. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is a participant in a Medical Clinic that offers service for workers on a capitation basis. Commonsense tells you that he must have a pass to go to the Port in case a Port worker falls down with a heart attack. That is a matter of common sense and I am sure that if hon. members can view this matter a little more moderately than the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South displayed -- honestly, Sir, it is the principle interest of the Department to collect the 30% of Barbados' revenue rather than be concerned with whether or not members of Parliament have a right to enter the Port. Is that the principle interest? You mean there is nothing else of importance in the Customs? I would like to congratulate the Comptroller of the Customs for how well he runs the entire Customs that the only thing of importance to discuss is whether or not hon. members can get into the Port.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, whereas I do not wish in any way to appear not to be supportive of the principles put forward by hon. members on this side, I want to make it absolutely clear that no member on that side has anything to dispense to me that I would wish in anyway. Let us get that clear. There is not a pass, there is not anything that anybody on that side can offer me that I could possibly be interested in. I just want to get that absolutely clear from the very beginning, so that is my position. If that is the attitude you see coming across from the hon. member for St. Joseph, I just want to make it clear that there is nothing that they can do, no privilege nothing they can offer me that can enhance my position in Barbados or anywhere else in the world as far as I am concerned so get that record straight. I want to make that absolutely clear. I do not wish any dispensations from that side.

On the other hand, I wish to give support to the principle as outlined on this side. Now to this whole question about the failure to distinguish between one's functions as a Minister and when you own Government property. I remember on the day of the recent Bye-election I had occasion to complain to the Police that certain unauthorised persons who were not authorised under the appropriate Act of Parliament to enter into the polling stations were walking in and out and I informed the Police and a certain Minister of Government said that if he were in charge of that particular Ministry he would have gone in there and broken up all the polling stations. A Minister of Government made that statement. It was not the Minister responsible for the particular area, it was another Minister who made that statement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir. We have more than one Minister on this side and I must say that if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is referring to me, I am sure I would not have to call in the Police. I would hold him and bite him up myself, so I do not believe he is referring to me. I want to know who he is referring to. I never had anything to do with any Police. If he brought in marijuana to Barbados, that is his business.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not worried about being bitten by the Minister. I am fully immunised against tetanus and rabies.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will now return to your discussion.

Dr. HAYNES: There is one particular item which I want to raise here. There has been some concern over the past two and a half years about parcels being set out to Barbados for old people by their relatives in the United States. As you know, this has been an historical custom going back perhaps for 100 years of parcels coming by boat and the Christmas parcels that come in and so on and it would appear to me that there has been a genuine hardship imposed. Most of the complaints I heard were around Christmas, 1977. I have not heard as many complaints in 1978.

I believe that representations were made by the appropriate officers of the Barbados Government in the United States at the time as to the problems that these persons were encountering. In other words a parcel might arrive here for an elderly lady which was being sent in for many years and then when she went to the Airport or to the Seaport to collect it would find that she possibly could not afford to pay for it. I myself had a very unfortunate experience when I was travelling from New York to Barbados and for some reason the plane overflew Barbados to Trinidad and then a poor old lady who had to be helped into the Airport in Trinidad who needed to take the first plane out when she got to Seawell Airport, when she was presented with the appropriate bill that she would have to pay as duty for the stuff she was bringing in quite innocently, she simply broke down in tears. I had to come to the rescue of this old lady.
3.15 p.m.

And I will tell you this, that six weeks later she sought me out and brought the money, which I did not accept. It was a tribute to the honesty of the poor people of this country, and this is a constant feature you will find among the poor people of Barbados.

Now somebody was asking what was happening at CBC under the previous Government. I would ask the question now....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will not allow any discussion on that at this time.

Dr. HAYNES: It is going to come though. You stopped me...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not threaten me about stopping you either; I rule it is not appropriate to discuss CBC under Customs.

Dr. HAYNES: I agree with you. All I am saying is I fully support you. It just happened that another hon. member raised the question. So I am glad you stopped me, for I might have divulged some very important information.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask you to take your seat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I find this one of the strangest debates in a long time. One would not believe that we are discussing a department that collects $60 million a year in revenue, that it is a significant department of international trade and that the debate should degenerate into an argument as to whether or not

one should or should not have a pass to get into the Port. The debate also degenerates into an argument in which one hon. member is interested in the sympathy he can evoke by being the Good Samaritan. And the debate degenerates into the situation where a member can get up and boast that he doesn't want anything from this side. This is a school-boyish attitude and not the way in which Parliamentary debates in this country should be conducted. It is a great tragedy that one must sit and see members in an independent country instead of lifting debates to a high level and looking at Port administration and what it means to the country spend more than an hour in a harangue that could never do any good to the stature of this House. The fact is that we are now reaping the whirlwind of the type of politics that the Democratic Labour Party started with the politics of denigration.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member just got up and said that he regretted the debate going in a certain direction and then continues to proceed in the same direction. I submit that the hon. member is being irrelevant.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I understand the hon. member's interruption, but I must say this: If we are to move forward, not only must there be certain basic understanding between parties in this country, but within this House itself those misunderstandings must be settled without the invective and without the attacks that are becoming part and parcel of the life of the country. I am not criticising; I don't even want to refer to the examples in and out of Parliament to which I myself have been subjected. I don't want to remind them of anything that happened in the past under the Democratic Labour Party and therefore one understands sometimes the annoyance of hon. members believing that the answer to that is to show that if you can give you can take, and if you can take you can give. What I am saying is that in this House we must begin to settle trivial points, and the point about passes is trivial to some extent when considered against the interests of the country as a whole. We must begin to settle these points in the correct fora provided under the rules of this House; we must settle them in the Committee of Privileges; we must settle them on the basis of members having a basic understanding of what rights and privileges they should have; we must get away from the cheap politics that whenever you discuss anything about a member's salary that it becomes a great political point. I have said before when I was on the other side that I have seen the hon. member for St. Philip South embarrassed in travelling abroad without any form of recognition by way of a passport from his then Government.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I think there is a rule in here about irrelevant contributions and I believe the hon. member is making an irrelevant contribution.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, normally I would agree with the hon. member; but being faced with your ruling, the latitude being allowed and the debate having been opened, it immediately gets into the lines along which the debate is proceeding; the hon. member must understand that. And that is why I said I kept very silent throughout all of this debate, because we spent a lot of time on this matter.

However, I want to introduce one or two things into the debate. First, in answer to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central on the only point of substance that he has raised in the debate up to now.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation. I would like to know whether you would have sat down on this side and allow that kind of sanctimonious, patronizing nonsense that came out of the mouth of the hon. member for St. Joseph and not make it quite clear that he has nothing to offer.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to give way to the hon. member if he gets up on such a point. The hon. member must learn to restrain his temper. If he would only tone down and let us talk to each other properly.

Sir, I was answering the only point of substance and that concerns the collection of Customs revenue at the airport and seaport. There has been no change in the Customs laws as passed under the Democratic Labour Party Government and there have been, both under the Democratic Labour Party Government and under this Government, administrators of the Port who have insisted on the enforcement of that legislation up to the hilt. They did so on the basis that they were enforcing what was understood to be international practice in this matter. The hon. Minister responsible for Customs, as well as the hon. member for Christ Church South Central have gone into complete investigation of the practices as exist in CARICOM countries and outside of CARICOM countries, and directions have been given to the Customs administration that Barbados can relax the enforcement of legislation of this nature, and I believe – I am not sure, I would have to check – amending legislation is being provided.
3.25 p.m.

But, Sir, we have observed in the last year or so that perhaps we are in need of updating Customs Legislation. Whilst I am aware that within the CARICOM countries efforts are being made to update their Customs Acts, I must advert to the fact that there are certain defects which are likely to embarrass any Government, particularly if we are not careful in an

area where security at the seaport or airport is becoming very important. You will be aware, Sir, that an Order was made last year dealing with the question of transshipments of goods and ammunition from Barbados into other jurisdictions. I think that at least one case of this nature of transshipment from Barbados into other territories arose. We have had at least one case of international proportions involving the movement of arms into Guatemala; and so, what we are hoping to develop in the House for the benefit of hon. members is a short look at some legislation which will correct the defects which we see in the Customs Act, making the Customs Act somewhat different, and making the administration of the law much more easy for those persons who have to administer the law.

The Port is a very sensitive area from the point of view of Customs. Obviously, every Barbadian in the context of the open society in which we live feels that there should be a minimum of restrictions in the seaport and the airport; but there are reasons why sometimes Governments, regardless of their political colour, must impose restrictions of one kind or another. The fact is that in the Port area you have competing jurisdictions. There are areas of security. Sometimes there is a great risk. Look at the hazard which many of us feel when we travel by aircraft in these days. Look at the delays. One has to be at the airport a long time before the scheduled time, some times an hour or an hour and a half. There is also a problem in relation to the movement of ships.

We also must recognise that because of the transshipment of goods in the Caribbean that Customs will have great problems on their hands because of the existing legislation. I will therefore appeal to members to be patient in this area. As regards the point made by the hon. member for St. Michael West, I believe that when he began to speak he decided to put the matter by way of a question, rather than to have a protracted debate on this particular issue. The debate has become protracted.

I just want finally to appeal to the House. I have been in the House for about seven to eight years and perhaps it has become the fashion for most of us who sit here – like Pope you can write the greatest satire on how people get so wrought up over points that are really small in the long run. I am sure that the hon. member's entitlement to pass through the airport or the seaport should not be a point of great political partisanship in this island. I am not criticising anybody. I am just expressing my point of view on these points. I am not speaking to the gallery, Sir. I am not allowed to speak to the gallery. I am only saying that we have a few more days in this House on the Estimates and I certainly would welcome constructive criticism from either side of the House.

I have a Ministry for which I am responsible, and we have collective responsibility to the Cabinet; and I think that in that way we would be making a true contribution. I think that the Acting Leader of the House has given an undertaking to raise the question. I would like myself to suggest to the members of the Committee of Privileges that it is about time that this House sat down and say what members of this House are entitled to. It is not a matter of giving some member a pass on this side or on that side. It is that each hon. member of this House, in the interest of the job that we have been elected to do, no matter on which side of the House we have been elected to do it, has certain basic privileges attached to them; and it is not a matter of dispensation one way or the other.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the Hon. Attorney General for a statement in which he acknowledged that there was no need to protract the debate. I am not protracting the debate in that way. I will ask a few substantive questions relating to the Customs Department, which was my original intention. Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Prime Minister will, I am sure, wish as Minister of Finance to give his views on this matter.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that one of the areas of concern has been for some time the question of the shallow draft facility. The current situation in the Careenage has been that customs duties imposed on the traffic of goods on an inter island basis does not attract any kind of customs duty; but generally speaking, the movement of the traffic to the new port – one does not know, and I myself do not know what will be happening in so far as this traffic is concerned.

I recall that we passed some legislation in here which causes some substantial increase in the rates which will be paid for port dues on inter island traffic. I would like to hear the Prime Minister on the shallow draft aspect of the Port, because revenue from Customs seems to have risen substantially according to the information which has been published; and unless there are some areas grey in this aspect of the revenue from Customs, not all of the figures that are published about Customs revenue are clear.

Perhaps, a more important point which concerns me, Mr. Chairman, is that a friend of mine, one who is an official in the Customs in North America, while speaking to me said that Barbados is getting a reputation as being a port where there is a large traffic of drugs of one kind or another.

3.35 p.m.

Now I do not wish to be an alarmist, I do not wish to throw out information willy-nilly merely for the sake of throwing it, but I think if we are discussing

Customs that I thought the nation would welcome a statement from the Minister concerned regarding this question which is growing in importance in the Caribbean region as a whole. Everyone is familiar with the statements that have been made in the Time Magazine and other national magazines about the South American Connections, and at one time it was suggested in well documented articles that the traffic was moving from Columbia for Trinidad and Tobago and then on to various ports in North America. The gravamen of the statement which was made to me by a responsible person suggests that somehow the nexus, if you will, had shifted from Port-of-Spain after one of the carriers, after being interrogated by the police, had a violent attack of some disease and did not outlive it. I don't know if it was Burroughsitis, but the point is that it has been changed to Barbados according to him.

Now from time to time we see in the daily press that some package was at the airport and had not been collected. I do not myself believe that there are any Barbadian nationals or many Barbadian nationals who would be involved in this kind of trafficking, because it speaks of a sophistication and, if you will, deviousness not normally attributable to people from countries like Barbados, but Sir, we are an open country, we do admit of people necessarily from all over the world, we make their coming to Barbados as easy as possible. I do not think that any of us have any quarrel with the basic intent of that. For those reasons it becomes even more important for us in the Customs area to exercise some vigilance.

I recall many years ago when I was not yet a member of the Government, a then Government Minister raised some question which appeared in the newspaper about the apparent ease with which Customs was processing visitors to Barbados, and it was suggested at that time that each one of the visitors should be given a thorough search. Clearly Mr. Chairman, that would have been nonsense because if in fact 300,000 people are coming to Barbados, a Customs Department that would literally frisk each one of them could spend the whole year working on the first three months of visitors. What I think is necessary however is that we must upgrade the training of these people in the Customs Department whose responsibility it is through their observatory powers to detect what is happening in terms of people who visit our country and those Barbadians who for whatever reason might become involved in the trafficking of drugs. I do not believe that the trafficking of drugs is a politically partisan situation as far as we are concerned. I think that anyone who has children or any right thinking person in this community must feel very deeply about the prospect of the spread of drugs in Barbados. I do not take a political position on this except political in the sense of a small (p) I feel that this is something which we cannot afford to wait until the horse has got out of the stable as it were to try to bolt the door, and what I am saying in essence is that the Minister, if he has not yet addressed his mind to this, and I have no doubt he should have by now, ought to make arrangements for our people in the Customs Department to get exposed to the most sophisticated training that is available all over the world.

Now we cannot feel that we are in some way inferior merely because we admit that we in Barbados may not be up to the newest and most up-to-date methods or methodology of the criminal elements across the world. I recall that when I was serving in another capacity that a senior police officer from Barbados came up to me. He had gone to Washington on an administrative course and on his way back down he indicated to me that he had never seen the drug marijuana, and I myself, though having been exposed to smelling it had never seen it. You cannot go to a party in New York unless it was present. It is now legalised, but in those days everyone who has lived in North America, especially my friend, the Hon. Minister of Education knew of many of the parties in the basements, and whereas I can say I have never seen the Minister involved in it, – I am sorry if my reference might have suggested that; I did not intend that at all – but what I am saying is that in those basements one soon got accustomed, and the hon. member for St. Michael North West knows what I am talking about, to that smell which was always described as the marijuana smell. The point I was making is that I got in touch with one of the senior officers in the New York Police Department who was a Barbadian, Floyd Sealy, and asked him if he could arrange for this senior officer to spend a day at the Police Academy in downtown New York, and he spent a day and I went with him and quite frankly it was one of the most interesting in my life. The point I am making is that here he was a very senior police officer who had never seen the drug marijuana under the microscope of indeed in its raw state.

I make that point to say that it is desirable for us that we do not become so proud as to believe that our capacity to extract the duty which we now do is all that is necessary and that we are beyond training and instruction from those who have had the experience which we are going to have to call into play some time in future if we have not yet done so. It may very well be that Government is thinking along those lines and prefers not to make a statement at this point in time, but I am calling on the Government to pay some attention to this now and if that is done we are unlikely to have difficulty in the future.

One small domestic point with regard to Customs. Recently there was a diminution in the image of the

Customs, a department which had always held a high image especially under the then Comptroller of Customs whose memory will stay with us even though he left us. I am not now saying that the present head of the department will not in time grow to acquire a similar image, because to my knowledge all of the officers in the Customs with whom I have had any dealings in one way or another have always been of the very highest order and I have always found them to be first rate. I was somewhat surprised recently to see in the newspaper a report of certain activities which apparently went on in the Customs and of which I need not go into detail for obvious reasons. I hope that that kind of activity was a deviation from the norm and not the sort of day to day activity which goes on. *(Asides)* I am talking about the biting and shooting and that sort of thing.

I am winding up now. Another thing is that there has always been some jealousy from what I understand between some of the Customs Guards and some Customs Officers because under the then administration of the Comptroller apparently he sent the Customs Guards to watch some of the Customs Officers and this naturally would result in some little difficulty between them on a personal level, but generally speaking I think all Barbadians will agree that the Customs Officers, certainly those at the airport with whom I have come into contact are very competent. I have never travelled through the seaport, therefore I do not know what goes on down there.
3.45 p.m.

Those at the Airport have demonstrated competence and courtesies and especially one day when I saw a female Customs Officer. I do not know if she came in under our administration or not but I wish to congratulate whoever brought her in because I found her not only to be efficient and concerned in a sense that not everyone who travels for the first time understands exactly what is required when one comes back from Customs.

I know of this, Mr. Chairman, because when I was a Minister I used to always insist that Customs examine my baggage to ensure that such duties as were payable would be paid and in a strange kind of way the only thing I have kept as a momento of the various trips throughout the Caribbean and the other places are the receipts from the Customs Department. I feel very strongly that members of Government ought to set examples to pay Customs Duty whenever it falls due. There is of course nothing wrong when you are able as a private citizen to declare what you have and get a smile only from the Customs Officer which I must say has been the experience of many people over the years.

When you have travelled through New York Customs you can only applaud the efficiency of the New York Customs, but when at the same time you compare them with our own Barbados Customs you cannot help but be struck by the relative warmth of the Customs people in Barbados and the decided coolness of those in New York.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a small contribution to this Head under Customs and in so doing I would not want to say no more about the present Customs than that they are doing a good job within the limited confines of their training and the knowledge that is available to them.

I would like to speak particularly about the inadequate staff with which Customs, in a developing society, has got in order to maintain an International vigilance on Customs procedural practices in a developing country. I would like to speak, Mr. Chairman, on a new fad that has taken over developing countries in Customs trying to keep abreast with the International problem of containerisation. Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Customs, because of the limited scope they have, are virtually trying to grapple with the problem of keeping abreast with Customs procedures in the world, and are doing, in my assumption, a fine job.

We have a problem of inadequate staffing. We have a growing problem of drug trafficking. We have a problem of Customs maintaining warehouses. We have Customs trying to do duties with respect to the influence and interpretation of the Customs Act, the handling of the tourist traffic, and so on. I believe, Sir, that what is needed in Barbados today more than ever is for our Customs to be kept abreast with the trends in the more developed countries, so that our Customs should have a more vital approach to Customs procedural work.

I remember when I used to be in the British Navy during the 1960's, how Customs performed their duties relative to the shipping business. Take the Port of Liverpool, for example. You will see the normal Customs Officers approaching the ships with the kind of responsibility of going through the legal paper-work of the British Customs Act. In addition to this, those officers were followed up by another team of secondary Customs Officers, as you would want to call them, to do the real down-to-earth work. I am not happy, Sir, that this is being done in Barbados in the interest and protection of the Customs Act.

When you see an officer operating in the United Kingdom in Her Majesty's Customs going to work to do his task, you would want to realise whether he is performing a normal task or whether he is a guerilla for

an Army. You see such an officer approaching his task with things like a ripping iron, a searchlight and other ancillary elements to really bring to task the possibility of discovering anything that is concealed by members or people who work in the ship. Things that are concealed from Customs and so on, one would want to know specifically the duties that such Customs Officers would have.

They are not content only to be satisfied with what is declared in the Customs Manifest. They are not content to say that you are allowed 200 cigarettes into the British Port but they are content only by making sure that what you have declared in our Customs Manifest is exactly what you have said. Customs Officers in the British Government are thoroughly trained in the structural mechanism of seacraft.
3.55 p.m.

They know where to look for possible areas where one can conceal contraband cargoes, and so they are equipped with the necessary equipment for detecting such cargoes or contraband goods that one might want to conceal when entering a Port. I would be happy to know that here in Barbados the Customs are so equipped that they too would be able to carry out a vigilant and aggressive approach to revealing what people would want to conceal when entering Barbados whether through the seaport or the airport.

The question of aircraft is another concern which Customs should be involved in. In 1977 we had the incident of the Cubana airliner which exploded off Barbados. I am confident that if a vigilant approach had been made with the necessary equipment to investigate what that airliner had on board, Customs would have been in a position to determine that there was equipment on board that could perhaps cause a disaster; but because of the lack of this equipment that airliner was allowed to enter Barbados and on departure exploded in mid-air.

I am sure that if the Customs here in Barbados through training – it is only through training that the Customs officers in Barbados can be aware of the many kinds of ancillary jobs they are supposed to do – not necessarily the paper work, the invoices they have to clear etc., if the Customs were more aware of the involvement required, they would do a better job. But as I said, with the constraints on our budget they are doing a very good job. I believe our Customs people are involved in too much paper work, and a more thorough knowledge of what is required at the airport and seaport is an area in which Customs officers should be more thoroughly involved. I do not think that because a ship or aircraft has arrived in Barbados and gone through the legal procedures, that that is enough to say the craft is cleared to enter Barbados and that that is all that is involved in Customs work. We have got a booming tourist industry, thousands of tourists are entering Barbados every month, and the Customs people should be trained to protect the visitors to Barbados. We do not really know what is coming into Barbados because of the slipshod arrangement at the Port and at the airport; no indepth survey is taken of what Mr. X or Mr. Y is bringing into Barbados. I remember some years ago while I was still at sea a friend of mine and I were going through the Port of Jersey and the Customs suddenly came and told my friend "I would like to have a word with you." I was surprised to see the Customs stop my friend but to my amazement the Customs had detected something unusual and subsequently my friend was found in possession of drugs. How were they able to detect this? I was not aware of it. How many people coming to Barbados daily and how are we able to detect whether they are coming here with illicit contraband stuff? I would like the Training Division of Government to give Customs officers training to keep them abreast of what is going on. We do not know specifically what is happening and in light of what has happened in one of our neighbouring countries a few days ago we have got to be more vigilant at the airport and the seaport as to what is coming into Barbados. Take for instance, Mr. Chairman, a consignment of cargo coming into Barbados for Mr. X. Under the present system Customs may be satisfied that it was only a shipment of shoes coming to Mr. X on Roebuck Street and because of those invoices Customs are duly satisfied it is only a question of Customs dues, but since because of inadequate staffing and lack of investigation at the point of distribution there is no system of ascertaining whether the shipment is shoes or not, how do we know whether they are really shoes? I have been reliably informed that one Bridgetown merchant had purported to bring into this country a consignment of meat on which there is no duty. Customs was satisfied that it was meat, but because the Government had placed a ban on canned vegetables, etc., it was a case of the merchant bringing in a consignment of concentrated juice which was prohibited under the Import Bill.

So I am asking that a more vigilant Customs procedure be undertaken, that our Customs make a more detailed search of vessels and aircraft coming into Barbados, and that the staff be increased to look after not only the invoices of the shipping agent but that Customs should be equipped whether by more staff or otherwise to make a thorough investigation into what is coming into Barbados in light of the recent developments in one of the neighbouring islands. One could easily satisfy Customs that he is bringing in shoes and it could be a consignment of arms. This is a matter of concern. The Customs are doing an important job but there is need for more staff to enquire more carefully into what is really arriving in Barbados.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to raise one small point. In recent time more and more goods are coming into Barbados through the airport, but it does appear that the administrative facilities up there for dealing with this ever increasing amount of goods is inadequate.
4.05 p.m.

There are occasions when people travel to the airport and then find that they have to return to Bridgetown because their documents have been transferred to Bridgetown and they have to return before their papers are processed. Obviously, this is a source of irritation to many people. I have been wondering what is the problem, and what necessary administrative action can be taken prior to the release of goods so that it can be done at the airport. This is a matter that has to be looked into because it is a source of irritation. As I have said already, you can go up there, and then you are sent to another section, and then much to your disappointment you are told that you have to go to Bridgetown before you can get your goods released. I think that all the necessary administrative action that has to be made for goods to be released could take place at the airport.

I have also heard talk about the movement of drugs. What I think is that Customs Officers need better training; but I would like to say quite clearly that in the area of drug detection, a lot depends on Customs Officers being properly tipped off by people in other countries; because no matter how much searching you do, there are certain limitations. There are a number of persons coming into the country – a large number of persons – and that will prevent you from checking and going through baggage efficiently. Even when you search you find that it is difficult to detect persons in possession unless the Security Officer or the Customs Officer has been tipped off. In Barbados it was possible through a tip off from Canada to detect a supply of cocaine valued $2 million; and it was only after repeated searching that we were able to detect this amount of cocaine.

While one can agree with the argument for better training of the staff; a lot will depend on Customs Officers or Security Officers being tipped off by people from overseas, or people from overseas coming through the airport or coming through Bridgetown. I would like to stress right now that the drug problem in this coutry is one which is of great concern to this country. While all of this is going on, we have to realise that people in customs are doing their work in the conditions that exist at the airport and in Bridgetown.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, there are points which have been made which will be dealt with. Dealing with the question of women customs officers and the question of drugs passing through Barbados, during 1978, we appointed two women as customs officers. As regards the question of gift parcels abroad, I will only add to what the Attorney General has said that we have given instructions about the financial limit for gift parcels which can be exempted from duty. Instructions have been given to raise it; but as the Leader of the Opposition will tell you, sometimes instructions are given to a department which are not carried out. Instructions were given that gift parcels up to a value of $25 should be allowed in free of duty. That may seem small; but we have no intention of allowing refrigerators to be bought overseas and sent here as gifts. What you find is that a lot of merchants would find it possible to buy refrigerators cheap in the USA and have them sent to their relatives here. I would not want to go too far into that.

As regards the shallow draft facility the proposed increase in the rates is on exports rather than imports.
4.15 p.m.

The Government has been reconsidering its first views on this matter in the light of representations made. Hon. members may be interested to hear that various decisions have been taken as to the future of the careenage. A Committee has sat on the Careenage on the basis that it will not any longer be a major port of shipment or transshipment, and various recommendations have been made. I am not in a position to tell you all of them, but hon. members would wish to be aware that the Government intends to transfer the headquarters of the Coast Guard from the sands of Oistin to the waters of the careenage, and to this end various works will be done inside the baggage warehouse, works which will not in any way interrupt the facilities which the fishermen now enjoy. In fact it will improve those facilities for repairing their boats, but it will have the effect of making that side of the careenage a security area as far as the Coast Guard anchorage is concerned. The position in the Careenage is very fluid at present. We have not decided whether to adopt the recommendations of the Careenage Development Committee. It is called the Careenage Development Committee but its purview extends from the Fish Market up the beach at Government Headquarters. The entire area is being considered as a development area and therefore parts of St. Michael South as well as the City. There will soon be a new window to the sea if we are correct in our expectations of what private developers may do. There may soon be, I understand, a new Restaurant. In fact such is life, Sir, that even before I had seen the report or known there was a report I was solicited by some one seeking to get the franchise for running a restaurant in the new area. (Mr. SANDIFORD: Did you give any?) It may have been a her. Who says it was not Mrs. Jackman? It might have been, you never know in this day and age, everything seems to leak; but that is under consideration. When the careenage ceases to

be commercial, its future use and the use of the shores between the harbours, all of that is under consideration.

The question of drugs. We are very aware of the problems of drugs. Barbados is not unique in having drug problems. There are many who are totally and entirely convinced that the next ten years will see a general legalisation of the use of marijuana in the United States. Many States including the most progressive have already decriminalised its possession in small quantities, and the Statistical Department of the United States estimates that there are 40 million adults who use it on a more or less regular basis or who have used it or who continue to use it on a more or less regular basis. It may be that we will have to wait until then, because if articles in Time Magazine and the other popular serious weeklies are any guide, the United States is going to use the legalisation of marijuana as a means of reducing its adverse balance of trade. They will no longer be importing it from Columbia; they will allow it to be grown in the United States, and I think this will have the tendency of undercutting the traffic in these parts of the Caribbean which at present indulge in it so intensely. There is less evidence that Barbados has a problem with harder drugs. I think I am right in saying that while we have had a few prosecutions for possession of cocaine that we have so far not had any prosecutions for possession of heroin.

The Columbian connection which the hon. member mentioned: I wonder if hon. members are aware that in fact we have had difficulties with the Columbian connection in Barbados at the airport. We have arrested more than one citizen of Columbia in connection with the movement of hard drugs and prison sentences have been meted out not only to Columbians but to nationals of other countries, not Barbados or any Caricom country, who have been traced and identified in connection with the movement of cocaine to the United States. We have also cooperated with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and evidence has been collected in Barbados and matters have been dealt with in Barbados which have resulted in convictions in North America for serious offences of drug pushing and drug transportation.

We are not in a position to say that we have stamped it out, but certainly since the strong measures which we took against the Columbians who were involved, I think that at least one of the Columbians who went to prison was a female, I think that since the strong measures which we took against that particular race, we have seen no particular evidence of the use of Barbados as part of the Columbian connection. I will very much hope that it never comes about. Somebody said recently that Columbia has become the greatest exporter of agricultural products in the world, that the exports of Columbian marijuana and cocaine to the United States now exceed the Unites States wheat sales to China. Well we have no desire whatsoever to get into that kind of business, because enormous though the profits are, there are socially erosive to the highest possible degree. I know that careful note has been taken of what has been said by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central and other hon. members on this subject, but I think that on reflection hon. members would not wish me to say what methods of detection of drugs are used at the airport. They are certainly more sophisticated than opening the baggage of every passenger, and there are a number of Customs Officers who are trained in this field and who are familiar with modern techniques of examination for drug smuggling. I am sure nobody would wish me to go further than that, but once hon. members understand that we are alive to the problem, I think that hon. members can sleep a little more happily where this is concerned.

The question that the sum of $641,096 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (5) Customs, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (6) INLAND REVENUE

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (6) Inland Revenue – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $236,424 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (6) Inland Revenue – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (7) RATES AND TAXES

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (7) Rates and Taxes – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $225,640 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (7) Rates and Taxes, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I should just like to raise a small question on this. With the recent revaluation of properties in this country and property owners being called upon to pay increased rates on their land and on the improved value, I wonder if the Minister responsible would indicate whether there have been many complaints about this revaluation, whether the Minister

has considered in view of the upward revision that the rate at which the tax is imposed might be lowered because it presents a burden on property owners in this country, and I am wondering if any relief in this particular area is on the mind of the Minister responsible.
4.25 p.m.

There is another problem, Mr. Chairman, relating to Inland Revenue in a sense because it is related to the Rates and Taxes and Evaluation. I refer to some inscription on the Income Tax return form which refers to Rateable Value but when you look at the notices you do not see any figure which will enable you to compute that Rateable Value of the land and I am wondering if there is not some outmoded system here which is in need of revamping.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the hon. member will give a reply. I am sure the Minister of Finance will reply, Sir, he is coming back to his place.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member says that we must do something to the taxes and we must do something to the Income Tax Return Forms? I think the hon. member is a little premature.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you will give way and let the hon. member repeat what he has said.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I know what the hon. member has said. I think the hon. member is a little premature. As far as the rate of property taxation is concerned, you know we really have a lot of difficulties here. Property taxation produced, I think it was 4% of revenue in 1975–1976. A little more than 4% of revenue, it looks like 5% of revenue in 1976–77 and a 5.2% in 1976–1977. It then in some remarkable way has managed to produce again less than 5% in 1977–1978. Considerably less ,than 5% in 1978–1979 and I understand the hon. member to be saying that property taxation appears to be too high. Is that what he said?

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of elucidation. The point I am making is that with the recent evaluation and paying at the same rate there has been a significant increase in the tax rates paid on property. This is the question that was raised.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I think the hon. member, if he examines it, will find that the projected revenue from taxation on property in 1979–1980 is less than the actual revenue collected in percentage of actual revenue collected in any previous year. We have projected now to collect 4.3% of our revenue from property taxation. I think also that keeping the same rate of taxation and increasing the tax paid produces more tax and therefore people feel the tax a little more than it was previously felt. This is true of any tax which is charged by way of percentage. After all, you pay more for a motor car now because the tax is more. You pay more income tax because you pay income tax as a percentage of your income. As your income goes up you pay more.

In the hon. member's argument I have not heard him imply indirectly that with income you should raise the level of allowance. I have very seldom heard it applied to income that you must reduce the rate because people are earning more. If your property is worth more why should you reduce the rate? If the country is on the one hand suffering from inflation and on the other hand benefiting from prosperity or any combination of the two, it is in the nature of things that taxes are going to go up a little bit.

The entire point of the system of land taxation was introduced in 1973 by the regime of which the hon. member was a part. The point of the 3-year increase in tax collection was introduced because it was argued that once property was going up in value that people should pay a little more Property Tax and therefore you should reevaluate the taxation every three years.

Now I am going to say something, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I could not find it so easy to say at Budget time. I share some of the concern of those members in respect to evaluation. The hon. member for St. John when he was Minister of Finance said in here that he shared the concern of the public about evaluations only in most cases because the evaluations were too high. He was forced to appeal against his evaluation because it was too low.

At this time I am saying that I am very concerned with some of the evaluations of properties. At some of the big buildings and structures in Bridgetown the Evaluation Officers have somehow managed to produce an evaluation on some of those buildings so that they are paying less tax than they were five years ago. I do not mean less proportionately but less in cash and I am going to say that Minister of Finance or not I am entitled to a degree of bewilderment which affects me when I see businesses in a street that has become a by-word for prosperity, being assessed on the basis that their properties have gone down in value since the new evaluation was made under the new system of taxation and it is a matter with which I have concerned myself and to which I hope to get some answers from the relevant Departments in the near future.

Nothing that I am saying here today should preclude my having to return to the subject some time next month. I go no further, Mr. Chairman, than that, but I will say, that I cannot accept the argument that because the property has gone up in value.
4.35 p.m.

But I will say that I cannot accept the argument that because the property has gone up in value the tax should be reduced so that you do not pay anymore taxes than before. We live in a country where the Old Age Pension has been increased, the public servants are to be given more money and income tax reduced. Is the Property Tax to be reduced too? Property tax that produces only 4% of the revenue? Property tax that runs in Barbados at something like one-quarter of New York rates? I do not believe that the hon. member can be serious. Remember it is allowable against your income tax also, and we have exceptionally generous provisions in this country relating to tax allowances for owner-occupied property. I do not know any country in the world where by now some steps would not have been taken to reduce the tax break you can get from the ownership of property and the judicious use of mortgages. People borrow money on the owner-occupied property to use in business and get tax relief on the interest that they pay on the mortgage. They borrow money on the property to buy new property and remortgage the new property and get two tax breaks. I really cannot see that owners of property can complain under the present system. The present system is not perfect, there are many anomalies that can be found because the present system has not been worked out in sufficient depth to enable it to function as an incentive system for the development of land as well as the system of collecting taxes from those most able to pay; but I really do not believe that there is a valid argument that property taxes are too high in Barbados at the present time.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just a few observations on this particular matter which is before the House. There is no doubt in my mind, and I have expressed the view previously that we have to watch this whole question of property taxes very carefully in a developing country like Barbados. Comparisons with property taxes in developed countries and highly developed societies like New York are not relevant to a developing country. The question of the use of property, the question of housing, the development of commerce, etc., these are a fundamental part of the developmental processes in this country.

Reference has already been made, I think, to the importance of housing development. It is not often clearly understood that housing constitutes a very fundamental infrastructural development of a society that deals with problems such as unemployment, health, education, cultural development, leisure and makes a major contribution to the total society. We have not reached the state of development in this area where we can put any excessive penalty on property outside of the developed commercial areas of Bridgetown, and I would readily concede that the hon. Minister of Finance direct his attention to what is happening there. But I would also say this, that even before we reach the stage of adequate housing development in Barbados, that indeed where there is a distinct need for tax incentives in this area of development we are having on the contrary a situation where our tax levels are inhibitory to this type of development. This is a matter of very serious economic importance because it is the kind of infrastructural area which can have tremendous relevance as far as the future Barbadian society is concerned. For example, you may spend $20 million a year in buying drugs for a variety of conditions where the fundamental problem might well arise from inadequate housing in the society. We can think, for example, of conditions such as asthma, or fractures in the elderly which probably cost millions of dollars a year in Barbados because when they were walking on the floor they fell through a hole and fractured a femur, and so on; and I read – I do not have the figures, and the hon. Minister for Finance says that I always quote figures that are bogus – he did not use the word bogus, I think he said excessive – but one careful land developer and a very close colleague of a member of the other side – I am not using any disparaging remarks because an hon. member of this house is involved in the development of property which is important to Barbados – but the point I am making is that when you build a house in Barbados, by the time you have finished building that house you probably would have paid something like 45–55% of the total cost of the house to the Government by way of taxes, customs dues, the taxes which the construction workers would have paid back to the Government under the PAYE scheme. So the Government gets a big advantage out of the building process. And I think this is an area that the Government should take a long term view of, recognizing that property development, particularly in the area of housing, has fundamental long term benefits to the society apart from the short term benefits. It is not only a question of four walls and a roof going up; it is employment, health, education, leisure and a whole lot of spin-off factors. Indeed good housing is contributory to a population control programme; in fact there is no area you can think of in which Government would be spending money in which good and adequate housing would not be a fundamental contributor. Therefore I would strongly suggest that the whole question of taxation and property should be looked at very carefully.

I would also like to bring to the attention of this Honourable House the situation faced by people on fixed income. There are many pensioners whose only income is from their pensions but they may own the house they live in and they have to pay taxes on that property. But it must also be remembered that in the assessment there is a figure included for the privilege of living in that House, and that may be the only thing their husbands may have left them, and if the husband's pension has been stopped after his death these people

are often forced to sell their properties and go and stay with relatives in order to survive. Consequently I feel that the Government should take a deliberate policy in distinguishing between commercial properties and houses which people own and live in. It is a different matter where a person has a second or third or fourth house generating rentals and income. There has to be some differential in this kind of arrangement apart from the overall economic situation in terms of the development of this country which I have brought to the attention of this Honourable House.

Then too there is a question of valuations. I am satisfied that the valuations in this country are done on a very haphazard basis. For example there have been many cases – for instance the hon. member for Christ Church North Central who is well known in the community to be an extremely wealthy man, if he has a house in St. James, the mere fact that his name appears might well lead to a valuation of three or four times the amount that would be charged if perhaps my name appeared as the owner of the property.
4.45 p.m.

Now, this is the kind of thing which is not fair. I think that the hon. member for Christ Church North Central would agree with me that that situation should not obtain, and people within that department have suggested that this kind of thing is quite unfair. I know of one particular.....

Mr. WARD rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do you rise on a point of order?

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that if the hon. member wants to say that all two of us have money, and that the Prime Minister has money let him say so.

Dr. HAYNES: I was just trying to give an example, and I would not be surprised if the hon. member has not suffered as a consequence of this. There are some poor people in this country who have been subjected to extra-ordinary valuations of their properties. I believe that there is a property in the Christ Church area where the valuation of the property has moved from $19 to $119,000.

Just to summarise the major points that I am making, the first is that we should create tax incentives rather than tax penalties. That, I think, will be the correct approach to this problem. I believe that taxation on properties that people owned and lived in should be frozen for some time. If you are living in both places that is a different thing altogether and should also be looked at very carefully. I would agree with the Minister of Finance that no question of commercial properties needs to be looked at; and I hope that I have been able to put across to this Hon. House the necessity to use taxation as an instrument of economic development and not necessarily as an instrument not connected with development. In Martinique some years ago the French Government introduced a number of incentives in relation to housing, and this had a tremendous effect, not only in relation to housing as such, but to housing development in that particular island.

I would like to see that approach in Barbados. I repeat that I think that the Government is getting enough from every new house built; and they should look at the effects of taxation in an area that needs development, an area which is related to employment generation. As we move into the 1980s and the 1990s, in order to do this I call on the Minister of Finance to use his imagination and to see if he can do something about this rather than seeing how much money he can get out of this, and realise that there are many other spin offs.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the Prime Minister put the case for Government for bringing in money and one of the ways is taxation. One cannot have much quarrel with that; but I find that taxation of this sort will really impose a greater burden on the people of this country where houses are offered for rent. It has already occurred and it is significant to note that while the Government will be obtaining increased taxation, the Government will benefit in another way because the Government is likely to find that the amount of money coming from that avenue will also increase. Many householders whose houses are below this value will now have to pay a higher surcharge.

The other point I want to draw to the attention of the Ministry of Finance is where people in straightened circumstances have applied for relief. I would also like to hear the Hon. Minister's policy on this system and how many people have benefited in the past or if at the moment it is intended to reintroduce it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know how many people benefit from it. I know that there are many applications which turn up on my desk every two weeks and nearly all from old age pensioners and sometimes one wonders at the quantity of land that they have for rent. There are also quite a number of people where you will be surprised to see them at. There is hardly a development in Barbados – Rockley, and Blue Waters and so on where there are people not asking for income tax relief.
4.55 p.m.

Indeed the places where we used to hear the worst complaints about which is the coastal lands in St. James, they seem to be the ones where least application is now made. Maybe of course they have certificates and they are collecting their rebates on a regular basis, but certainly the hon. member need have no fear that the relief provisions contained in the Act are not being fully utilised. Even members of the Land Tax Relief Boards I observe to be among those applying, and they very properly disqualify themselves when the Boards are sitting on their means to pay the taxes sometimes on what I would call a small plantation are being assessed, but as to that I have not heard any particular complaints about the work of the Land Tax Relief Board. Guidelines were given to it. It was indicated to them in the old days of back scratching that the former vestrymen used to grant to each other tax relief which carried over long after the abolition of the vestries. We have put an end to those and we have tried to administer the relief provisions.

You may yet find that the overwhelming majority of cases, perhaps as much as 90%, are cases with old people who are not pensioners. In other words, people who have a property that has become a little too large for them in old age on the relatively small retirement pensions they may enjoy from Government or elsewhere, but they are not old age pensioners, so they do not go through more or less automatically.

There are also a small number of people who apply for relief, but you can see again they are people who were a little over-ambitious with house property, for example, and they now find difficulties meeting the mortgage payments and paying the tax and so on, and the relief procedures are used for them. The people who are probably refused relief I think are cases where people sometimes are greedy. They have a lot of parcels of land and it does not occur to them that the existence of a large number of pieces of land come to the attention of the tax authorities and they apply for each one individually, but when you put it all together in sum you realise they may be running quite a considerable operation. We have one man with properties I think in eight parishes, a stone works and bungalows which are rented out, applying for relief on the grounds and saying one of his properties in St. Lucy – it might not be St. Lucy but you understand what I mean, Sir, some distant property, so he thinks he should not pay any taxes. That is the situation that you get. I think that hon. members will agree that in all probability the Land Tax, I am calling it, Appeal Board, but it is the Tax Relief Tribunal or whatever it is called... (Mr. TAITT: Who are the members of the Board?) There is Mr. Lushington Gill of Hillaby, St. Thomas. Hon. members on the other side are laughing. The Leader of the Opposition is not laughing. I believe he is an old political associate of the party represented by the Leader of the Opposition. He is a very decent gentleman, a sidesman and so on in St. Thomas Church; there is Mr. Wilfred Thorne of Arch Hall, St. Thomas and there is Mr. Kenneth Forde from Christ Church. I really cannot remember them all.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, if you would look at Item 10, Acts 1867–1; 1868–6 and 1928–2 – Annual Compensation to the Rectors of St. George and St. Philip for use of premises as suboffices, I am sure the hon. member who is unable to raise this question would like an explanation of this.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The reason why I have mentioned the names of Messrs. Thorne, Gill and Forde is that my policy in appointing members of the Land Appeal Tribunal was to appoint persons who had formerly been members of Local Government bodies. I certainly cannot remember all the members, but certainly the three of them were members of Local Government bodies who have had dealings with land taxes in the old days. I cannot really deal with it in great length for the hon. member for St. Michael South Central except that today again he has got hold of the wrong end of the stick and wielded it with enormous conviction. In this country there seems to be a conspiracy on the part of persons like the hon. member, myself and other persons who have managed to make a few dollars in professional life and manage to put up a house or bought some property and we conspire not to recognise that the tax laws of Barbados are exceptionally favourable to us. I am putting myself in the category even though my words will indicate that I recognise it. Now I am speaking not of middle income and lower income people; I am speaking of people who are building a house that is going to be worth $150,000, to put it at a low scale a few years ago; I do not know what they are costing today, maybe $½ million. When you borrow $120,000 for those who need to borrow to put up a house for $150,000 and the tax valuation is, say, $150,000, although they seldom value it right up to the whole amount, you can check and you will find that your outgoings in the early years will be in the region of $1,060 to $1,070 per month; well more than that; counting insurance it will go up to about $1,120 per month for insurance, taxes and mortgage interest, and out of that you get back $800 a month from the Income Tax Department. We must not walk about trying to deceive people who have less money than we have that they are not enormous tax advances to building an expensive house. The public seems to think that members of Parliament do not pay taxes. Last year I paid $22,000 in income tax for the year 1978. Out of that I may be fortunate when I fill out my returns to get back a third, being personal now, based on rebates for mortgages, interest insurance, repairs and so on, and I cannot agree with any hon. member who says that we need any more tax incentives

for house building. It is well known that when the interest runs down 10 to 15 years you re-mortgage the property, winds the interest back up again, use the mortgage money to build a second property and get a second tax break.

The hon. member for St. John must be aware of the amount of the funds that go out. Last year something like $9 million of income tax refund...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Since the hon. member has called my name, I should just like to rise on a point of order. The Commissioner of Inland Revenue has never told me about the amount of refunds that go out. As a matter of fact, I have the greatest difficulty in getting back my own refunds from him. I have not got back my refunds for year before last or for last year although tax was deducted from my income, whatever it is, if you can call it an income, and also I submit my returns in time at the end of the year.

While I am on my feet, on a point of personal explanation, the hon. Minister of Finance and Prime Minister said that I was forced to object to the valuation on 10,000 square feet of land on improved site value which I own not far from one of the several properties which he owns in the parish of St. Michael and island aforesaid. I was not forced to do anything.
5.05 p.m.

I was Minister of Finance and the hon. member is aware that I was the only person in the history of Barbados who has ever objected to an evaluation on the ground that it was too low. I did this deliberately because the Ministry was being inundated, that is the Land Evaluation Department, the Division of Evaluations, with objections and as he said I was aware that principally the evaluations were only about 60% of the market value of the properties and I was concerned about an hotel which had 31 acres and I only had 10,000 square feet so if they had valued my property at only 60% of the true market value the hotel was getting away with a lot more than me and the hon. member for St. Thomas who is now Minister of Finance himself would have been getting away with, so it is not correct to say that I was "forced."

I elected to do it which is a slightly different matter of voluntary objection. I did it in the interest of the finances in this country with a long-term objective in view of the interest of the financiers. I do not like having to pay in every subsequent year since then, 33 1/3% more than I would have paid if I had kept my mouth quiet, but I did it in the interest of good finances of the country, so I think that the hon. member will agree that I was not forced to do it. All I can say to you is "go and do thou likewise."

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Perhaps the use of the word "forced" was not a well chosen word, Sir, but no doubt the hon. member will get his reward.

There is one point in the speech of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central which I have taken note of. I am seriously questioning the desirability of continuing the system of which subsidiary properties are treated in the same favourable way as an owner occupied property. I am really thinking about that. In the United Kingdom when the Capital Gains Tax was introduced hon. members would recall that it applied to all properties except owner occupied residents. If you lived in a house for a certain number of years you could sell the house without having to pay Capital Gains on it, an encouragement no doubt for people to sell valuable properties in their old age without the burden of the United Kingdom Capital Gains Tax. That is a matter which is under consideration at the present time. I think I have covered the points, Sir.

Mr. TAITT: I draw to your attention Item 10.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry, Note 10. I do not see the hon. member for St. Philip South in his seat. He would know something about it. This goes back to when we had a Law Revision exercise in here in 1967. The hon. member for St. Philip South was a member and Mr. Talma was a member of a Select Committee which analysed the Laws of Barbados in preparation for this edition. It was proposed to repeal certain laws once and for all and we discovered that the Law Revision Commissioners had proposed to repeal the 1867–1 which I think is the St. Philip Repeal Act, the 1868–6 which I think is the St. George Act and I think the 1928–2 had also to do with St. George.

These were Acts which secured the revenue for the Glebes around the Churches of St. George and St. Philip to the Rector and it did appear as if it was so but it turned out to be not so perpetual as was thought and they did indicate in the Third Act that the Government should pay a rent for a little portion of the Glebe in which the St. George Sub-Treasury now stands. It was proposed to repeal them and the Select Committee went into the matter at some length and eventually decided that it could safely be left to the Estimates. The amount of money is now $325.00 a year. It is very small.

I well recall that the hon. member for St. Philip South at the end of the Committee Meeting telling me that he was not sure what we were all talking about, referring to the experts from England. He just wanted to be sure because as a loyal supporter of the St. Philip Church he had done his duty by the Rector in the interest of the Church of England. He did in fact preserve those Acts and we did preserve the interest of

the Glebes for the Rectors for the time being. I think that since that date the then Rectors have vacated their post and the incomes from the Glebe have gone into the Church revenues and are not now voted under these statutory provisions. This little amount is just to pay the Rectors for the use of some of the Churches.

The question that the sum of $225,640 under Head 8(7) – Rates and Taxes stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (8) LAND VALUATION

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (8) Land Valuation – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $212,171 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (8) Land Valuation, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one very quick question. Recently, the land tax bills which have come up have shown up something call arrears and a number of persons that I know did in fact pay their land tax and thereby have no arrears. I am told that this is as a result of some computer error. There has been no further tax bill coming out to correct this obviously incorrect tax bill which has come out. I wonder if the Minister is in a position to shed some light on this obvious worrying point for a number of persons.

Perhaps while he is doing that he could fill us in on the matter that a number of records connected with the land tax and other taxes were destroyed in the recent fire at the Rates and Taxes Division. I do not know if this is accurate but perhaps the Minister is in a position to fill us in on that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I do not know about the destroying of records. I will make inquiries about that. I suppose what has really happened is between the processing of Land Valuation and Rates and Taxes. They still have not been able to computerise the tax collections into such a high degree of accuracy that they are able to maintain the necessary cross-posting and ensure that the bills are sent out absolutely correct.
5.15 p.m.

It is true that it is a number of years since the exercise has started, but computer mistakes have been responsible for a number of the errors. I have paid tax bills twice and got back a nice letter from one of the officers indicating that they had found the receipt and sent back the overpayments explaining that the computer had made mistakes in the posting of the receipts. I am informed that no records were destroyed in the fire but I would doubt myself that all the records which were in the possession of the Local Government authorities at one time or another ever reached the Rates and Taxes Division. Honourable members may remember that I gave an amnesty on taxes prior to 1972, and as far as I know the record since 1972 should be complete. Honourable members will surely recall that $1.8 million in back taxes were written off in my first Budget. At the moment the Permanent Secretary in the Prime Minister's office – the Head of the Civil Service....

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister is saying that he called for an amnesty in 1972. Perhaps that information has not yet permeated down to the Tax office, because there are numbers of people getting letters from the Tax office suggesting they are owing taxes for the years 1968 to 1971. The Prime Minister is obviously not aware of this, but it is a fact.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am not aware of any such letters and would very much like to see a letter of this kind. We have had some movements in Rates and Taxes recently – one has moved into Glendairy – but I would hardly believe that having had an amnesty declared in the Budget, somebody sent out tax bills for the same period. If the hon. member cares to give me the information I will investigate it, but if people do not wish to have their names involved we would just have to ignore it. But be sure you are talking about 1968 to 1971 and talking about land tax, not trade tax; do not give the former Senator Ashby the impression that when he gets the demands for the trade tax owing back to 1967 or whatever it is he can throw it in the waste paper basket; it is the land tax on which there has been the guillotine. The fire at Rates and Taxes did not destroy any records on which I am aware.

The question that the sum of $212,171 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (8) Land Valuation – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 8 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING (9) STATISTICAL SERVICES

Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (9) Statistical Services – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: In the Statistical Services there is a fair amount of action. I have already

dealt with some of it but I would like to take this opportunity of appealing to the public to cooperate with the Statistical Services in the forthcoming exercise taking place over the next three months. We will have a survey for the rural development scheme and there is a good deal of work being done on that. We have had some staff expansion and I think very soon we will be establishing some more posts. Temporary officers now working have become very experienced in statistical matters, but without the cooperation of the public the Statistical Services cannot carry on the sort of survey needed by the Government and so I appeal to the public to cooperate. I would remind the public that we have strict conditions of secrecy in respect of any information given to a Census officer of enumerator of the Statistical Services.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $146,637 under Head 8 – Ministry of Finance and Planning (9) Statistical Services – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I believe that in a recent debate in this Chamber I made reference to the importance of the work of the Statistical Department in providing data for several Ministries in their forward plans; there can be no doubt about this. The work is set out in a statute of this country and there is no doubt it is an important service not only to the Ministry of Finance but to other Ministries and Departments as well; and I think that the very status of this department both in terms of its relation with other Government Departments in the country and in the relationship with other territories in the Caribbean and beyond is of such vital importance that the service should always be seen to be given the necessary status concomitant with its responsibilities; and it is a matter of concern especially when it relates to a regional coordinating committee that participate in that work. And in the 1980 population census there is work involved, a lot of sample surveys – this is the latest fad, everything is a survey – and I am really concerned that for quite some time and to the best of my knowledge this department has not had a head appointed to the substantive position, and I wonder if there are any Establishment problems connected with this particular matter, if for instance we do not have any competent persons to head up that particular department. It is a most important service and I am wondering if the Prime Minister as Minister responsible for the Statistical Service can throw any light on this matter. I believe the Minister recently gave the assurance that there were only a very small number of acting persons – I think he said about three – but I think the importance of this service is such that you might like to look at it more closely and I wonder if the Minister has any additional information to give.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member persists in putting a case. I always admire when counsel puts a case not once or twice but three times. Whenever statistical matters come up the hon. member make some speech. I can only say this: If the head of a department resigns and the department has eight persons in executive positions, while you are waiting for the head to be appointed you may very well have eight acting appointments, because everybody may move up one, but that does not mean that there are eight vacancies. But we have not had that situation with a whole set of people acting. I explained in my remarks that some of the temporary officers have been acting for three years as temporary officers and that I think it is time that the post be established. If the hon. member is referring to the head of the department where there is a vacancy, I have explained that the acting head has wanted to go on a course. What does the hon. member want me to do? Pick up the establishment file and read out the correspondence, recommendations, etc., of the Statistical Service? There are certain things which hon. members must not flog so hard. Does the hon. member know the history of all the matters involved? People are sometimes promoted over other people's heads, and when the person who has been promoted goes away it may be very well be that they fear that when they have left, somebody who was formerly their superior will be appointed into the top post. I do not know why this strong case is being put up. There are some undoubted peculiarities here, but I do not think any injustice is being suffered.

5.25 p.m.

If he really thinks that, he will conclude that I talked about it more than the former incumbent of the post, because I am interested in Statistical Services. After all, what are we doing? We are doing a household budget survey. That was done in 1965. We are doing a continuation of the household survey on unemployment which was started by the hon. member for St. John. We have side tracked ourselves by doing a survey on daylight saving time which is permitted, I think, under clause 7 of the Schedule, and which therefore is permitted by the law; and I believe that in many ways it was a most useful exercise, because even if it shows that a majority of people were in favour of it, it also shows that there is a substantial minority who feels very strongly about it. I am just saying it was a valuable exercise.

We are also doing a survey on rural development – a rural development scheme. There is no point putting together a scheme, as the previous regime did at Spring Hall and then again getting something to which you cannot attract the right sort of people. We are trying to get for the purpose of our own information, as well as for the purpose of an overseas loan application, information from people who live in

country districts and who live on plantation tenantries. We are trying to get information from those people as to whether they really want to have plantation lands given to them, and if so, whether they will co-operate in an exercise in intensive vegetable production. We feel that rather than take a jump in the dark, it is better to have a number of trained enumerators going around to ask them, are you willing to take part in such a scheme? That is one of the surveys which is being carried out.

I do not think that there is anything to apologise for. The hon. member seems to be poking fun at the various surveys. I really do not see that there is anything ridiculous about them. If the hon. member is not glad for the Duffus Commission, that confirms my view all along which has been that may be the hon. member is sorry that we had the Duffus Commission because he is sorry that the Duffus Commission said what it said because it has allowed some of his colleagues to take some comfort. I have no doubt, knowing the hon. member and the statements that he has made on a number of occasions, that that element would be present; but we see absolutely no reason to apologise for the commissions or the surveys. I will repeat my assurance to the hon. member that the matter of the acting appointments are being dealt with carefully and expeditiously. There was what I think was an irrelevant contribution from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. You said it was irrelevant in your opinion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not remember that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: It was irrelevant in soliciting not only the names of persons who are to be appointed to temporary posts but even their addresses. I would like to know how the Public Service could send a letter to somebody appointed by them to a post without knowing his address. I would like to know that. If you do not know a man's address, you cannot send him a letter of appointment; but that is characteristic of the contribution of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

I think that I should myself certainly address my remarks as regards certain of the personnel concerned; because clearly it seems to me that the hon. member is putting a case for a constituent. There could not possibly be a case for a friend in dealing with this matter.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I would like to elucidate the point that I have made, and in so doing I am saying that there is an important department in the Prime Minister's Office which has a relation with other departments and with agencies, not only in the Caribbean but throughout the world has been without a head for sometime; and this has nothing to do with putting a case for anybody. I wonder why the Prime Minister should have reduced the matter to this. Is he really saying that someone cannot be appointed because he wants to go on study leave? How is that relevant to going on leave. I do not really understand the argument. How is it advantageous for someone not to be appointed and go on study leave without being appointed? I do not understand. I would be glad if the hon. member would deal with the merits of the case rather than trying to be personal. I am dealing with a post.

The question that Head 9 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN left the Chair, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported progress and has asked for leave to sit again.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for 10 minutes.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting at 5.35 p.m.

5.35 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 108 – MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Head 108 – Ministry of Finance and Planning – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that there is an item here which relates to the Central Purchasing warehouse that has already been dealt with today.

I beg to move that the sum of $5,365,047 under Head 108 – Ministry of Finance and Planning, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to your attention that that sum seems to be incorrect. If you turn over the page the figures would be $6,765,047.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It has been drawn to my attention that there appears to be a carry forward of the sum represented on page 26 and that in fact the total sum is $6,765,047, so the question is for that sum to stand part.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, there are two aspects of this Head which I should like to mention. The first one is the relatively, well not so relatively large sum of money which has been allocated for feasibility studies. Now, Mr. Chairman, for some very long time I have held the view that feasibility studies of various projects are to a large extent the invention of a number of persons especially from North America who find ways to inflate projects and indeed to provide employments for friends and lackeys. I am not suggesting at all that this is the case with this particular vote. I am merely drawing it to the Minister's attention and soliciting from him some more detailed information as to what are the directions in which we are going by doing feasibility studies. It says here that there will be one on transportation.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that not so long ago there was a report called the King Report in which some attempt was made at gathering initial information on the transportation problems and systems of this country, and I therefore assume that this transportation study for which there is going to be a feasibility survey is something new and different and something which will involve large sums of money, and I would like some detail on that.

Now the Speightstown re-development is something of which we have been hearing a lot for a very long time, and if my recollection is correct there was a Committee headed by the then Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Talma, charged with the responsibility of looking at the re-development of Oistin and Speightstown, and I seem to recall that there was a scale model of the proposed re-development of these areas which in fact was put on display in Speightstown itself. If there is going to be a feasibility study now on the re-development of Speightstown, there seems to be some suggestion that that exercise would be thrown out the window and we will be starting from scratch, because Mr. Chairman, the concept of a feasibility study suggests a study from the beginning to see if the particular project is feasible before going into a more analytical and broader study of the particular project. I look forward to hearing from the Prime Minister some detailed information on what he or the Government proposes for this Speightstown re-development feasibility study. I see here that included in the feasibility study would be the hiring of professional services. Now clearly the information for that can only come from the Government, but I should like to make this point. For a very long time in the history of Barbados and other developing countries we have had situations where the professionals in the Public Service who do the work and who themselves have been capable of putting forward realistic, sensible, and technically feasible and proper plans for developing projects have had other people come in from outside the country with different experience. These people incapable of understanding the nuances and realities of Barbados' development and Barbados' requirement come in and as it were, ride piggy-back on the local officials, read the report which is essentially the work of the local officials and then leave after having acquired a relatively large sum of money for a feasibility study payment.

I think it is fair to say that during our time we were very aware of this kind of exercise. I do not wish to be understood to be saying that there ought not to be feasibility studies or there ought not to be the hiring of professional people or that there are no professionals outside Barbados to whom you cannot look for assistance in what we are doing. I am merely issuing a cautionary statement to the Government that we must be careful not to be taken in by the demands of the various regional and often more so the international agencies who in the majority of cases are staffed by a number of third rate rejects from the developed countries who are incapable of holding their own in their own environment and who are foisted upon developing countries with that type of expert. That is a phenomenon which has come even more to the fore in the last 20 years or so with the growing of certain regional and international institutions like the IADB and other places like that. We have had certainly in our experience a number of people who have come down to Barbados and whose advice is couched naturally in the language of the environment from which they come and whose understanding can only be in the context of the environment in which they have developed. An example of this which we have in this Head is provision for a cement plant. I think it is now history that we have had for too long a dilatory approach to the development of a cement plant. I recall vividly that a woman, I think her name was Mrs. Pig or Mrs. Hogg came down here when we were in the process of putting together a cement

plant. We had the best advice available to us from experts from Jamaica who had put up a cement plant there and where a cement plant was working.
6.00 p.m.

We had advice from people in Milwaukee, in Germany, in Spain and in various places. I remember that Mr. Freddy Clarke, I call his name only to identify the quality of the local personnel, Mr. Freddy Clarke had done a tremendous amount of work with a Jamaican called Mr. Chin. I think that was his name who was in fact an International Expert if for no other reason than he had more experience with the kind of Cement Plant which was at the time working in Jamaica and who had been used for advice on a Cement Plant on a similar kind in North America and we were in the process, and I do not mind saying that I paid great tribute to the then Minister of Finance who demonstrated a great capacity to grasp quickly certain technical aspects of the development of a Cement Plant.

Indeed it was because of a lot of personal hard work that we were able to come to the conclusion that we would move from the vertical kiln to the horizontal kiln. We were in the process and I remember that when Mr. Clarke was on leave he came over to Jamaica where I had a meeting with the Caricom Ministers and together we were able to involve people who were involved in this Cement Plant and a great amount of work was done and the financing had been arranged through the International Part of the National Bank.

We were in the process of going and down came Mrs. Hogg. She was an Expert from the World Bank who was looking around in the Caribbean for something to get involved in. She was a French Expert. She was in the process of looking around the Caribbean because they have a strong philosophy about International Agencies that if you hear of a country in Africa that is described as an under-developed country is about to do something, you must not lend them money unless you despatch somebody from Washington whose only experience might have been that they went to a University in Mississippi, but you must despatch that Expert to that country in Africa and they stop whatever is happening and prepare a feasibility study and send that feasibility study back to Washington so that the analysts can examine it in detail to determine if they would lend the country in question a little bit of money.

When Mrs. Hogg intervened in the development of the Cement Plant the cost was moved from a projected figure of about $22 million E.C. to something like $50 million U.S. Mrs. Hogg indicated that this was a project in which the World Bank should get involved. The only thing that is wrong with it is that it needs another, she did not use the word "another," but it needed another feasibility study. Now we had done a feasibility study, a pre-feasibility study, a post-feasibility study and a practical feasibility study. We had taken stone and rock, if you would pardon the expression rock-stone, from various parts of the North of Barbados. We had sent it to the laboratories in London whose qualifications had never been questioned before. We had received information from them that all of the ingredients required for the establishment of a Cement Plant seem to be there.

We had made provisions for the acquisition of gypsum. We had had discussions with people in the region. We had allocated money for the feasibility study when along came Mrs. Hogg and hogged up the work literally. That happened at a point where we were changing Governments and the new Government coming in quite naturally thought it desirable, I thought it was unfortunate, but I understand it. They thought it was desirable to take another look at the project to see what the political mileage in the project was and how they could extract some political mileage from it and the long and short of that, Mr. Chairman, is that we the people of Barbados have suffered as a result because even though the loan was required for establishment of a Cement Plant, we are now still at the stage on this 20th day of March, 1979, once again about to vote money for the establishment of a Cement Plant along with some feasibility studies.

I am being advised by one of the stalwarts on the back bench that we should move a Resolution and reduce this vote by a dollar. Is that the Resolution? I am not trying for that sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting is that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance should give us a little more detail of what he proposes for these feasibility studies and that at least we can get on with the business of establishing a Cement Plant. I do not believe that at this time in Barbados the question of whether we should have a Cement Plant or not is a question that ought to be raised. The longer we delay in establishing a Cement Plant the worse it will be for us over 5,10, 15 or 20 years.

I recall the hon. member for St. Michael West raising a question of the price. I remember he raised valid questions about the environmental aspects of the creation of a Cement Plant and I think these are areas which are useful and will benefit the community. I think therefore, if we do not start the Cement Plant this year, that next year it will cost another 15% more. If we do not start it next year it would probably cost another 30% or 40% or 50% and in the end if one looks at the prices of cement coming into Barbados at the moment and if one examines the prospects for the shipment of cement across the world over the next 10 to 15 years, if one takes into account the problems involved in the energy propulsion, if you take into account the Iranian situation and all of

the circumstances surrounding energy, you will see that cement in Barbados could very well be about $20 a bag in five or ten years from now. That will mean, Mr. Chairman, that certain persons in this community will have to give up forever the concept of building what is described as a modest house.

I recognise that there are some people who would not have that difficulty, but that is immaterial. We are interested in the broad spectrum of the society and I hope therefore that the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance will be able to give us some indication of what he intends to do.

I finish on this point, Mr. Chairman, The Spring Garden Samuel Jackman Polytechnic Road. I will finish on that point not because the road passes the constituency, that part of Barbados which I love the most, not because it would be of great interest to the people of St. Michael South West, but because the concept of the road and the industrialisation of the immediate area around have become over the last 2½ years some kind of a political football. I would invite the Government to let us, although the Democratic Labour Party conceptualise the putting of the road and an Industrial Park in the area to let us stop the politics about the area.

6.10 p.m.

Let us get down to the details of how it is proposed to develop the area. Environmentally it is going to be of supreme importance to Barbados for the next hundred years how that area is developed. If we do not now take the time to develop it along the lines of which our progeny will be proud, we will be damned for ever by that same progeny for having lost the opportunity to re-develop the whole area running from President Kennedy drive to way back to Paradise Beach and the area taking in the constituencies of the hon. members for St. Michael West and St. Michael South.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only the question of the role of industrialisation. I think you yourself will have some interest in knowing what kind of housing development we are going to have, not for the next three or four years but over the next twenty-five or thirty years, for that whole area going by President Kennedy Drive, Westbury Road – don't worry about the Cemetery, that will remain intact, for there are many people dying to get there – but the area surrounding it – Rotten Town, Richmond Gap – I am sure the Minister later on will tell us what he proposes to do with the Richmond School. It is getting to a point where consideration will have to be given to redesigning or rebuilding an entirely new school, and plans ought to be laid now for the development of that whole Eagle Hall area, Black Rock and Brandon in the context of what we see here presented for feasibility studies.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I agree with much that has been said by the hon. member for St. Michael West on the question of feasibility studies. I think that we became mesmerized by these international organizations with their M.I.T. graduates and others who have no practical experience of the problems of developing countries sitting down in offices in Washington and other places and paying frequent visits to these countries impressing upon the "benighted natives" the need to have these visitations before you can embark on any developmental projects for the benefit of the people of the country. The point which was made about the resentment which this engenders among the resident natives – if I use the word natives it is not in a pejorative sense – the native staff, or resident staff no matter where they may come from – I frequently have to remind some of these people from overseas that even subsequent to the establishment of the University of the West Indies our professional people have been trained in the same universities as these so-called international experts and have frequently eclipsed these experts in examination results but through a sense of loyalty to their country of origin have returned home to work when, as the hon. member for St. Michael South West has point out, the so-called experts cannot venture into the competitive field and have to seek the security and sanctity of international organisations without being exposed to the rigors of competition in the professional world. I am being very straight-forward about this.

The hon. member mentioned the matter of the cement plant. Unfortunately, the Government wanted to make every project of what they call the forward administration a no-go project, and that is why we have not got a cement plant here today. The hon. member who just sat down said that in ten years' time the price of cement in Barbados is likely to be $20 a bag. I can see he has not done like the Minister of Finance and indulged in any big building recently. I am presently engaged on a building project for my organization and the price of cement is now not too far from $20; it is certainly more than $8 a bag of around one hundred pounds today; and to say that in five or ten years' time it will be $20 is being very optimistic, because I think that in two or three years' time we may find ourselves having to pay $20 for a bag of cement.

Feasibility studies and prefeasibility studies – now if you want to put up a building you have to have pre-qualification tenders and all that kind of nonsense. In the old days you would call in old Alamby and tell him you want a school and ask him how much he would build it for. Grassfield School – better known as St. Michael's Girls School – the only thing the St. Michael Vestry has to its credit, after much urging by the late Mr. John Beckles; but there is not a single civic building in the whole of the parish of St. Michael that the Vestry of St. Michael as a civic organisation can claim any distinction for. Right here in these Capital Estimates we have a sum set aside

for the improvement of the office of Rates and Taxes which is a disgrace. We inherited that from the Bridgetown City Council and the Vestry which was its predecessor. With all due respect to my friend the hon. member for St. Philip South, the mentality of Local Government politicians in those days was one of seeing how little money they could spend. There was not a single Local Government Authority that did anything like the civic hall of Wolverhampton where you have displayed the terpsichorean art on festive occasions. They never saw their function as being one where they would provide amenities for the people; they felt that their civic duty ended when they said "give the lady fifty cents." And when it came to parochial roads, I had the experience when I first represented the constituency of St. George of being informed by the members of the Vestry that they wanted me to put in to the Central Government Department of Highways for 834 feet of road to be done in St. George; and when I took over the reins of office I had all the roads in St. George and St. John, except the road going down towards Consett Bay done in two years. But their mentality was 800 feet this year, 1100 next year. The result is that all of us have taken over monstrosities like the building in Cumberland Street which is the main area in which Government revenue is collected. A colossal amount of revenue is collected in that building – dog licences, motor car licences, property taxes, etc. I have heard of rabbit warrens and I have read "Alice in Wonderland", but I have never been in a rabbit warren; but the sooner we pull that building down and build a decent building, the better.

6.20 p.m.

So this is a question of feasibility studies. The amount of $1.4 million is a lot of money to be spent on feasibility studies. What I would suggest to the hon. member is that if you want to do something, you do not need a feasibility study to do it. Do what we did with the new post office. Call in the architects, make an estimate as to the cost and come to the House and ask for the money. We have had people in the Public Service, we have had people in the Ministry of Communications and Works, engineers and so on displeased because they see other people from overseas sitting in offices and drawing in three months more money than they worked for in a whole year, just to do a feasibility study on something when all that you have to do is to make a decision. If you want to build a school, you do not need a feasibility study on something when all that you have to do is to make a decision. If you want to build a school, you do not need a feasibility study for that. What is the need for a feasibility study to build a new Town Hall? To pull down Cumberland House, or whatever they call it and build a new office for the Rates and Taxes Division? Does that need a feasibility study?

You call in engineers and tell them that you want to have the harbour extended; and this idea that a sovereign Government has to have somebody from Washington to tell them whether they should do something is nonsense. A sovereign Government decides what it wants to do and then calls in the experts to tell them what it is going to cost and how to do it, and then they go for a tender. That is axiomatic. Let me give you an example. When it comes to the opening of the flour mill you will have the Police Band and a fanfare of trumpets will blow, and one of the Ministers will open the flour mill which we planned.

The Inter-American Development Bank told us, that they were not going to build the breakwater on which we wanted to site the flour mill because they would have to do a feasibility study before we could even build a breakwater, and that is despite the flour mill. They wanted a feasibility study based on the breakwater, and not on the flour mill; and the best people to tell us about the flour mill were people like the big millers in the USA – not the Minister of Health – the big millers in the flour mills. The Minister of Health is of a superior grade. I am referring to the big millers. Maple Leaf said that they would find the money to build the break water for us even though they were not in the breakwater business. We called on the millers and told them what we wanted and that is how we would get that open down there in probably two or three months and we would have had our own flour.

You do not need people to do a feasibility study to tell you that you can do something. A Government is not in business necessarily to make money. If Shipping and Trading wants to open a new supermarket they do not call anybody to do a feasibility study. They know that supermarkets are making money; and it is only a question of whether they are going to buy the next supermarket. There is no feasibility study as to whether you are going to buy another supermarket.

So, it is a question of getting a builder or an architect to say what kind of facade you are going to have and so on. Let us move on from that. A $¼ million is a lot of money. We have the capability inside of Barbados to do all the studies on any of the projects. When we wanted to build a Hilton Hotel we did not decide to ask the IADB to carry out any study. We decided that we wanted a hotel built, and not a boarding house extended or a chapel turned into a boarding house and then extended. We wanted a hotel built as a hotel from the foundation so we called in architects, and we called in Mr. Conrad Hilton and we asked the Hilton if they would run the hotel. If we had wanted a feasibility study, you would still be building the Hilton Hotel today.

You make a decision on what you want to do. If you are running a profit and loss account you may need

feasibility study. (ASIDE: How about Golden Mile?) There were too many studies on that. That is why it did not get off the ground. Now, Sir, I refer to Page 77 of the Capital Estimates. Some years ago there was a gentleman from PAHO who came down here and was a bit concerned about the Health of this country in which we are living on the top of a coral limestone formation, and he was concerned about the safety in terms of bacteria in our water resources system. They sent down a geologist, an expert, by the name of Dr. Kellstrom to delineate the areas in this country in which we could protect our water resources.

After some detailed study Dr. Kellstrom drew up a water resources map which was accepted by the Government, a map dividing the island into five different zones, from zone 1 to zone 5; and the idea was that in zone 1 there should be a total prohibition against building of any kind, although there were few habitations; but no further development of any kind could take place in Zone 1. In Zone 2, some restricted building could be constructed of a special kind and in special circumstances. Without going into close details, in zone 3 and 4 there were certain modifications, and in zone 5 you can build with the approval of the Town and Country Planning Department with no restrictions on building at all.

As far as I know, Sir, all planning and all building by anyone has to apply for permission which is controlled by the Water Restriction Act, the regulations of which are circulated to all Government departments as well as a map originally designed by Dr. Kellstrom. I believe that he was Sweedish in origin, but he was a United Nations expert who prepared a map which regulated all building development in this island.

Now, we get to the stage where down in Sea View in the parish of St. James that people down there, when they try to build in on their premises in order to put in water bourne sanitation are not allowed to do so, because the whole of Sea View came into zone 1 where there was a total restriction on building.
6.30 p.m.

We called a special meeting of members of the Water Board with Mr. Arthur, the Government's Public Health Engineer, the Director of Waterworks, Mr. Nicky Sealy and others and asked them to see what they could do to relieve the anxiety of the people of Seaview who were anxious to improve their premises, whether they could not devise some kind of system whereby those people could put in shower baths and things like that, and we were met with a fairly stony silence at first, and at our insistence they went away and looked at the whole problem and came back and said they would try to devise some system of overground septic tanks, but would not allow them to put anything underground at all. I doubt whether any of the residents of Seaview have been able to benefit from this, but this is giving you an idea about how rigid the whole system was supposed to be.

We wanted to build a school in St. James, very briefly, Sir, in conclusion, and we had to acquire some land from Trents plantation I think it was below the playing field for Maple Club, because Maple Club strangely was in zone 5 and zone 1 was right next door, and therefore our plan was to build a new school at St. James on the grounds of Maple Club and of the ten acres half would be reserved for the school as a playing field and half for Maple Club in exchange for the grounds which they were giving up. I was surprised when in passing there early one morning I saw a tremendous big structure going up, and I learnt that the school was now being built in zone 1.

I know we are running out of time, but I think that if the Government has redrawn the water restriction zones in Barbados that the general public ought to be told so. If the Government is contracting out of the restrictions which were imposed by the Government itself as a result of the planned surveys carried out by United Nations Organisation and World Health Organisations, the general public ought to be told. If the people in Seaview could not put in a shower bath up the hill, *a fortiori* the Government should not set a bad example by putting in a school with toilet facilities and all of the other attendant conveniences, shower baths and so on for probably 1,500 to 1,600 pupils right in zone 1 where there is supposed to be a complete prohibition and restriction against building. We are running out of time, but it is a good note to end on because I think the hon. members who may have some explanations will be able to go home and come back after consultation and give us some answer which they can mutually agree upon and which will be acceptable to us on this side and to the public in general.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am not offering a final reply. I am going to make my contribution at this stage. I believe that the Hon. Minister of Education and the Attorney General who was then Minister of Town Planning wish to say something on this subject which has come up again at great length on the water zone and the condition of the people in Seaview. My contribution will be limited to dealing with the substantial matters raised about the desirability of feasibility studies in speeches by the hon. member for St. Michael South West and the hon. member for St. John. I am not precluding other members from speaking nor am I suggesting they should not speak. If there is something in the speech of the hon. member for St. Lucy that he would like dealt with, I will make enquiries and even if I am not here in the morning or whenever it comes to be dealt with, I will make sure he is given an answer.

As far as feasibility studies are concerned, hon. members are a little too ingenuous in this matter. There is

nobody that I know who as a matter of deliberate policy sets out with straightforward programmes like building a school, building the Spring Garden Road or even the Speightstown redevelopment, the part of it which is being studied under Item 8 and would not want a feasibility study first. The part of the Speightstown redevelopment which is being dealt with is the Speightstown by-pass road. I will come to that. We are not dealing with whether or not we are going to improve the esplanade, build new market facilities, perhaps thinking about locating some housing or integrating Speightstown in the Heywoods development. All of these things we can make up our minds about. We can make up our minds about the road also, but we are not looking for a feasibility study for that; but hon. members are giving the unfortunate impression over the matter of feasibility studies when they know that there are certain international aid-giving agencies that demand a feasibility study before they will consider a loan application. Sometimes in the case of Barbados you do not need a pre-feasibility study.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, there are two points very quickly, Mr. Chairman. First of all the gravamen of our statement was that we acknowledge that the international agencies demand it. We are not saying they do not. We are saying that the international agencies condone and induce and all those words this nonsense of feasibility studies and the other thing that is used.... (Mr. CHAIRMAN: Rip off!) Mr. Chairman, rip off, genuine international rip off. They lend us money which we have to pay back and included in that money is the passages and all the rip off pieces for the ends of experts. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, let me make this point. Mrs. Hogg included in her first recommendation that we would have to buy the equipment from France. Now the point to that is that Mrs. Hogg is a French woman.

The other point I wanted to make is on the Speightstown by-pass road. Right here in the Estimates 1974–75, and I wanted to draw this to the Minister's attention, there is item (i) Speightstown By-Pass Road – for commencement of a construction of a by-pass road to reduce traffic congestion through Speightstown – $75,000. I am just drawing it to his attention.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I draw to the attention of the hon. member the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party for the 1966 general election in which it spoke of redevelopment for Oistin and Speightstown, including the construction of a Speightstown by-pass road, and that was when I believe the hon. member was still suffering in Brooklyn saying that he was out to come back to Barbados and join the hon. member for St. George South in getting rid of Barrow. Anyhow, we have come a long way.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, if it were so, it would obviously have been fed by the information brought by the hon. member, but on discovering that information was not true, we discovered it was not necessary to get rid of Barrow.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Whatever it was, the fact is that to them it was very attractive. Just let me give of my advice after ten years in the Opposition. We tried that too. We tried that in the 1966 election and in the 1971 election, pointing out how many of the Democratic Labour Party schemes had been thought or or started or conceived by us. Try it. That is all I tell you. Your 1966 is coming up and your 1971 is coming up; both of them are coming up.

Now as far as feasibility studies are concerned, we can fulminate until we are blue in the face, you are not going to get money out of the Inter-American Development Bank who are our principal overseas lenders... we invest heavily with them and we are entitled to borrow from them, but we are not going to borrow unless we are prepared to pay for the feasibility studies. The Inter-American Development Bank I do not think is staffed by persons who are such refugees from the governmental systems of their own countries as some other international agencies. Many of them are political refugees.

6.40 p.m.

There are not refugees by reason of incompetence. They may be refugees sometimes because they are too competent and have excited the mistrust of the Military Regime around them or whatever the case may be. I have met people who I think are very competent, brilliant people at the IDB, people who should be in the Government of their own countries. Recently I had the privilege to meet various prospective members of the new Government in Venezuela. One of them was a representative of the CDB and they were with the IDB. It was merely that he was not politically in favour and he is now going back to one of the command positions in Venezuela in the Venezuela Economic Planning. I do not think he would have been incompetent. He handled the Caribbean well and would be well-known to the hon. member for St. John so we should not characterise them all as incompetent.

After all, I do not regard Mr. David Coon as a reject in any sense other than he no longer has a place in Jamaica politics but he is an IDB representative in Santo Domingo. I think it would be a little low in prestige for the hon. member for St. John, but if it appeals to him, I have no doubt that he could find himself in a good position but I do not believe that it appeals to him. I do not believe that there are positions there important

enough other than the position of President. My friend and colleague, the hon. member for St. James says Advisor to the Government of Guyana.

Now that our Gross Domestic Product is over-taking that of Guyana I think perhaps their pride would not allow them to accept any further advice from the hon. member. That is only in passing, we cannot help it. I assure hon. members that I feel exactly as they do over a project say like the Spring Garden Road. The Spring Garden Road is not a new project. It is not the old Pine Road and it is not part of the Harbour Extension. Hon. members can be assured of that. They can see the plans if they feel like it. It is not anything that was planned before, it is a different conception but I am not taking any credit for it. In fact, it has always been a favourite idea of mine. You will find it in the 1966 Manifesto of our Party when we said that there should be a West Coast Road corresponding to the popular districts of the North St. Michael area and so on.

We have known pretty well within six months of coming to power how we wanted the Spring Garden Road to run. The Paradise End was difficult to achieve because of the buildings there. I do not think there is anywhere else where it is difficult to achieve the line. You may shift it 10 metres to the right or 10 metres to the West in order to accommodate yourself with the acquisition. You may want to shift it a bit to the East to let a certain gentleman proceed with his development in Brightons. You do not want to go and clear land for a road where you know somebody is trying to put down six bungalows if you can help it. You do not have to have any inducement to decide that. It is a matter of common sense that you try to accommodate acquisition to other people's need.

There is no need for a feasibility study for the Spring Garden Road, you make your mind up to build it to bring it into production, the land at the back of the Farm, in order to expand housing at the Farm. I believe the hon. member for St. James is concerned about sewage disposal at the Farm. You know what you want to do. We had to fight with them over whether there was going to be a free feasibility study for six months. We then had to struggle and agree that we should have our own feasibility study and that you should not just extend the terms of revision of the Transportation Study. You then had another three months qualifying the Consultants and we had a situation where every single day I passed down there I was fretting because I could not see bulldozers and the work force driving through Brandons draining the area, upsetting the people who live in not very good conditions in the Northern End of Brandon where the swamp is right behind them, draining the Brighton swamp and coming right through bringing the land into operation.

I do not need a feasibility study when one firm in town is pressing Town Planning to release some land at Brighton for a warehouse, a rum bond and a bonding operation and where a big construction firm wants a couple of acres to park its equipment and have its construction headquarters. I do not need a feasibility study for that. What we need is to give the land to land reclaimers or whoever we decide on and say rent out the land for commercial industrial use and get some jobs.

The problem with a project like the Spring Garden Road is that having started with the loan applications we have to go through all the paraphernalia on the performance and the consultants do not always perform correctly. The Consultants in the Sewage Scheme have done this country a most drastic and serious mischief in under-estimating the cost of the Sewage Scheme by some millions of dollars in respect of the actual sewaging. Over $6 million U.S. the Consultants have misled us. We have gone a long way. The people have moved from Emmerton Lane. They did not mislead us, they misled the previous Government. It is the Consultants' fault and we are advised that we have no recourse because we have suffered no damage. All we can say is, do not worry to go ahead, do not borrow the money. In the meantime a Community has been disrupted and taken away in connection with this matter.

Now there are side issues. I am told that the former Prime Minister can be very authoritative in these matters. He would have the Consultants here and a feasibility scheme be carried out and then he would ignore what they say, like the Polytechnic and the Sewage Scheme. I do not mind that we are entitled to take a position I think that the former Prime Minister was wrong in saying that the Polytechnic should be sited in Brighton. That does not mean that he was wrong for saying it but I think he was wrong. We have come to another conclusion. I happen to think that if it was his decision to put the Sewage Plant where it is, he might well have been right. I would not want a Sewage Plant at the Indian River with the only obvious place of discharge into the harbour so he may well have been right in that regard.

These are decisions, however, that we have to take but all of the International Agencies insist on reducing the Sovereign Governments to their lowest common denominator. Something is put in front of me from the Caribbean Development Bank to sign but I turn it and see that the Government of Barbados agrees that no change would be made in the personnel of the Agricultural Division of the Barbados National Bank. Something about people that I did not even appoint. In other words the people are going to work in the Agricultural Division of the Bank without the consent of the Caribbean Development Bank. No, I could not sign that. I told Mr. Demas right away that I cannot deal with that and he

said well we do not know but in the small Islands you have to have very careful control over these schemes.

I am not suggesting under those conditions that the Caribbean Development Bank enjoys bad relations with the Governments of the LDP's in the Eastern Caribbean. I cannot tell the President of the Bank and the Board of Directors who to appoint to the Agricultural Division. Eventually, we found a formula which we agreed on but I had to explain that Sovereign Governments still have to have a little sovereignty.

As far as I am concerned the Spring Garden Road has to start work in the first week of the new financial year. We will write a letter saying that we are starting the work and in due course, if the loan is granted, we will apply for the reimbursement but we are going to start the road and go ahead with it and finish with that. We want to see the people working and see some development in the constituency of the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

5.50 p.m.

We want to go ahead with these matters. Hon. members are really pushing at an open door when they deplore this over-reliance on feasibility studies. There is one exception, aid that comes from Europe, and in the widest sense aid that comes from Britain. But the British did not ask for any feasibility study when the question of their contribution to the Caribbean Development Facility came up. The aid was tied in, but the aid was limited to material bought for development purposes, and we had no difficulty deciding that we could accept this condition and spend the money pretty well as we wanted. And aid from the EEC is not necessarily conditioned on a feasibility study. The consultancies we had on Oistin are of a nature we would have had to have for our own information because none of us, as the Coast Guard exercise showed, are beach engineers. We have asked the engineers to prepare a plan and an analysis of the likely effects of the movement of sand and the stability of the Harbour conditions in the future.

I think hon. members may have asked about these amounts. First of all the cement plant equity and other contributions. We have tried every type of cement plant and we are coming down to a plant which uses a small rotary kiln, something that the consultants who did the feasibility study said did not exist. We are acting in collaboration with virtually the biggest cement plant in the world, using its own new technology, and since it is new technology some feasibility study is perhaps necessary. The feasibility study for the cement plant is $200,000; the water resources study $100,000; Spring Garden $100,000; Speightstown $200,000. The reason for the Speightstown feasibility is that we are now seeking to finance the by-pass road as part of the Heywoods project. Our engineers at MCW came up with such a high figure that the World Bank said that this would be the most expensive piece of flat road built anywhere in the world. The $200,000 for this feasibility study sounds like a lot, but if you knew what the MCW engineers estimated for the Speightstown by-pass – I cannot tell you how many millions – you will agree the $200,000 is worth spending just to knock a million off the MCW estimate; that is the reason why Speightstown is included.

The hon. member for St. Lucy will be glad to hear that he will be able to visit his constituency with some convenience because when that road is built you will be able to leave the Speightstown road well south of Speightstown, by-pass it, drive through Heywoods and go on a new road straight to Six Men's. We hope to start work soon on that, cutting out that dangerous corner by the old whaling station; you will be able to go straight through and perhaps cut off three quarters of a kilometer of the road to town, but you will have a much faster road that does not go through the centre of Speightstown.

These are my comments Mr. Chairman, and I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress and ask for leave to sit again, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am advised that the Honourable Attorney General wishes to make a statement; he may do so now.

STATEMENT BY HON. ATTORNEY GENERAL RE GRENADA

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Speaker, The Government of Barbados, after consultation with the Governments of Jamaica, Guyana and the Associated States of the Eastern Caribbean, today announces *de facto* recognition of the new administration in Grenada.

Precedent does not strictly demand that a formal statement of recognition be made as, according to our latest information and advice, the constitutional position in Grenada is that Her Majesty the Queen remains the Head of State and the Governor-General, Sir Paul Scoon, is still Her representative there. In this case, however, a formal statement is being made to put the issue beyond doubt and more especially to explain that Barbados will continue diplomatic relations with Grenada.

For the Caribbean the last week has presented considerable challenges to those of us who still believe in some form of Caribbean cooperation and unity and who

firmly hold to the principle that Governments should be changed only by free and fair elections held at regular intervals as fixed by law. Together with our Caribbean colleagues we have sought to obtain from the new administration in Grenada certain assurances, namely that free and fair elections will be held within a reasonable time frame, that the administration will observe the due processes of law and avoid "political trials" and that it will seek to attain in the observance of human rights and fundamental freedom a standard as high as that which prevails in our own country, Barbados.

That is why we take quite seriously the assurances of the new administration in Grenada when it states that there will be an early return to constitutional practices through free and fair elections, that there will be no harassment of political opponents and that fundamental rights and freedom will be preserved.

We reiterate our caution that there should be no external interference in the internal affairs of Grenada.

We will continue to consult all of our Commonwealth Caribbean colleagues so that we may constructively together assist Grenada in its search for early stability and return to constitutionality.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House now stand suspended until 10 o'clock tomorrow, 21st March, 1979.

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 House accordingly.

7.00 p.m.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

HEAD 108 WAS RESUMED

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,765,047 under Head 108 – Capital Expenditure – Ministry of Finance and Planning stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 4 – CABINET (1) CABINET OFFICE

Head 4 – Cabinet (1) Cabinet Office – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,055,755 under Head 4 – Cabinet (1) Cabinet Office stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is just a matter of seeking information. I wonder if anyone on the Government benches can say what are the rates and allowances paid to Ministers when travelling on Government business – the rate for hotel accommodations, subsistence and the other expenses which are made from that vote. I wonder if they can state the rates because I recall that in the past it used to be said that Government Ministers were travelling too much and the rates were too high. I wonder also if we could be given some information as to how many trips have been made by Ministers to date.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I know that my friend and colleagues on the other side is only playing for time. He is well aware of the fact that a question has been asked in this House on this matter and that a reply will be coming. He is only playing for time. I beg to move that Head 4(1) stand part of the Schedule.

The question that the sum of $1,055,755 under Head 4 Cabinet (1) Cabinet Office – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 4 – CABINET (2) PRINTING DEPARTMENT

Head 4 – Cabinet (2) Printing Department – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $522,550 under Head 4 – Cabinet (2) Printing Department stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 5 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
(1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $363,544 under Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would just like to point out to hon. members that in the Note to Item 12 the word "refregerator" is incorrectly spelt.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for observing the typographical error and I am sure hon. members will agree that the Head stand part subject to the correction.

The question that Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
(2) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICE

Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (2) Government Information Office – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $195,927 under Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (2) Government Information Office – stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The question is.....

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, we are moving very swiftly this morning. I was waiting for someone to second this particular Head.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have been getting some nods indicating seconding of the motions from the other side.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I hope you get some nods on this particular Head both from the front bench and the back bench of the Government. We are seeking some information in this particular regard relating to the whole policy of Government Information, Public Relations and Government activities in relation to Government broad-

casting through the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. There must be considerable concern and alarm and I hope there will be some address to these matters coming from either the front bench or the back bench or both.

I was most alarmed when I read the newspaper today concerning the banning of certain bits of information by the Government radio station CBC. I can see the headline now: "NEWS CONTROL AT CBC".

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. From past rulings of the House, whenever we try to debate Statutory Boards the House has always ruled against discussion on these matters. I can cite past rulings when Mr. Peter Morgan, the then Minister in charge, ruled against me at the time of the Estimates. It seems to me if these rulings meet with your approval – I do not know if you are of equal standing or more than equal standing or are bound by these rules.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will have to repeat the point you were making because I was interrupted on a personal matter while you were speaking.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What I am saying, Sir, is that there is no particular vote here relating to CBC and I recall trying to raise a matter about CBC at a former Estimates debate when Mr. Peter Morgan was then Minister in charge, and I was ruled out of order on the basis that the item did not relate to CBC but to the Government Information Office. I wonder whether that ruling still binds the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am thankful to the hon. member for drawing my attention to the matter but I have no knowledge of that ruling. I will allow some discussion on broadcasting generally without allowing any detailed discussion of any problems at CBC under this Head. I think the Head does cover broadcasting and it is arguable that the Government Information Service uses the facilities of CBC for broadcasting of its programmes, and in these circumstances I cannot over-restrict members right to discuss broadcasting under this Head; but I would point out that there can be no detailed discussions about the running of CBC or the ramifications of CBC. There is another section of the Estimates where CBC can be properly discussed.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we want to talk about the Government Information Service and the activities of that service and the Ministers who may be responsible for that Service. It has two Ministers I understand; I understand one is the Minister in the Prime Minister's Office and I can well appreciate the reason why the Attorney General might want to stop us from talking about CBC.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member must not make this allegation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw that remark because it is an implication on the Attorney General's motive and is suggesting that he is trying to hamper the rights of free speech which were fought for so hard and so long ago by Parliamentarians. 10.15 a.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I can make an observation on that. I said that I understand why the Attorney General wanted us to stop speaking.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The hon. member may want to score a political point. I believe that the hon. member was in the House when I raised the point about CBC when Mr. Bolden was speaking in the House and a ruling was given. It would be highly improper to me if I did not draw Your Honour's attention to that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have already asked the hon. member to withdraw the allegations. I am still waiting to hear if he will comply with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will withdraw. I will sit and remain silent.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want you to stop speaking. I am saying that you should not make that imputation against the hon. member that he is seeking to stop you from speaking. I am the only member at this stage who can stop you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I understand the hon. member to say that he would sit and remain silent for the remainder of the night. That is his choice. You do not have to urge him to get up and speak. That is his choice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order. I wish that the hon. member would continue his speech which started at 10.10 a.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I fully appreciate your ruling. I want to assure the hon. member for Christ Church West that I have made no imputation against him. I elected on this particular issue to remain silent. The lashes will come otherwise.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, before I make a substantive point on this Head, Head 5(2), I would say that those of us who were not in the House of Assembly at the time when Your Honour made your ruling, that it would be useful if we could have an indication, or see if the rulings made previously which would help us to bind ourselves in such a way as we may know the lengths to which we may go; because, clearly, Sir, in an important matter like broadcasting and Government's policy, one would like to

know that one can debate that issue relatively freely without interfering with the rulings or decisions of the Chair. So if it is at all possible during the course of the day, and the staff of Parliament can give us some indication – if it is possible, and I go no further than that – nonetheless on a debate of the Government Information Office I think that I would not be amiss if I dealt with the subject of Government information in its broadest sense as it applies to a developing country.

There are two philosophies about public information. As you know, Sir, there are many countries where the need for public information from a Government point of view is deemed not to exist. Those countries claim not to have a public information office or a government information office; but in essence they usually have some agency funded by Government or at least called public agencies through which Governments see that the point of view of the administration is put. We have for example, in the USA, that there is a world wide propaganda machine which is described as the "information service".

Now, Sir, in a developing country it is perfectly acceptable that a political party which controls the Government will wish to explain its position on issues to the public in a particular way. I well remember the hon. member for St. Michael West using the words "slanting the news" in a particular way. I myself do not back off from the term. News can be presented in three ways. It can either be slanted for one side, or slanted to the other side. I have found in recent times despite the efforts of the professional people involved in the promulgation of news about Gover-- ment, it appears that there is a high level of political interference in the dissemination of public information.

What we in Barbados must consider is whether we are discussing public information or political information. We must distinguish between the two. It is my considered view that political information should flow from the political parties or from political personages. I think that there should be some kind of distinction between political information *per se* and public information. I deemed the second one to be information given to the public which the public is bound to desire for the purpose of enlightening the public on various issues and matters of grave importance to the public. Therefore, it must come as a tremendous shock if in the dissemination of such news to suspect that a Government Minister would direct an information office, when putting out a particular piece of information, to leave out aspects of that information that touch on the Opposition. For a Minister of Government to do that, he would not only be doing a disservice to himself and to his political party, but he would be doing a disservice to the entire community; because so soon as information put out by the Government is demonstrated to be palpably trumped up or politically slanted, it proves to be of no avail because the people who hear it will know that it is not true public information, but political propaganda. I feel very strongly, Mr. Chairman, that political propaganda should come from the political platform and I make no apologies for saying that. It can be shown that when my party had the responsibility for the Government Information Service, that they were guilty of that, I would still feel the same way that it is palpably wrong for a political party in power to interfere in any way with the dissemination of public information, such that that information is not the conveyance of truth and fact, but pure political propaganda.

This Government, Sir, has a Minister of Information. At least I think that his portfolio embraces public information. Now, Sir, we are unable to speak in certain ways about Ministers and members of the Other Place; otherwise there are a number of things that I would say about that Minister that even my children, I would not want to hear.
10.25 a.m.

It would not have been difficult were these things not in existence to find instances of what can only be described as political wickedness coming from the lips of that particular person long before he became a Minister. I heard him with my own ears and I have heard members of his own party suggesting that if you ask him to do any work of a productive kind that you are not likely to get much response, but if you say to him "come let us go and spread some wicked political propaganda, come let us go and deal with some people in a negative way, come let us go and do something that is going to be to the detriment of somebody", his eyes light up, his face becomes flushed, he is animated and reaches the point almost, Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Tht hon. member is now speaking in the present tense. If you are speaking in the present tense and making reference to the conduct of a Minister at present, I will have to warn you to desist from that line of speaking. The conduct of members of either House of Parliament may not be referred to except upon a substantive motion. I can allow it when he was not a member, but I cannot allow it when he is a member.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I wish to assure you that I am not speaking of him in his present capacity as Minister yet. I am going to get to that, and then I would not be able to speak in the terms I am now speaking. I am speaking for example of when he was Chairman of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, when an almost reign of terror was instituted in that institution not only for the people who worked there many of whom have subsequently gone, but for the Government Informamation Service itself. It is a fact that the whole fabric of the Government Information Service has suffered a diminution not of the quality of persons in the Service, not of the quality of work which persons in the Service are able to do, but the quality of work which they were permitted to put out to the people of Barbados.

I am sure you appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that when one is talking about the Government Information Service regime not so long ago, before the hon. member for St. Michael North West started bringing back some decency to C.B.C. – I am not discussing C.B.C. – before that and since the demise of the last Government, in between there I am not saying that there is anything wrong *per se* with the Government Information Service, but I am saying that the Government Information Service was not permitted to do its job properly. What I am saying applies to all the time that it ever was. What I am saying is a position of principle and if the cap fits over here, it should be worn over here. It has always been my position that the Press in this country, in fact in any country must be free, but I am concerned with this one, but more important a Press that is the responsibility of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate whether it is my Government or their Government, what I am saying I believe as a person, and that is my position and I do not mind. If the cap fits, you have to wear it.

The point I am making is this: if you appoint honest, decent people in a Department and you tell them this is their job description here are the objectives of our policy, this is what we wish, if you are satisfied that they are technically competent, if you are satisfied that they are professionally proficient, then you leave them to get on with the job as best they can. If you feel that in carrying out the job they are not carrying out the policies of the Government, you then can take corrective measures to put someone else to carry on the job in such a way that your policies may be carried out. I do not believe, Sir, that it is possible for any Government to function if people at the top in the administrative section of that Government are wilfully and deliberately not carrying out the policies of the Government. It is my view that when a Government is elected, that Government has a right to carry out that Government's policy. The fact that the present Government has no policy is only incidental to my position on this. He is going to quarrel with the members of the Press because they laughed. I do not understand the Hon. Attorney General. The Press can laugh too. It is still a free country. Do you mean you want to muzzle them at C.B.C. and stop them from laughing in here too?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, I came into this House very peacefully and the hon member is trying to pull me into the debate. I would not even prevent him from talking nonsense, but he must be relevant. If he is going to try to bait me today, he had better not try. I am not going to object to him saying that I frowned on the Press laughing. That is the sort of foolish remark that is calculated perhaps to win him friends and cause me enemies, but it an untrue remark.

Mr. TAITT: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly possible in this country still whether you are sitting at the Press Table, whether you are sitting in Parliament itself or indeed to some extent whether you are sitting in the Gallery to laugh, and it ought to be perfectly possible for professionals to carry out their duty without any undue directions on a day to day basis from Government Ministers or Government functionaries.

Now, Sir, let us take some of the programmes that we have had the honour of seeing recently from the Government Information Service. Technically there is not much complaint; no one can quarrel with them. From the point of view of subject matter, again hardly any one can quarrel with them. If you take the technical competence, the whole programme subject matter, it seems reasonable to assume that normally such technical competence and subject matter would be handled in a logical and reasonable way. In some of the instances where we have seen Government Information Service broadcasts either on television or radio, it would be clear to anyone who is reasonable familiar with the pattern of production that the particular productions have been interfered with in a particular way. There is clear evidence in the broadcasts, there is clear evidence in what one sees that somebody not technically competent but politically violent must have interfered with the particular documentary or information which has been put out, otherwise, Mr. Chairman, one would have to criticise the professional people, and I am not prepared on the basis of seeing them function in the past and watching them function now to criticise the professional people in the Government Information Service.

I therefore say that the Government has a responsibility to the people of Barbados to stop if they are, and I have every reason to believe that they are, the newspaper has published these clear instances of Government Ministers interfering with information in the private sector as it were, furthermore in the public sector for which they have responsibility. In the newspaper today there is a clear statement, and I wish to applaud all those news people, all those information people at C.B.C. who finally have had too much to take it upon themselves to say "enough is enough".

10.35 a.m.

Certain remarks were ordered to be expunged from the records by Mr. CHAIRMAN at this stage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think you must now resume your seat as you have had your 15 minutes.

Mr. TAITT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, one of the most important functions of this Honourable House is the preservation of the Democratic processes of this country which processes have resulted in its very existence. One of the important functions of those officers is to make sure

that those principles of democracy are adhered to within this Honourable House.

Over the past few days, matters that have been of grave serious concern to the democratic processes of this country in respect to the dissemination of information to the public has reached very serious proportions and I am going to make some very serious, I repeat, very serious charges with the cacophony of the members of the opposite side on what precisely are based on facts. I understand that you have ruled that C.B.C. cannot be discussed under this particular Head and I do not propose to do so.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Just let me acquaint the hon. member who failed or did not elect to be in his place when we met at 10 o'clock of my ruling on this matter.

I said that I would allow some latitude with respect to C.B.C. but I would not entertain a debate on how C.B.C. is run. There is another Head under which that can be debated. I am going to give you the whole thing because I want you to be sure. In so far as the Government Information Service does make use of the facilities of C.B.C., and for that matter Rediffusion, I think members would be entitled to have some discussion on C.B.C.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am very much in agreement with your matured judgment in this matter. I want first of all to make a specific charge that all newscasts appearing on C.B.C. have to be submitted to the Government Information Service on the following day for scrutiny. That again, in itself, has caused a serious problem in the terms of free expression and free selection of news items on C.B.C. by the professionals working in that Department. That is charge Number One.

Charge Number Two, Mr. Chairman, is even more serious. I am charging that the Prime Minister of this country and the Minister of Finance has been calling the Government Information Service and C.B.C. to disclose what particular stories were presented on C.B.C. the day before and sometimes while the particular broadcast is taking place.

The third charge I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that the Democratic Labour Party Parliamentary group issued a statement on the situation in Grenada about 7 o'clock last Saturday night. That statement was brought on C.B.C. on their Newscast at 6.55 a.m. the following morning and immediately after that broadcast came over the air, the Minister of Information in the present Government called up C.B.C. and told them that it should not be repeated and it was not repeated.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Now I have listened to the three charges.....

Dr. HAYNES: Serious charges, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Grave, serious, whatever word you want to use. The three instances referred to in my matured judgment now seem to convey against various Ministers in their official capacities and I have had no prior notice from the hon. member and I.....

Dr. HAYNES: Before you rule, Mr. Chairman, ... *(Asides.)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, you cannot interrupt me now, neither one of you.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I would ask the hon. member....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am doing the talking in here now. Both will sit down. I have had no prior indication and I have every reason to believe that His Honour, the Speaker, has not had any prior notice of these references as to the conduct of any of the persons referred to in their official capacities nor are the facts set out, nor a statement sent by the hon. member to substantiate the allegations.
10.45 a.m.

I therefore cannot entertain that line of debate unless the conditions of Standing Order No. 28.10(b) are complied with. It is clear but I had better make the point for the benefit of everybody now. These Estimates have been going very well so far, but if attacks – even if justified – are to be made against persons in their official capacity, then the person who intends to make the attack must comply with the pre-conditions of Standing Order 28.10(b).

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, you do appreciate that there is a particular difficulty here, and the particular difficulty arises from the linkages between the Government Information Service and the organs through which news would finally reach the public. This is the particular problem that we have.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not see that as a problem. It is not a problem because I have allowed you to use the linkage between CBC and the GIS to make a speech of the policy of CBC. But I am not going to allow imputations to be made against people in their official capacity unless the facts are set out. In other words, I am not going to entertain irresponsible, unsubstantiated and unfounded allegations about persons in their official capacity. So I will want the facts upon which you base your statement, otherwise it will not be entertained.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I take your position in this matter, but the other point I wanted to raise is this: I presume that we can get around this problem by not calling names. A situation arose on Monday the 19th where the situation in relation to the Barbados Union of Teachers was to be played down and

certain selected aspects of the Parliamentary news of that day given the priority. This was fairly complied with. This series of events including the restrictions on various agencies not to publish matters in relation to Grenada unless they were scrutinized led to a very serious situation at CBC yesterday when a meeting had to be called, because what has been happening in relation to the linkages between CBC and that particular station has led to the resignation of four trained and four of the best people in that particular area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a matter that must now occupy the attention of this House because I believe that the Government Information Service and those particular organs which it can control when we here in this House have to take a decision as to what must be the future of this service and no information given, I am firmly committed to the concept that this service should be catering to information education and the promotion of leisure within the society. And whatever members on the other side may say about what has taken place in the past or otherwise, I want to make it absolutely clear that I am totally committed to the belief that a service of this kind should be free of all political bias. And I say that for this reason: I am absolutely sure that it benefits no particular party to use the service in this particular manner; the fall-out in the long run will be a negative one, but even more important, with the talk of providing money for the training of journalists, etc, journalism can only flourish in an environment that is free and in which people can give expressions to the innovative qualities that are inherent in that profession; and as soon as brakes are put on them in any direction apart from those circumscribed by the law – adequate in my view – I believe that we in this House must take a firm decision on the matter of freedom of speech. I happen to know that the majority of members of this Honourable House will support the position that I take in principle, for we cannot allow ourselves to be tied down by partisan consideration in this matter, because we are destroying people, we are destroying professionals and if we are not very careful we are going to create a situation in this country that can have severe repercussions in the future. The events of the past four days in relation to Government Information Service and its extension organs is something that all Barbadians should be ashamed of, and we in this honourable House must come to the conclusion that something has to be done about it; and specifically I am going to call on the hon. member for Christ Church West who has frequently expressed all sorts of biased positions in relation to this matter. I do not think he is aware of what has been taking place over the past four days and I would call on him to get up and assure this House that he shares the same commitment as this side in respect of the freedom and expression of those involved in the Government Information Service and its extension services – visual and audio, etc. These matters are of serious import, Mr. Chairman. You preside over this House during these Estimates while the House is in Committee. You have a responsibility not only as to what takes place within these precincts but also a responsibility to be concerned that expressions in this House can be manipulated or surpressed by organs controlled by the Government of Barbados. I believe you would share my concern. If I read your face – which usually is not inscrutable – I believe that you share my concern in this matter. I am not asking you to participate in the debate but I am sure that you feel as strongly as I do about these matters, and I hope that the hon. member for Christ Church West will not allow partisan position to enter into this matter, because if he does so I will be forced to come to the conclusion that many of the principal stands that he attempts to stage in this House and outside are not genuine. But when he gets up and supports this position I will be happy to go on public platform and applaud him. I will wait and see what his response is. If he does not, then of course I will be left with no alternative.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I share the hon. member's concern and I wish to assure him that I am very pleased to see that he is now getting more time on CBC as a member of the Opposition than I had when I was a member of the Opposition.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, first let me start by drawing to the attention of the hon. member for Christ Church West that if he shares the views or gives commitment to the other side, there is going to be a bye-election in Barbados, for I would resign.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Will you please leave me out of the debate, both sides of the House? Neither of the two is able to win Christ Church West at any time even if both of them run against me together.
10.55 a.m.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: My colleague is well aware of the fact that I will help him to win in Christ Church West, not to attempt to win it. Mr. Chairman, again the Government Information Service, Reporters and journalists are being drawn into what I consider the political football. As regards the events to which the hon. member referred as taking place at CBC, I am no more aware of them than from what I read in the Nation this morning. There is one thing I will say. If the members of CBC staff rebelled against certain directives that they were given by members of this Government, it shows in no uncertain terms what open government is all about; because I remember only well that members of CBC staff were genuinely afraid to open their mouths to the former Prime Minister of Barbados. On this occasion they are free to go to the Press and say that things are not going

in the manner in which they would like to see them go. They can express their views, strike or do whatever they feel they should do.

I do not know what directives are given by anybody on this side. I agree with the hon. member for St. Michael South that because you did something bad over the years we should not try to do it badly also. We should try to do it better. The former Minister of Information, Mr. Peter Morgan, wrote me a letter when I was acting Leader of the Opposition. I requested him for me to reply on the interim budget that the former Prime Minister had brought in. Mr. Morgan wrote me a letter saying that the Minister of Information gives instructions to CBC and that I could not reply. It is as simple as that. That is the letter which I have in my possession. If I had seen the Nation Newspaper this morning before I left to come to Parliament, I would have looked for that letter and brought it here because I would have known that this type of discussion would have come up this morning.

Now, you hear about democracy being destroyed. You hear that journalists cannot walk; journalists cannot talk. That is for the political platform. Let me tell the hon. member that we are capable on this side of putting a good case to the country. If you believe that the few thousand people which you draw at night at public meetings, and talk about toilet paper and an old age pensioner not getting her money on time and that sort of nonsense will help you, when this side is ready we will put our case. We do not have to get CBC to put on pictures and all of those things in order to put up a case.

I heard when Dean Crichlow said – and I respect his views – that there are more people who vote than the party faithfuls who rally behind a party. You have your supporters and we have ours. You are like a horse galloping on mornings when nobody else is running. You are coming out when nobody else is coming out to play yet. It is when we come out to play and the big game starts that you will know what the position is.

I must confess, Sir, that I was amazed this morning by the silly charges that to my mind were made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He said that he was quite serious in making these charges; and yet he did not say that they were going to be responsible charges, because he is a very irresponsible parliamentarian. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that I will not hear anything more about reporters...

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I think that the hon. member is casting an aspersion by saying that a parliamentarian is irresponsible. I do not think that there can be a graver charge against a parliamentarian.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, do you want me to withdraw the remarks? If so I will withdraw them and take my seat.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I have some very decided views on this matter of the flow of information, and they may not necessarily square with the views of the Opposition or the views of the Government. I believe, like hon. members who have spoken already, that there should be a free flow of information in this country; but I believe that this free flow should be a balanced flow. In a country like Barbados, with a weak economy, an economy that is buffeted by every bit of reporting, every bit of alarmist reporting on the airways or in the Press, an economy that can be buffeted by international repercussions, I believe that it is the duty of the Government to ensure that the flow of information is neither alarmist nor unbalanced.

I see that they have a censorship on the films that come into Barbados because we feel that in this society responsible persons should determine what type of pictures the people of this country should be exposed to, and particularly children; and by the same token, I believe that there is an overwhelming responsibility of Government to ensure that the information that is coming out over the airways and in the Press is the type of information that will not reap a havoc, either morally or economically. We have an economy, Mr. Chairman, which is based to a large extent on tourism, and to a very large extent on foreign investments; and if a lot of irresponsible statements are noised abroad on the airways or in the Press, they can cause irrevocable harm to the economy of this country.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South Central claiming all sorts of rights for CBC–TV. I do not know if you have asked the hon. member to withdraw the word "irresponsible". If you did, I did not hear it.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. If the Chairman's microphone is not functioning, we have a problem. He has been trying to bring to the attention of whomever is responsible that his microphone is not functioning; and continuously he has been trying to speak and cannot speak. The only reason that I am speaking is because obviously you can hear me.

11.05 a.m.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ask that the words "irresponsible parliamentarian" be withdrawn.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of comments made by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and I am going to try to juxtapose them with the behaviour on television on the night of the last by-election. I heard the hon. member on television, and this is the sort of thing I am talking about

where Government needs to exercise some modicum of control of what happens at CBC. After all the people elected the Government to govern, but I heard him on that night talking about all the mayhem he would create in parliament if certain things did not happen, and now he gets in here and talks about responsibility. Let the hon. member for St. Michael South West get up and make objections again. It is the most irresponsible conduct that I have seen by any member of Parliament for a long time. He was going to break up parliament and he was going to cause all kinds of turbulence in here, and he gets in here today and makes the kind of commentaries he has made.

I want to allude to one thing, and in fact it is the only reason why I have got up, which relates to a news broadcast I heard on CBC some time recently where one of the journalists at CBC took a letter appearing under a non-de-plume in a newspaper as the substance of an anti-government report in the issue of the teachers' dispute with Government. A letter appeared in the Barbados Advocate News that was signed by a non-de-plume, and the gist of the letter was critical of Government's position, and one of the journalists at CBC used that letter in a news report to put an anti-government case or a pro--Union case and as far as I am concerned, if Government has no role in stopping this sort of thing, it might as well shut down CBC. I do not care what is the view of my own party or the other side in relation to that. I feel very strongly about it, and the journalist up to now has not even been reprimanded. This is the sort of thing we have got to put up with, and the Opposition gets over there and tells us they must have access. Why don't they talk to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central? When he improves his behaviour he will be given a little bit more exposure. He has got a little already and he will get a little bit more. So I do not see the gravamen, to use the favourite word of the hon. member for St. Michael South West of their cause. I reiterate I believe there must be a free flow of information, but one must understand that every right has certain responsibilities, and there is no point giving a right to hon. members to have access to the public media to make the type of statements they are making.

We had a very delicate situation in the Caribbean recently and it was a time when one expected that legislators would have thought before they talked. I read the report in the Nation this morning I do not know if it is true because hardly anything in the Nation is ever true.

Let me just digress a moment here. I read for instance in the Nation a big alarmist and lurid story the other day about scab labour in the schools, where one of the journalists wrote that the Ministry of Education had plans to put retired teachers, youth workers and social workers into the schools, and the real gall about that report was not so much that it was totally and 100% untrue, but that the journalist had the nerve to say that the Minister of Education was unavailable for comment. Now I want to put the records straight on this. The article came out on the Friday and on the Thursday afternoon, I was in my office from 2.30 p.m. until 6.30 p.m., and there was no call from the Nation; and I was at my home from 7.15 p.m. until 8.30 the following morning and there was no call from the Nation. It is that type of irresponsibility we are talking about. It is all right to talk about free speech and free dissemination of words whether or not they are true. The journalist at the Nation knew that if he had got in touch with me or any senior officer of my Ministry, he would have been told that that story was totally and utterly untrue with no foundation of fact, and what would happen is that he would not have had a front page story to print that day. That is why I keep saying that it is all very well to talk about the free flow of information, but if they are not going to accept, and by "they" I mean everybody in Barbados, the responsibilities that are complementary to those rights, then I believe that Government has got a duty to apply the safeguard necessary to protect an innocent public from some of the information that we have been seeing passed out over many years in Barbados.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I am happy about and it is that I have been able to survive in this Honourable House for the last eight or nine years. During those years I have had the pleasure of sitting in the Opposition and I have had the pains of being maltreated by Government Ministers, and I now have the pleasure of seeing some of those very same Government Ministers sitting in Opposition today. But what grieves me most of all is to hear those ex-Ministers who formed the Cabinet under the Democratic Labour Party regime talking in these Estimates about injustice being meted out to them. It surprises me that they are now raising the very issues which we raised before, but for them we are wrong and when they were there they were right, and they will tell you outside privately...the member sitting down... that his views were always the views he put forward now, but he could not get his other colleagues to agree with him. Get up and deny that now.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I am the only member over here and I deny it totally, categorically and absolutely.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I have always been told never to trust you. Do you want me to withdraw that? I withdraw that.

Mr. Chairman, I used to sit in the last but one seat from the bottom on this side and you came in and sat below me. There used to be a gentleman sitting in that seat by the name of Peter Morgan. I used to call him Robinson Crusoe, because I still believe up to this day

that he was washed up on St. Lawrence beach and picked up by a Friday called Barrow and he was made Minister responsible for Information, and CBC fell under that particular gentleman, and whenever you had to complain about his interference with CBC, do you know what he did? Not only did he insult Parliament, not only did he insult the people of Barbados, not only did he ignore the cries of the people of Barbados, but he would come into this Chamber with a transistor radio, stick the earphone in his ear and take his finger and block the other ear and sit down and tell you "I can't hear a thing you say; I am running CBC, not you!" And he said on many occasions year after year that it was a Government station not an Opposition station. That is what we got when we were in Opposition. But, Mr. Chairman, I blame the past Chairman and the present Chairman of CBC. Do you know why? Instead of firing the news reporters for incompetence, they dragged along with them to get this sort of thing heaped on their heads. And it is not only at CBC. 11.15 a.m.

I am saying now that the Nation is the next one to be dealt with. The Nation, yes, I say it now. Tell Harold Hoyte because, Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something. I have said before and I believe it. A newspaper is to put out appropriate headlines if it wants to sell. In this day and age when you have radio and television, a newspaper has to be quick on the job to keep its finances going but what I detest are the half-truths that are put out by the newspapers in this country.

Yesterday a Reporter met me outside the door and told me that politicians want to control Newsmen because they want to have the right to do what they feel like and a politician must not complain. I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman. When I was in the Ministry of Agriculture Harold Hoyte phoned me one day telling me he is doing a story on ADC, I want to know about Carmeta Fraser. I said to Harold, "You called at the right time, I have the file right here on my desk." I read out the file starting back from July 1975 when the then Permanent Secretary, Russell Kellman, was challenging the authorities at ADC over Carmeta Fraser's actions. I read the file to Harold Hoyte. When I was finished you know what Harold said to me? "Mr. Minister, I do not mind what you say, I am going to write in my article that the treatment of Carmeta Fraser looks like political victimisation to me," and he did write those words in the newspaper. He did and that is what I call utter dishonesty in a Newsman.

You can say anything you want to say about me. Ask the present Prime Minister now about when he was invited to CBC to make a speech in relation to Barbados Independence Day. Was it ever broadcasted? What are you talking about today? The Leader of the Opposition lost the Government. The day he lost the Government CBC went out and recorded a whole long interview with the Leader of the Opposition and that was spread all over the face of CBC Television News, etc. for weeks on end as if he was Leader of the Government of this country. *(Asides.)* Cut? It should have been chopped up, not even cut. You now know that? When we were in Opposition and we asked to have the use of the people's Media, we were told it is a Government Station. What has happened now? Is it no longer the Government's Station?

Mr. Chairman, you talk about irresponsibility? I made a speech at Marine House at a Food Exhibition and in a statement handed out to the Press I said "Scientific evidence has shown that there should be some control in the picking of sea-eggs in this country if you want to preserve them." What did the Media do? The Media twisted it. They said that we were going to ban the picking of sea-eggs and cause an upheaval in this country. Nowhere did it ever appear in the statement that we were going to ban the picking of sea-eggs.

When you talk about irresponsibility? I know what the problem is. I think this Government is sitting down thinking of what you all would say if they dismissed incompetent persons in Government and it is time that they do it and face up to the facts. Talking about something at CBC? If you have to monitor the News? If you have irresponsible people you have to make one or two choices. Either get rid of them and be happy about it or monitor them.

Tom Clarke was down here sitting in that room behind there when Morgan went and handed a paper to him and told him "sign it and resign". They said "Tom, sign it and save yourself embarrassment" because he refused to turn it into a political media for the then Democratic Labour Party Government.

Look at the programme of your Minister's speech. He brought it in and now all of a sudden I do not really understand what this talk is all about. The Hon. Minister is reminding me about Dr. Gonsalves. Dr. Gonsalves wanted to pull down the Government in the country where he lived. I had to save the same Dr. Gonsalves up in Brittons Hill when the people wanted to cut his throat. He now talks about me as his friend. You have to beware of friends like those who will come into your house, sit at your table and eat with you and then turn around and drop a dose of poison in your dish. You have to beware of friends like those. So what are you talking about? The same Carmeta Fraser, nobody never stopped her going on the Radio. What are you talking about?

Last week on Rediffusion you heard a programme criticising black and white and you talked about the Prime Minister's relatives came out of a white family in Branchbury, St. Joseph. That is the sort of thing you want to put on the air? That is the sort of thing you would like to see – that Barbados is in a blood bath with black and white? The Government sits down. The Government

keeps quite and you get criticised. What can you do? How can you please people? You all know you had to stop it. You all brought in the Public Order Act. You all did it. You stopped the meetings after 11o'clock. But what has the Government done? Have we touched it? We have given you as much liberty as we can and you come in here and cry.

Mr. Chairman, it seems as if you cannot please anybody at all. You cannot please the Opposition now. The trouble is I do not think that they have ever appreciated that they have lost the Election. They believe that all they have done is to move from this side to that side with reduced membership but they can still run the country. Who do you think we are? A boy in the yard, a lackey? No. Let them cry now. Wait your turn. Twenty years from now you can make another decision but as of now, keep quiet.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, Sir. *(Asides.)* This is not winding up. The Minister will be here no doubt in time to wind up the debate. It is under the Prime Minister's Ministry. I am making a speech, Sir, on this matter.

Sir, in a way I welcome this debate because perhaps one can describe this debate by saying that the wheel is going full circle. People do not like to go back over historical developments in a country and even the Journalists, including my good friend, Mr. Bertram Niles, keep counselling the present Government and asking the hon. member for St. John not to say anything about what was done during the time of the past administration, that one must today forget all of that, as though all of a sudden the development in this country is one that came about overnight and that the lessons to be learnt from the past or the conclusions and inference to be drawn from the past must be pushed under the carpet.

I think it is timely on this occasion to remind this country of a few things. Let me begin by saying that the gravity of my submission here is that this country in 2½ years has come a long way towards getting greater freedom of expression and greater freedom of public opinions than it had in 15 years under the Democratic Labour Party Government.
11.25 a.m.

I am going to prove it, Sir, and I will start from 1961. In 1961 Mr. Gladstone Holder was a Government Information Officer and he became the Chief Government Information Officer. Prior to the election he brought forth a publication called "The Eyes Have It"; this is a factual publication. It offended the then contesting party, the Democratic Labour Party, and they said that that publication went to the advantage of the Barbados Labour Party which formed the Government of the day, and I listened to several meetings – and indeed I am sure in the record of the tapes that I have I could possibly find with a little bit of research one of those meetings – in which the hon. member for St. John criticised Mr. Holder viciously and said what his view of Mr. Holder was and what he was going to do with him.

Now, Sir, Mr. Holder was not allowed to function properly as the Chief Information Officer of this country. Indeed it reached the stage where Gladstone Holder was forced to take legal advice as to whether or not he was only supposed to turn up without work being provided for him since, the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, issued a directive that Holder was not to appear on television in the Government Information Service or otherwise without his special edict. *(Aside).* Let me deal with it, Sir, you see, they do not remember, I will deal with every accusation.

Any interference in the Government Information Service started in this country in 1961 with the hon. member for St. John. He did not respect either the technical expertise of Mr. Holder, because he believed that Gladstone Holder didn't share his political views....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. I wish to recall for the benefit of the Hon. Attorney General that in my submission on this issue I said that whether it was done before, whether it is done now, my position is a position of principle. I am sure you recall that, Mr. Chairman, and there really is no need for him to go on indicating in the manner he seems to be that I was responsible as part of the Government for some kind of activity. I just want to make it clear.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I really want to be very patient, Sir, and I am not going to give way on those sorts of points, I am not going to be provoked in any way at all, and I am going to bring instances to remind the hon. member for St. Michael South West of his role. The position is that Gladstone Holder as the Government's Chief Information Officer...

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If it is a point of elucidation I am not giving way.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I said. Two days ago, Mr. Chairman, you ruled that if names are being called then adequate notice should be given to the Speaker. I would like to say this, that I think the hon. member is doing a disservice to Mr. Holder whom I have worked closely with on several matters for the Government Information Service and who has been a very loyal public servant and loyal to every regime that he has worked under.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I ruled earlier this morning during the course of the speech of the hon. member for St.

Michael South Central that I will entertain no debate on any person in his official capacity, or on any member of Government or member of either House unless Standing Order 28(10) was complied with. Mr. Gladstone Holder, to the best of my knowledge, is in no official or public capacity in this country. It is a fraudulent and stupid point of order.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, the position is that Mr. Holder suffered grievously at the hands of the then Minister in charge of Information. Will journalists recall that? As a matter of fact, even today if Gladstone Holder writes an article in the Press that is in any way not in agreement with the position of the Opposition he is abused on public platforms, as indeed I am in the famous Brittons Hill meeting, merely because he has a different position, and Mr. Holder happens to be a journalist as well, so when we are talking about attacks on journalism one would say quite clearly that the Democratic Labour Party is in no position to take up any such situation of principle.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central was at the meeting in Brittons Hill where a vicious attack was landed on the character of myself, and the one subsequently in Gall Hill in which Mr. Holder himself was under attack because of his journalism. *(Asides).* The hon. member wants to know who attacked him, I am not accusing the hon. member, it is the hon. member for St. John. Where were the journalists then in defence of Mr. Gladstone Holder and his right to publish freely in this country? Where were they? Why didn't they then remember that the very Harold Hoyte and a series of people were physically thrown out of the DLP meeting at Combermere only in 1977? Why don't they recall those things? The Democratic Labour Party has no proper history of respecting press freedom, they are in a campaign to win the Government now, so of course you will hear an early defence of the Press.

I will go further and tell you something, Sir. There are two ways of stage managing news. I make bold to say that there are members of the Democratic Labour Party who write their own Press Releases and give to journalists in this country and they all come out verbatim that way, and don't challenge me to call the names either, Sir. I make bold to say so, and I make bold to say.....*(Aside).* The hon. member protests too much, and you know what Shakespeare said about those who protest too much. I go further and say that not only do they write these but they also maintain private public relations persons, – let them deny they maintain J. E. R. Associates to slant the news. There are several of the non-de-plumes in the Nation newspaper and the Advocate that are written by paid journalists on behalf of members of the Democratic Labour Party. Let us face facts. It is not only you who have information, we will give you some of the inside information, and if the journalists want respect in this country – and I've always pleaded for them – they must begin to understand that they cannot be manipulated by either party, either through a public relations firm or by intervention from anybody. That is the whole issue.

The hon. member seems very concerned, Sir, very concerned, but the point is that I can tell you today that several of the letters that are written, sometimes with all sorts of names that are not true, are written by public relations people on behalf of the Democratic Labour Party, and they are building up an atmosphere that they are creating for the people that there are several people against the Government, simply because they are manipulating the Press in a way that the Press should begin to understand. That is what is happening, and they are manipulating the Press with what they consider to be first-class political strategy.

Let us take the Press itself, Sir. I will have a few things to say about the Press. I believe that we need greater training of journalists, and I have tried in a small way to look for courses in order to encourage this. Part of the weakness about public information in this country is that the owners of the Press themselves have never paid journalists properly; they have never given them training, so people feel challenged, exposed and afraid. 11.35 a.m.

The point is that unless journalists feel sufficiently independent they will find themselves malleable. Let us take the newspaper. On today's front page of the Nation is a statement that I went to Grenada and came back. That statement is palpably untrue. The hon. member for St. George South cited the instance of the teachers and bringing scabs into the schools; that is palpably untrue. There is a statement about the opening of a Cuban Consulate – also untrue. I could go through and give you several instances in which the newspapers, because some of them try to upstage others, allow facts to give way to fiction, and the Press itself, as the hon. member for St. Michael South said, must show a degree of balance. But too often people believe that Press freedom does not mean a press duty and responsibility, and I believe we are going through a period of time where there may be loud popular applause but a lack of judgment in balancing news items. And I am appealing to hon. members in their own interest in the dissemination of information to make sure that they have a balanced position and stop being manipulated by people outside – by politicians and businessmen, etc.

Now let me put the position. It is a figment to believe there are never two sides to a question; there can be many sides. But when a Minister of Government appears on a television programme we hear that the Government is speaking too much; when we keep silent you hear that we are not giving the information. What must the Government do? If it is going to be criticised when it appears, and when it does not appear it is criticised for not appearing, the Govern-

ment must therefore become inept it must not be able to act, it must not have access to information, etc. This is the position we find ourselves in, and journalists must recognize that Government has a duty as well to explain their actions and must clearly and responsibly report on its actions, views and judgments. I say that public information is in no danger in this country. The degree of information now given out by the Government Information Service is wider than the level prior to this Government coming into power.

Let me give you another example from the last Government. The Chief Fire Officer was told by the former Minister of Information, Mr. Peter Morgan, that he should not issue any Press release on fires occurring in this country. How short can this country's memory be? The hon. member for St. Michael West was a member of this Government. You hear a lot about collective decision. I revoked that decision without even going to the Cabinet. There was a blackout on fires by the then Minister in charge of Information merely because Mr. Clarke exposed the racket that was going on in the buying of fire equipment from HARP. Mr. Carlton Brathwaite was connected with it, and Mr. Brathwaite was, after the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the third most powerful man in the country. But all this must now be pushed under carpet. Information does not become important any longer; that is the type of position that the Democratic Labour Party left in this country in relation to public information.

Now, Sir, I want to deal with political broadcasts. We have fought very strongly since 1964 for political broadcasts to be allowed in this country. Formerly they were not allowed other than at election time. When it came to the then Leader of the Opposition, he was either shown with his head slanted and we were told it was a technical defect by Mr. Ian Gale who was hand-picked by the then Prime Minister and got all his directions from the Prime Minister on managing the news. All directions went through Ian Gale, even the political broadcasts allowed us at the 1971 elections. We were not even given the technical props allowed; nothing of the sort. And I say we are making progress, probably not as rapidly as we want to for an ideal system of Press freedom, but I doubt the words of the Democratic Labour Party that they are interested in Press freedom, because their deeds show otherwise; their deeds are contrary to the opening of public information. Those were the deeds of men intent on keeping themselves in power. They are so worried today that they are out of power that they are going to batter up some members of the Press.

The historical record of the actions of the past Government is so clear - the managing of the news, the abuse of journalists, etc. The record is so clear that it is only a purblind person who will accept their word when you have their deeds contrasted against them.

The issue of freedom of the Press is an issue I believe in very dearly, and that is why I am taking steps to bring a new Defamation Act to liberalize Press freedom; that is why the Government is considering a Freedom of Information Act in order to give greater access to public information; and that is why despite the stinging personal attacks made on me by members of the Democratic Labour Party and their paid hirelings, I will stand firm to principles on these matters and fight very hard in order to ensure that journalism gets the proper respect and not merely a short term courtship of words rather than deeds.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, at this point I beg to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN report progress and ask for leave to sit again, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER took the Chair and reported accordingly.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, there appears again to be a problem with the microphone and I move that the Sitting be suspended for ten minutes.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

The question that the House be suspended for ten minutes was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

11.45 a.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken, the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael West caught my attention.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make a long speech on this Head; but there are certain things that distress me greatly about information and the handling of information in Barbados. I support the concept of a free Press, and I am sure everybody else on this side supports the concept of a free Press. Sociologists have put forward what is no longer a theory, but an axiom, and that is in a world of rising expectations, or in a state where people are being offered more than they had, dissatisfaction grows; and it is not surprising to me therefore, that we are hearing so much about the need for Press freedom.

As the hon. member for Christ Church West so ably documented, Press freedom reached its lowest ebb in Barba-

dos under the administration of the Democratic Labour Party; because in its two and a half years of service to this nation, this party, the Barbados Labour Party, has not issued any strident notes to journalists asking them not to publish certain aspects of news. I am familiar with the style of the former Minister of Information, Mr. Peter Morgan admonishing journalists that they were only to report the positive side of the news, a flexible term referring to publishing only things approved by the Democratic Labour Party.

One thing that disturbs greatly is the fact that appearing in today's Nation, on the back page, an article which seems to indicate that there is some dissatisfaction among journalists up there; and I would like to bring it to the attention of the Chair; and we are prepared to make it a Document of the House so that we can have a further examination and clarification on what is really going on at C.B.C. I am anxious to know whether or not there is a problem up there. The hon. member for St. Michael North West is Chairman of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation, and I am sure that he is anxious to make a contribution under this Head; and I am waiting for him to get up and help us understand what is going on at C.B.C.; but the hon. member for Christ Church West indicated.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. We are dealing with the Government Information Service. I recall your ruling today, and I wonder how the hon. member can call on the Chairman of C.B.C. to discuss what is happening at C.B.C. I did not know that the Government Information Service was responsible for muzzling the Press.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON: The hon. member knows very well that I am not referring to the hon. member personally; but in as much as he is in a position to advise us on the information aspect, that is why he has been asked to clarify it for us. It has been pointed out, Sir, that journalists in Barbados need training. I still say that in a small society like Barbados it is unfortunate that polarisation in every class happens very easily; and I do not think that the Press is any exception. Because of the policies of the past administration, it is conceivable that a good many persons responsible for the handling of information in certain Government owned institutions may inadvertently from time to time have fallen captive to their own political inclinations. And as a consequence of that, it is important that we guard against the inept handling of information based simply on political persuasions.

I am not accusing anybody; but I am making a fervent plea to journalists in Barbados to examine themselves critically and see whether or not what they want to report is information or propaganda. I am satisfied in my own mind that some agents of the Press do sometimes inadvertently go astray. I can recall when the BMC was at one time hitting the news for one thing or another that was not complimentary to the staff or management of the BMC; and I took a newspaper reporter one time when he was down at the BMC snooping around to support a news item that he was prepared to release that there were rats swarming all over the place.

I took him myself into the cold storage facilities of the BMC and I walked him into that cold room and showed him the new facilities that the BMC had put in and that this Government had gone to great expense to provide for the people of Barbados. I told him that since he did not now have a story to support his view that the BMC was infested with rats, I would anticipate that he would be fair minded enough to report to the people of Barbados that the BMC's cold storage facilities were now spotlessly clean and free from rodent infestation. Mr. Chairman, I do not have to tell you that story did not appear.

Journalists sometimes look for sensationalism. I can give you again, Sir, an example of one of the newspapers in Barbados printing a story that we had dumped 15,000 pounds of fish into the sea. We called the newspaper in question and we pointed out that the story was inaccurate – and precisely what the hon. member for St. George South complained about – they said that the Chairman of the Barbados Marketing Corporation was not available for comment, although nobody had made any attempt to clarify the story before it was published.

This is going to continue the situation where journalists get exposed to ridicule unless they themselves realise that journalism has a professional responsibility. It is something that calls for integrity, just like Law, just like Medicine, just like anything else – it calls for a measure of integrity; and until journalists get that through their heads, they will continue to wallow in a situation which does not do any justice to Barbados.

I do not want to talk about who should be reprimanded and who should not be reprimanded; but I want to point out that I am satisfied that under this set of circumstances the staff of C.B.C. could have found it possible to put anything like that in a newspaper if the hon. member for St. John was still Prime Minister of Barbados. I have watched one who was supposed to be a very fine and budding journalist in Barbados – I would not call his name – who was emasculated by the former Prime Minister. 12.10 p.m.

There was no protest from C.B.C. at that time, they did not dare do it, and it is only because the Barbados Labour Party has gone over backwards to provide a climate where information can flow freely in this country that journalists are increasingly giving their voice to protest and calling for greater and greater press freedom. Press freedom can operate were there is Press responsibility. If the Press is prepared to report accurately what goes on, I am abso-

lutely certain nobody is going to complain. I have said when I am edging through the slips, report me as edging through the slips, but when the hon. member for St. Michael South West goes through the slips, one should hear him reported just as accurately. When I am wrong, say so; when the Opposition benches talk nonsense, let them say that too.

Mr. Chairman, I can remember the hon. member for St. Michael North Central getting in here and calling for the liquidation of the Barbados Marketing Corporation, but when it appeared in the Press the following morning, it was something altogether different, and you can expect that this Government is going to sit down and watch itself being misused and not say something about it. We have a voice and we will use it to support the journalists when they are doing their duty faithfully and without fear or favour, but when they do things which upon examination are not responsible, I believe it is our duty as well to bring it to the attention not solely for the purpose of ridicule but for the purpose of helping them to come to a full understanding of what their duties are particularly in a developing country. There are countries all over the world which are going through the process of development which feel it necessary to muzzle the Press. The situation in some of our own neighbouring states indicates that Press freedom is something that has gone through the eddoes a long time ago. Barbados continues to enjoy what I would consider to be an excellent measure of Press freedom, and that is why the journalists can do some of the things that they do and the Government has not done anything so far as I am aware to prevent them from reporting the news, and I am happy that before this day is over we will have a clearer indication of what the true position is in respect of the Government-owned broadcasting service so that all this nonsense that we hear about press censorship and all that can be laid to rest.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that I have not intended getting into the discussion on C.B.C. at this stage, but the hon. member for St. Michael West has provided an ample opportunity for us to look at this matter in much more detail than maybe this side had intended looking at it before, because we are dealing with the question of the Government Information Services. The Government Information Service from time to time releases information over the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. In this context we will have to look at the policy of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation and at some of the allegations which have been made, because in a way they have to do with the kind of information which comes over in the public media. I am therefore making today's Nation a document of the House, and I believe I have the privilege, Mr. Chairman, of reading from that document, and I should like for the purpose of this debate to read what is contained on the back page. I have just realised that there is no number on that page, but anyhow it is on the last page which has an item "News control at C.B.C.". There are some very interesting comments which are made here, and I should like to read them out because I am not sure all hon. members would have had an opportunity to read it. I understand my colleague has not had an opportunity to do so. The article states:

No more interference with the news! That was the message conveyed yesterday to Government ministers in Barbados by news staff and management of the state-owned Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation (CBC).

It came when news staff, led by the director of news and current affairs, George Hall, and general manager, Tony Best, held a heated one-hour meeting with the corporation's chairman and member of Parliament, Ezra Alleyne.

The confrontation at the CBC Pine studios resulted from a number of instances of alleged interference with news presentations over the past few months, intensifying with the recent Grenada and Barbados Union of Teachers events.

According to a report reaching THE NATION the staff's main concern was whether they would be allowed to function as independent journalists or merely as an extension of the Government Information Service.

Concern mounted last week, when the station was allegedly ordered not to carry news of a Press conference held by former Prime Minister Errol Barrow, which dealt with the Grenada situation, and matters of national interest.

Staff was also incensed over a Government directive to cancel a number of interviews and a documentary on Grenada and the March 13 coup.

Last Sunday, one minister reportedly called CBC and ordered that a story from the Opposition Democratic Labour Party, which was read on the 6.55 a.m. bulletin, should not be repeated.

According to the report, the last straw came on Monday night, when two ministers, allegedly sought to suggest which news item should be given priority on the 7:30 p.m. TV news.

News staff and management were also reportedly annoyed about two other recent incidents in which scripts of stories in the news had to be sent to a minister at a leading hotel to be vetted before they could be broadcast.

News staff reportedly refused to accept Monday's directive and on Tuesday, the meeting was summoned with the chairman.

It is understood that a compromise was reached in which the newsmen were told not to accept any directives from any political figures in future, but politely refer them to the general manager.

They were also told that they should acknowledge directives from the general manager only.

Last night, the chairman Ezra Alleyne, and general manager, Tony Best, declined to comment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the Chairman would not decline to comment today, but let us move on. It is interesting to hear the hon. member for St. Michael West and the Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party, and to hear the hon. member for Christ Church West as it were beating their breasts about the purity of the Barbados Labour Party and about the purity of the Government relative to this question of attempts which they have been making at controlling news which comes out on the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation whether it is television or radio. In the face of this report Mr. Chairman and in the face of the fact that the hon. member for St. Michael North West who is present in this Chamber and who in another capacity as Chairman of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation had to be called in to settle the dissatisfaction which existed amongst members of the News staff at the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation over the attempted manipulation of news which has been coming out on that particular medium, one must therefore come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that all is not well.

12.20 p.m.

We have therefore got to look at this in its entirety because it is clear that the news staff at CBC are very concerned and are fed up about the conditions in which they have to work.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The report that I have and the documents that I have are full of allegations. I have not seen any facts yet.

Mr. GREAVES: I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that the member for St. Michael North West would be able to clarify these allegations because in so far as involvement is concern his name has been mentioned specifically in the allegation and I believe he would be doing this country a service to either confirm or deny whether these matters and issues were raised with him from time to time and certainly yesterday and whether or not the Minister of Information in truth and in fact has been in the habit of giving directions and directives to the kind of news coming through CBC.

Mr. Chairman, the question of the professionalism of most Journalists is something of extreme importance and I believe that pressures are brought to bear on Journalists and particularly from Government sources from time to time to present a favourable position. I recall reading only recently a news item in a Trinidad Newspaper where a Journalist from 610 Radio resigned because he felt he could not practice as a professional because of the kind of directions which were being given to him and I think one of the hon. members, I believe the hon. member for St. Michael West, referred in the course of his address to a directive which went out from a former Minister of Information to the news staff at the CBC inviting him to present a positive side of the news and he said that the members of the staff did nothing about it.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the member for St. Michael West is what we would call in local parlance, "a come-yu." That is a fellow who has only recently arrived on the scene. Maybe he was not in Barbados at the time when this particular instance took place but it was to my knowledge that the newsmen at CBC did protest and the directive was withdrawn so that when you make a point that attempts have been made and will be made from time to time to get a favourable construction and presentation of the news is something which I do not understand. We have approached it by our Party issuing a directive.

What is worst now is that you are getting Ministerial inference to the extent of even asking not for the positive side, but the news not to appear at all and that is where we have to be very critical because I think we have got to be able to, at this point in time, set some very clear and high standards if we are going to get a fair representation of news and if we are going to be able to develop the kind of professionalism at which most Journalists are all aiming to achieve.

There are some other points, Mr. Chairman, which have been made by the hon. member for St. Michael West where he indicated, and I quote him, "Information can now flow freely", indicating I suppose, that under the Barbados Labour Party regime, under that administration information can now flow freely. I think that those of us and any right thinking Barbadian can see very clearly that this statement is simply not the case because I suspect that the only place where information can flow freely under the present administration is in the waste-paper basket.

The hon. member for Christ Church West made some allegations of which, of course, he had no evidence in spite of the fact he said that he could produce evidence. I just want to deal with two of them. One is where he indicated that members of the Democratic Labour Party had been paying members of the Press. All I can say is that if the Journalists in Barbados are so cheap that they can stoop to receive any money from the Democratic Labour Party.....

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, Sir. I do not know whether or not there is a deliberate attempt on the part of the member for St. Lucy to misrepresent what was said by the member for Christ Church West but I am gathering, listening to him, that he is seeking to imply that there is money passing. What the member for Christ Church West said was that some members on that side over there paid Journalists to prepare press releases for them. I would not want him to leave the impression that the member was saying that

they were paying Journalists, private Journalists. I do not want that impression to be left.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The point of order is accepted. I think what the Hon. Attorney General was saying was exactly the point raised by the member for St. Michael West about press releases and Public Relations Personnel being paid.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I am glad for that clarification because I believe when Hansard comes out it will prove clearly what the member says and I am going to make a point about Public Relations, but I will leave that out for the time being. Then the member for Christ Church West referred to letters which appeared in the newspapers and he indicated that they had been planted there by the Democratic Labour Party Public Relations persons and by members of the Democratic Labour Party.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that you also read the newspapers, both the *Advocate* and the *Nation,* and it would be interesting to take a summary of the letters which appear in "Our Readers Say" Column of those two Newspapers and the interesting thing about it is that I would think that most of those letters, and I would even venture to say, are more supportive of the present Government and of the Barbados Labour Party than of the Democratic Labour Party so that what we can therefore conclude is that if the Attorney General is saying that we have been planting letters in there, it is fairly obvious that the members of the Barbados Labour Party and members of the Government have also been planting letters in there. I understand, that for example, the Prime Minister has 14 *non de plumes.* I do not know. We have to be very careful in this particular area.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will be glad.....

Mr. GREAVES: I am winding up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not believe that it is Parliamentary to suggest in the absence of any evidence what you have just said. I would ask you to withdraw that.

Mr. GREAVES: Sir, I beg to withdraw that.

12.30 p.m.

Sir, on the question of Information, I think that we have to be very clear on this particular matter because it has to do with the professionalism of the people involved and certainly creating a work atmosphere at the work place which would enable people to function as effectively as possible.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, over and over again we will hear the term "freedom of the Press" but very often the term "freedom of the Press" means different things to different people, and if you have to get the opinions of the Press men themselves, one would be very much amused to find that many of them do not accept that such a thing as freedom of the Press exists.

You will find that every section of the news media – newspapers, newsletters, magazines, radio stations, TV stations – owned by individuals or owned by companies, an individual or company has a set policy, and they employ people referred to as Pressmen or journalists to work for them, and those Pressmen or journalists are free to write as long as they conform with the policy laid down by the owners or operators of the news media. Let us get that clear, and any time the journalists or Pressmen set out not to conform with the policy as laid down they are running the risk of losing their jobs or finding themselves hauled across the coals. If anybody cares to get up and deny that they may, but that is so not only in Barbados but all over the world, and Pressmen know it too.

What people are trying to imply when they talk about freedom of the press is that the journalists is free to write whatever he feels like writing, whenever he feels like writing and wherever he feels like writing. This is not the case. Any attempt to restrain that type of policy from overtaking or being extended too far depends on how efficient and professional the journalists or pressmen make themselves. If you examine the journalists or pressmen in Barbados you will see that there are a lot of things to be desired. One expects to see them better trained in this art of journalism, one expects to see them have some form of etiquette or professional conduct which they adhere to. If you look carefully at what is going on in Barbados you are not going to find that, what often you find is that somebody gets a job at one of the news media, starts writing, and then depending upon how he plays up to individuals in the society or the Government, he gets hailed as a problem journalist or something of that nature.

The question of conduct is very important, and in this atmosphere in Barbados of professionalism, where you are finding over and over that people like to eat at the tables of other people, the tendency for the further undermining of the freedom of the Press is great, because in the Barbadian situation where an individual journalist may find it necessary or convenient to play up to a politician or some other person in the society because he hopes to benefit in more than one way, you will always find that there are articles appearing in the Press which often do not reflect what actually occurred in this society.

Sir, we have been concerned for a long time about freedom of the Press but we are not doing anything in this society as members of Parliament to ensure that this real freedom does exist. These people have jobs, they

have to work either for the Government station or stations owned by private people, and they are always under the threat of losing their jobs, and because of that threat, especially when you get a type of bellicose manager or bellicose Government seeking at all times to enforce its opinions and decisions or wishes upon other people who are subservient, you will always find people who are concerned about losing their jobs to such an extent that they are prepared to kowtow willy nilly to any directions given out by a Government or by owners of some sections of the Press.

Sir, one of the things you find in newly independent countries is the tendency of people to join parties or to become associated with Governments in power for some political or economic advantage for the future, and if you look carefully at what occurred in Italy during the period of Fascism under Mussolini you will observe that on those occasions the Press became infiltrated by members of Mussolini's party and they were then in a position to decide what went into the Press and to attune what went into the Press to suit the wishes of their leader. One has to consider whether or not this has happened in Barbados, whether or not we are having people working in sections of the news media who are prominent members of the party and are using their influence in those areas to ensure that what comes out in the news media is attuned to the wishes and directions of the people in power. When you get that type of situation there is absolutely no need for any party in power to come out and talk in terms of curtailing the freedom of the Press, because already the Press has set about to impose upon itself self-imposed censorship. This is what is happening in Barbados. You are getting a self-imposed censorship brought about by the Press where certain things which are not favourable to the Government in power they are not prepared to publish. If you read any section of the Press you will observe over and over, especially on things which occur in the House of Assembly, that there is a certain slant given, and even members on this side have made certain points you find that when it is reported in the Press what you often get is the reply given by the Minister as the main story and then towards the end of the article you hear that some members of the Opposition also spoke or made some query in relation to it.

Let me examine the articles carefully. I am not saying for one moment that this happens because there is a definitive directive given by any member of the front bench, but because some members of the Press may consider themselves ardent supporters of the party in power and they are now working in a section of the Press they use their position in such instances to ensure that whatever comes out coincides or plays up to the wishes and directions of the people in power, and this is the type of situation you find. *(Aside).* We don't have to talk about CBC, CBC is a Government station and as I said, there is a policy of the owners which ensures that the people who work for these sections of the Press conform to it, and if they do not conform to it they are in fear of losing their jobs. This is not only so in Barbados, this is so all over the world. The only serious exception to what I have said is, when you look at the Barbadian situation, maybe Rediffusion. This is the situation in this country, and when you get a situation like that, who suffers? The nation suffers, because the nation is being given – and when I say the nation I don't mean the newspaper – the people of this country are given a one-sided view of what has actually occurred in the country, and this is not good for the people of the country, not good at all. Right now in the present state of affairs in Barbados people do not know exactly what is happening, because when they read what is given out on the news media they are getting one impression, when they hear from people who are actually involved they get another impression and then you find that these two impressions are at opposite ends.

I would like to believe that the responsibility of a Press, especially in a newly independent country, goes far beyond supporting the party in power whether it be that party or this party, goes further than kowtowing to the wishes of an individual, regardless of which party it is, and goes further than eating at the tables of some other persons. They have a responsibility to the nation to keep the people properly informed at all times so that people will have necessary information where they can have true judgments as to what is occurring in the country and affecting their day to day lives, but when that does not happen and you find that due to these factors which I have mentioned, people who are working in the Press set about to twist information or to adapt their stories to suit certain situations, then the people become lost and confused.

12.40 p.m.

They are not in a position to judge carefully what is happening, and that is a sad state of affairs. So while we are all talking about freedom of the press and people are going about shouting of what the Barbados Labour Party might have done or how badly the Democratic Labour Party did, we are finding a situation now that after all the Democratic Labour Party was not so bad; and it is amazing that the hon. member for St. Michael West who holds himself as a preacher and a man supposed to be guided by the highest principles of the Bible can castigate the Press for printing a true story on what happened in here in a debate on the BMC last year. This is a situation which you are finding in this country. This is an area of concern because people who are involved with morals and the religious philosophy, when such leaders themselves do not maintain the standard which they want people to follow, what is going to happen to the country? Those who are less capable of defining right and wrong should have a difficult task to uphold the principles enunciated by the particular religious philosophy. And in

Barbados we seem to be settling for a level of mediocrity, and it is time we start doing something about this.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members and to Your Honour's attention that I am not trying to muzzle anybody, but we have spent two hours and forty-five minutes on this item. There is in the Estimates another Item under which I am quite sure the Leader of the Opposition will be able to get up and tell us what the policy of the former administration was on CBC. The Standing Orders allow me to put the question, which is referred to as the parliamentary guillotine. I would not like to have to do this, but we must take into consideration that we have had two hours and forty five minutes on this one item, five speeches on it. There are other items for $60 million expenditure – education, agriculture, etc. Why all these hours with CBC? I am going to sit down, but if they go on like this I will have to attempt to use the parliamentary guillotine.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I must say that the time for debate has not expired and if hon. members choose to spend three hours on one Head it is a matter for them. The right to free speech which has been claimed at the beginning of this Parliament is something charged to all of us, and how members choose to spend it is a matter for them, not for me.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am aware of that, Sir. The Leader of the Opposition said that the backbenchers waste time over here. I have instructed them to try to avoid talking so that he would not have reason to complain.

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Clown, what point of order?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, you will get him to withdraw the term clown.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Who is the clown?

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to ask the hon. member to withdraw the term clown.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There has been no reference to anybody on the other side as a clown.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I am drawing your attention to the fact that three hours are allowed for the debate. We have other big heads here on which they can score all the points they want to score. I am going to use the guillotine.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have heard what the hon. member has said, but if hon. members are not interested in letting the public know how $60 million will be spent, that is a matter for hon. members.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is about the fifth time that the Acting Leader has threatened to do something in this House. He is now threatening the guillotine. It will be no point discussing anything else at all if fundamental speech is going to be threatened. We have a right over here if we want to take the whole five days to talk about freedom of speech. It is a fundamental issue.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are only reiterating the point I ruled on already.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, my role in speaking in this Chamber is only to speak when I have something sensible to say, and I want to say here and now that the problem at CBC is a problem which is inherited. I am the only person in politics in this country who can give an effective directive to the staff of CBC, and the problem is that from the inception of CBC no one has laid down a set of rules to guide staff in accepting or rejecting directives of any nature whatever, including directives from members of the public. I cannot control any member of the public from calling CBC, and I have taken the only effective action that can be taken in the face of complaints and that is to give the staff certain directions as to what they should do.

Now certain allegations have been made yesterday morning and I am in the course of investigating these allegations. They were made that morning and I came directly from CBC to this Chamber and I have not yet had a chance to investigate these complaints. But there are more basic problems at CBC which give rise to all sorts of allegations, and there are some indications that someone of a political nature has interfered in relation to the Barbados Union of Teachers; and I am not going to shield anyone in these matters.
12.50 p.m.

A member of the staff took it upon himself in the exercise of his own independent professional judgment to lift a letter from the newspaper and carried it on the news. There was no Government interference direct or indirect. That is one of the matters referred to in the document laid in this Hon. Chamber. The point which I am making is that the newsroom in certain circumstances is given the right to exercise their independent judgment but there are sometimes gross errors of judgment.

I, as Chairman, must retain the right to speak to members of staff on those errors of judgment. It is as simple as that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am trying not to dissuade other hon.

members from reacting to the hon. member; but he has raised a very interesting constitutional point; because when we have a Minister of Information, or Minister whose portfolio which includes Information, is he trying to say that he is not going to accept any ministerial directive coming to the Corporation? I just want to make that clear.

Mr. ALLEYNE: I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that I retained the right to exercise those powers which the Act gives me, and I will exercise my own independent judgment where I think that there are errors of judgment. That must be the prerogative of the Chairman. I want to say now that I am not guided by anyone except where the Minister might give a policy directive. The Chairman of a corporation has a duty to use his own independent judgment, and this is what I do.

The point I was about to make is that there must be some limitations of the concept of free speech. There must be some limitations in the interest of national security, for example; and one of the points in the article relates to the security of the nation. That must be one of the constraints. Journalists must understand that there are certain instances in which national security demands either that they restrain themselves from publishing in the interest of national security or rearranges the publication of the material which he has in the interest of national security. It may be too that parliamentary privilege must, in my submission constitute a restraint; and another of the items referred to in the article relates to possible contempt of Parliament. So there are restraints which must obtain not only for the Advocate, the Nation, Rediffusion, the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation or anywhere else. It is as simple as that. I am not for one moment in any way condoning or defending ministerial interference as I have said before.

The only directive which can come to the staff from day to day is from the Chairman. I want to say here and now that I will not permit the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation under my Chairmanship to be used as anything other than an instrument of information for the public. Members on the other side know that they have had a closed shop where CBC is concerned. The President of the Democratic Labour Party as recently as Saturday night was able to telephone CBC...

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. The hon. member is saying that the President of the Democratic Labour Party was able to telephone CBC. Surely the telephoning of a news release is totally unrelated to an appearance on T.V.

Mr. ALLEYNE: The point that I am making is that there is freedom of access to CBC under my chairmanship. Let me say that in normal circumstances a Press release should be written and signed so that they can be no question of what was said; but in that particular instance, in the absence of that, the release was carried. There was an allegation that it was stopped. My direction to the staff was to use their own independent professional judgment as to whether they should carry it or not on the basis of complaints made to me.

A directive has to come from the Chairman and no one else, including members of the public. I know for example in times past the wives of certain politicians used to call to have certain items taken off. That will not happen under me. *(Asides).* Let me deal with a number of very crucial points, because if a Chairman has the staff under his control, politicians on neither side can interfere with them. That is the way I see this subject. On the other hand, the Corporation has received public lashes for matters for which it was not responsible, like the frequent publications of the speech which the Prime Minister made at the Barbados Labour Party's Annual Conference. Representation has been made that the Government in some way forced the repetition of this speech. I can state that that was not so. Again I have been advised by the member of staff that he exercised his own judgment in this matter. That is what I have been told. We have got instances of things of that nature.

It goes back to the question of training. There has never been any system of training for the newsroom at CBC. Some of the members of staff are trained, but there are errors of gross misjudgment. In the article there are references to "Government interference". I have already said that the allegations should be investigated. I cannot come here and say what the facts are because I do not have the facts before me.

I want to say something about the report in the "Nation". The report on the back page of the "Nation" is not absolutely accurate. It says that there was a "heated discussion". The Chairman of a Statutory Corporation does not have heated discussions with employees. I was told that members of the newsroom had some grievances. Then there was the headline "News control at CBC". There is no news control. There have been complaints, about four or five in the last few years, and I intend to investigate them; and I want to give this House the assurance that I will do so as far as it is possible.
1 p.m.

Just let me say this before I sit down. When the Prime Minister appointed members of Parliament as Chairmen of Statutory Corporations, there was much criticisms from the other side. I believe that the one event which has demonstrated the wisdom of that is the issue of CBC, because it is only an elected M.P. who can resist the sort of pressure which the other side is alleging have been

used, and that is an important point. It is particularly in relation to the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation that you need to have a Chairman who is also a member of Parliament so that, as you say, in the interest of maintaining the integrity of the station he can resist any pressure from either side which may from time to time be attempted.

I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman. In Barbados when the political temperature rises the heat is turned on on the news room at CBC. That is precisely the picture which has emerged in the last two or three weeks as reported in the Nation. The political temperature has risen and the heat from both sides has been turned on to the news room. It is my duty to maintain an even temperature in the news room as between both sides and that is what I intend to do.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, as indicated during the debate yesterday that I would allow the House to be suspended at 1 o'clock, I therefore beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended for one hour.

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

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

On Resumption:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is resumed. When the sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

HEAD 5 – PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE
(2) GOVERNMENT INFORMATION OFFICE

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, under Head 5(2) we have had a pretty wide debate taking in not only the Government Information Service, those who have been responsible for the operations of this service, and the recent allegations about interference in the operations of the news room of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. There have been some very serious allegations made and I use your word, Mr. Chairman, very serious allegations made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to remind the hon. member that he started this debate and any contribution that he is now making would have to be in a different vein from the matter on which he spoke earlier.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The defence that has been put up so far has tended to be in the vein that there was interference under the Democratic Labour Party, and therefore it is in order for interference to be carried out by the Barbados Labour Party. I do not subscribe to any such theory of Government. If it was wrong under the Democratic Labour Party, that is no justification for continued wrong-doing by the Barbados Labour Party Government. There is an old saying in this country that two wrongs do not make a right, but yet that seems to be the gravamen, the main burden of the line of defence being put up by some of the principal speakers from the Government benches.

Now we had been told that this Great Combination if given the reins of Government of this country would bring new levels of efficiency, fairplay and good government in the administration of public affairs. We were told the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation would be rid of partisan political influence and patronage. Those were the words in the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party, very ringing words giving the impression first of all that there was political patronage and influence under the Democratic Labour Party and that when this new Government got into power there would be a new day dawning in this country and there would be no political interference, no political patronage in the operations of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. We were told there would be full freedom to use broadcasting and television systems by all, subject only to the safeguard of the rights of others. These were the solemn promises made. Now I am not claiming that I have been denied any access to CBC radio or television, because I have not sought it, and I believe that if I sought it on reasonable grounds that it would be granted. I am saying that openly. So I am not laying any charge in that particular regard.

2.10 p.m.

What I am calling upon the Government to do is to get up and deny or explain those very serious allegations which go to the foundation of liberty and democracy in this country because democracy is posited on the foundation that there must be a free flow of information whether one is in the Government or one is in the Opposition and there should be no attempt on any occasion to stifle or mussle for political reasons any reasonable information that may be put out by the Government or by the Opposition or any reasonable group in the country so long as it is within the four corners of the law in this country.

I think it is a very serious charge when Government Ministers can be accused of interfering with CBC. I think for their own justification, in order to set the record straight, they should get up and explain whether there has been interference or not and what is the nature of that interference. You cannot argue this case on the ground that the Democratic Labour Party did it when they were in power and you are doing it now. That is not an argument. Least of all because when you were in Opposition and when you came to the people and asked for a mandate from them to run the affairs of this country you said that the CBC would be rid of partisan political influence and patronage so you cannot now obviously argue that you are the Government and this is a Government Station. If there are allegations then you are not right to do it because it was done in the past. That is no argument at all. People in this country like fair play. Two wrongs do not make a right.

We have heard the Member for St. Michael North West, who is the Chairman of the CBC, he made one of his rare interventions in the debate today and he was sweating profusely after making it. Mr. Chairman, I think he attempted to make a sane speech and if I remember him correctly, he said he was the only person in this country who could give directions to the CBC and keep it on a sound course or words to that particular effect. I am willing, if I have quoted him incorrectly, I am willing to get the correct words from the records, Mr. Chairman, but I have no intention or it is not my intention to misquote what the member actually said.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I recall my colleague saying he was the only person in the country who gave a directive to the News Room to bring a balance.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, this is an important point and I would be glad if we could get the record. It was near the beginning of his speech because I want to be accurate on this. There is no intention to distort the fact.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: This is before the intervention of the hon. member for St. John on the Constitutional position.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, is it possible to get the record?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will continue. Efforts will be made to get the part of the hon. member for St. Michael North West Speech to compare the accuracy of the two versions.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make it abundantly clear and give the House the assurance again that I am not attempting in anyway to misquote. That is certainly not my intention.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order. The hon. member for St. Michael North West did say that he took a broad policy. He was subject to managerial directions. *(Asides.)* That is what he said.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that we are going to have a conflict as to what he actually said relying on members' memory. I said that an effort will be made to get the correct words. You can just pass on from this area of uncertainty.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Very well, Mr. Chairman, I will pass on. We were also told by the Barbados Labour Party that if returned to power they would restore to Journalism true professionalism and that is the very allegation that is made that true professionalism is being denied to Journalists at CBC. Mr. Chairman, I am repeating that these are serious charges and the onus is upon the Government to state whether the professionalism of the Journalists at CBC has been put in jeopardy or challenged in anyway and to give the circumstances surrounding those charges.

What seems to be beyond any shadow of a doubt is that certain directions have been given to CBC News Department and the Chairman appears to know nothing about them. In other words, persons appear to have been calling into the Station giving directions or purporting to give directions as the Chairman and the Chairman seems to be unaware of these either given over his head, or around his body, or behind his back, or however you want to put it.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making any long speech on this particular matter. I merely indicate again on what the Opposition feels very strongly. There has been a challenge to the Government and in the interest of a good democratic Government in this country, like the member for St. Michael West, he is concerned about the Reports and he has asked for an explanation. We are doubly concerned about it and we are asking for some explanations concerning these matters. I hope heads do not roll on these matters.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The heads will pass.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the Heads will pass. Mr. Chairman, as far as the Government Information Service is concerned, I wonder whether the Minister responsible could indicate how many shows by the Mobile Cinema have been given in the parish of St. Thomas during the past year.
2.20 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, Heads may pass but this matter is of over-riding importance in that it touches very deeply on the democratic liberties and the potential for survival of this society as a democracy. Earlier in this debate I made five specific charges of intervention by certain persons in the presentation of the news of CBC. The hon. member for Christ Church West was most careful in his speech not to touch on any of those charges.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Three of the charges were withdrawn and it was quite in order for him not to deal with them. On my direction three of the charges were withdrawn.

Dr. HAYNES: The hon. member for St. Michael North West has clearly by implication made it clear to this House that he has a problem in that regard, and there is no doubt.....

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. I did not make it clear that I had a problem, I indicated that I was in charge of the staff and that there were certain problems in relation, for example, to training and that there were times when I had to intervene because of error of judgment, but I have no problem.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am indebted to the hon. member.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, I am sure the hon. member is aware of what took place at CBC after that 6.55 a.m. broadcast relating to a news release from the Democratic Labour Party group in this House. However, I do not wish to belabour this point except to say this – and I want to make this absolutely clear – that I will do my utmost when a Democratic Labour Party Government is returned to power to make sure that CBC becomes a totally independent station and I wish to make it clear that I have a fundamental belief that only in such an atmosphere would the proper professionalism be able to be developed and to be exercised and to flourish, only in an atmosphere of freedom, because I believe that it does not help either political party, no matter which one is in power, to exercise that kind of control over a TV and radio station, because the net fallout is always to the disadvantage of the practitioners of that exercise.

Finally, I am completely convinced that a free society depends on free dissemination of information, and once more I want to pledge that CBC will be taken completely out of the party political arena when a Democratic Labour Party Government is returned to power.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I just want to make a comment here. If hon. members are going to make second speeches on this Head, I hope the ground will be new, because I can order a member to resume his seat if he becomes repetitive.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, just one small question. You will recall that earlier in the Estimates we also had this undercurrent, and I believe it has been some considerable time now since the Government Information Service has an appointed Head, and I wonder if the Minister is in a position to tell us whether he intends to change the status to appoint a non-civil service head or if in fact – this is something that has been making the rounds and I think is of some interest to members of Parliament – a non-civil service head of the Government Information Service who would then become another of the Press Secretaries. I do not know if the Press Secretary is considered to be part of the Government Information Service or what is his role in the Government Information Service, and I understand from reliable information that there will be a new Press Secretary from the 1st of next month. I do not know if that one is going to replace the present one or will be in addition to the present one, or if that one is going to head the Government Information Service. It is being put about by a number of interested people, people who come here and you can find them, for example, in the environs of this House, people who support the Barbados Labour Party, who are interested in whether in fact the present Press Secretary is being transferred to the GIS or if he is being transferred all the way out, if he is being fired.

That is a matter of policy in which I will not wish to get involved, but I am interested in if there will be a head for the Government Information Service, whether that head is going to be a civil servant, whether that head is going to be the present Press Secretary or another Press Secretary or what, and I think it is a question on which the Hon. Prime Minister should give us some light.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I believe that as a former employee of the Statutory Board involved in some measure with the flow of information I should make a few comments on this Head that is before the House relative to that Statutory Board for which I worked.
2.30 p.m.

The item appearing today in the Nation newspaper "News control at CBC" to my mind is no news at all. I was employed by that corporation for about seven years, and as far as I can remember there has always been some measure of control of the news that went out from the news room, by the Government in power, and I can name at least nine occasions on which there was interference by members of the former administration.

But the story in the paper causes some measure of concern not only for those on that side but equally for us on this side if these allegations are true. If the allegations are true, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned. One will recall in 1975 when the television carried a headline but there was no news after that headline because there was interference from the former Minister to drop the news of that headline. That headline referred to a statement of the Leader of the Opposition at that time. It was a question of interference. It was not uncommon for the former Minister of Broadcasting and Information, Mr. Morgan, to call members of the staff of CBC and instruct them not to carry certain items in a broadcast. It was ridiculous. I will not forget, and all hon. members should know of the incident when the Leader of the Opposition was invited to make his contribution to Independence in 1975; equally so was the late Governor General and the former Prime Minister; they were all invited to make a contribution in a five minutes broadcast to the nation. The Governor General made his broadcast which was well received and the former Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, was in the process of making his contribution when a directive came through, again from the former Minister, not to broadcast the Leader of the Opposition's contribution to the Independence Celebration 1975. Was this not interference in the news?

The story appearing today in the Nation states that the News Editor of CBC has complained about interference in the news from his news room. That same News Editor in 1975 and prior to 1975 was sitting in the Chair of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation. I am asking why he did not complain at that time about interference in the news. The answer is a simple one – journalists operating out of the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation operated out of fear of the political mechanism of this country; they were not sure whom they were offending when they had to write a story or whom they were to contact. This stems from a lack of professional training. The journalists did not see themselves as professionals and hence could not operate as true professionals.

"No more interference with news!" I do not see any news value in that. That has been going on from 1971 when there was interference by Ministers, and by the former Chairman of CBC. I will not forget how the former Chairman would come around election time and try to find out what kind of support they would have from the news room. He wanted to know if they had our support. But if these allegations today in this newspaper have any bearing in fact, I am calling on the hon Prime Minister of this country to make a thorough investigation into the allegations and if the people at CBC have any reasonable grounds for complaint that these matters be rectified as soon as possible. Because I had a good relationship with the staff members at CBC, they frequently get in touch with me to make their complaints. I would not want to tell this Honourable House that everything is rosy with the members of that Corporation; everything is not as happy as one would want to believe.

My recommendations are that the journalists operating out of CBC be given a policy, because there is no direct policy on which they can operate as journalists. Everything is done in an ad hoc manner: Furthermore, the journalists there have never been given proper training. Because one is able to write Shorthand at 90 words a minute does not mean that one is a professional journalist. My recommendation would be that the journalists in Barbados organize or reorganize themselves into a complete body so that they can stand on their feet.

Yes, there was interference at CBC. Even you yourself, Mr. Chairman, was exempted during the 1976 bye-election from having any kind of coverage on CBC. It was a frequent thing for members of the opposite side to call up and say' "No more coverage for members of the Opposition." I remember distinctly on one occasion when the now Prime Minister called when I was still a member of the staff of the news room, entreating me to see if I could get an item in the news for him.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I believe the hon. member may inadvertently be giving the wrong impression to the House. I recall the particular circumstances surrounding Your Honour's election to this House and I recall distinctly that the then Leader of the Opposition had a Press Conference and dropped some warm lashes on myself and the Government, which was carried on CBC and contributed significantly to the good results which you yourself know.

Mr. SISNETT: I thank the hon. member for making that point but I will not forget the occasion when the hon. Prime Minister called a Press Conference and the news was sent to CBC, and one of the aspiring journalists at CBC took the copy of that Press Release and put it under his typewriter, not because it was not a good story but because there was this constant fear about carrying anything of the Opposition. These are facts that can be verified by the staff of CBC.

In winding up Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate that not everything is rosy at CBC as is imagined. I hope that the present Chairman will get on with doing some serious work and have a look at the management structure to see if that management structure is what is required to run the corporation, because in my estimation the management at CBC is at fault. They have not been exposed to proper managerial positions; they have never functioned in the capacity of managers. One inquiry in the mid 1970s recommended that that management be got rid of and I am surprised today to see the same people sitting at the reins of management of CBC.

In closing, I just want to call on the Hon. Prime Minister again to look into these matters and ease the tension of members of the staff operating at CBC so that they can see themselves operating as true professionals and doing a good job for the people of Barbados.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This Head, Sir, comes under the Prime Minister's office, and even though I do not engage in the day to day dealings with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation or the Government Information Service, I think I should say a few words on what I have heard said.

I would be surprised if there is any country in the world where politicians did not complain about the news media.

2.40 p.m.

I remember that there was a time when Mr. Khrushchev was the Premier of Russia, and his son-in-law who actually lived in the house with him was the editor of Izvestia and it has been hinted to me by an Izvestia man who was in the Caribbean, but this gave rise to difficulties in Russia. The politicians whom Khrushchev might step on at certain times said that Khrushchev used to tell his son-in-law what to do in Izvestia the next day; and that is within a one party state where although Pravda and Izvestia are not owned by the same arm of the party, so to speak, at least there is not a monolithic political approach; and there was jealousy between Pravda and Izvestia the politicians not always keenly following the directives which came from people whom they did not feel were adherents to the army.

The facts surely are that even where there may be neutral countries, it is fairly hard to find neutral people. We had a good example in the words of the hon. member for St. Michael West which was quite inadvertently an exercise in political bias. The Advocate reported today, but the headlines were yesterday. The Advocate headline was "MP Raps PM for Interference in Appointments; and it started off by saying that a member of Parliament, Dr. Richie Haynes – and I think that that means the hon. member for St. Michael South Central – rapped the Prime Minister, Tom Adams – and if I remember it correctly, it said that an Opposition member yesterday called on the Prime Minister, Tom Adams, to stop his interference in appointments to temporary post in the Public Service.

Now that is a fair and accurate report of what the hon. member for St. Michael South Central said; but during that debate I rose to my feet and I said how could the hon. member say that when the constitution not only gives me the *right*, but it places on me the *duty* of making temporary appointments. I said that while the hon. member was speaking; and I would say to the credit of the hon. member that having heard that point, he did not continue to refer to interference. He spoke of victimisation and so on; but he took the point. The Constitution of Barbados says that the Minister responsible for personnel shall make appointments to temporary posts. Those may not be the exact words, but that is the effect of it. In fact the hon. member for St. Michael South Central took the point made by me that the Constitution was changed by the other side to make that possible.

Now, the explanation was omitted by the Advocate; while that original statement from which the Advocate quoted is relevant, specifically but implicitly was given headline prominence – "Haynes: Interference with Public Service Jobs." Now, later down in the story the Minister of Education was reported as saying that on August 1, 1976, 73 people were appointed to the School Meals Service, and they started to work in September, and this is the first time we knew of workers starting off work when they are on holiday. Now something was also omitted from that report. The Hon. Minister of Education said, and other members agreed that the former Leader of the Opposition said, yes, he appointed supporters of his party from his constituency, and that is why he got the 20 votes that got him in. So you have two statements omitted from the Advocate-News story. You have the statement which everybody who was here at the time knows is true, that Mr. Sleepy Smith admitted giving people jobs in the School Meals Service which gave him the 20 votes into the House.

Now this is what I call bias. I do not believe that the reporter himself really wanted to show the Government in a bad position, and the Opposition in a good position; but because the reporter was an old and well established supporter of the Democratic Labour Party he was just not hearing statements adverse to the Opposition. Now, this is one of the most difficult things to deal with in journalism. It is not that people are wicked, but it is that sometimes they are so committed, that they cannot help it.

Mr. Chairman, we meet this situation which causes a great deal of trial and tribulation in the breast of those who are the sufferers. Now, the change of Government obviously could not *ipso facto* change the political allegiance of the people at CBC. That is a fact. There may be people in the newsroom who hold passports of the Democratic Labour Party. They may be known to the Barbados Labour Party; but there is no intention whatsoever of victimisation of those people.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. I said in my speech that I was not being specific. It was the hon. member himself who said when he was Leader of the Opposition that he would not have to worry about CBC because he had about 60% of the people up there.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are not elucidating anything that you were saying.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am really going to appeal to hon. members.

2.50 p.m.

How do hon. members think that we on these benches feel when we used to get a bad break from CBC when we were in Opposition and we feel we are still getting a bad break today? I ask hon. members to be realistic. How do you think we feel when the same people that got reported favourably when we were in Opposition still get reported favourably today? I do not speak for

myself so much. Any hon. member on this side will know that there is a lot of pressure on the man at the top. Well, I said "any hon. member," but only one hon. member will know that. I would like CBC to know, as well as hon. members, that there is a widespread belief among supporters of the Government that the Corporation itself and its news department in particular does not give the Government a fair break.

I want to speak frankly. We have resisted the old system and I am not saying, Mr. Chairman, that because it was done in the past that it must now be done again in the future. We have resisted the old system. I am a little distressed to hear that the management at CBC have evidently not made available to the Chairman a relatively long document which I prepared when I was directly responsible for broadcasting and addressed to the Board. In that document there were one or two matters which relate to the financial structure of CBC which I will not go into. It was communicated to them at the same time that the legal structure of broadcasting was going to be shifted. At the moment the Minister of Communications and Works has general power to give CBC directives about the contents of broadcasts, but I informed the corporation that a new Act would be passed in which responsibility would be concentrated in the Ministry responsible for information. But I also dealt with the content of broadcasts in that letter, and I gave a direction, or perhaps they may have interpreted it as a persuasion. I offered some persuasive words relating to the content of broadcasts. I said that stories which were politically controversial in themselves should be balanced with both points of view being put, and particularly I said, I am not hiding that I especially said this, I said that before CBC broadcast stories which were critical of the Government, the Government should be given an opportunity to put its case as well; not that CBC must necessarily broadcast it as well. I gave some direction relating to religious broadcasts. I discovered that many religious broadcasts which are in fact advertisements were not being treated as such. I mention this because I have been criticised for it by Pastor Holmes Williams. I gave directions that all religious broadcasting which was a paid advertisement should be prefaced by the words that "what follows is a paid advertisement on behalf of a religious group." This does not of course apply to the Church services which are broadcast on Sunday mornings as a public service by CBC. I also gave other directions relating, as far as I recall, to local entertainment and the general content of matter on CBC, but fundamentally there was a direction at CBC relating to balance, that stories politically controversial in themselves must be balanced. I think I also said something about not taking part in the politics of the other Islands within the range of CBC. This may have some bearing on the article published recently in the Nation. In other words, you must not only balance it within Barbados, but you must not allow anybody to have such command of CBC as to constitute interference from a Government-owned station in Barbados with the political affairs of other Islands. The principle of balance was meant to operate throughout the Eastern Caribbean.

I must tell you, Sir, I do not have a day to day responsibility for it, but I have not been happy in recent weeks with the balance of some programmes on CBC. I believe, for example, that the way the teachers' matter has been handled has been doubly unbalanced. I know absolutely nothing about who suggested to CBC that they should select one critical letter where there were others, not critical, to broadcast in connection with the teachers' strike. I see this made the newspapers but I am absolutely assured that the Minister without Portfolio knows nothing of it either. I gather the Chairman has dealt with that. I certainly know nothing about it, but I am going to tell the Chairman of CBC now that some of the broadcasts about the teachers' matter have distinctly not been in harmony with the direction on balance. I am going to say that to him. I cannot recall if I have said it to him before. After all when you consider that there are children under the age of 8 at school in Barbados; if the teachers are going to strike, the Government may wish to know in order to keep the children out of the schools. If the teachers go on a rotary sick-out contrary to the Public Service regulations and do not tell the Government which schools are going to be affected, you can have a lot of little children running about without adequate supervision at some danger to themselves. There is no doubt about that.

I believe that CBC fell into serious error when it did not call the Minister of Education as required by the directions in force to ask them for a comment so that the Ministry of Education could decide whether to make this point, what point to make, what to say about the matter. This is the same thing, Mr. Chairman, which I gather is a matter of criticism in the newspaper which has been produced in the House. I do not think that if hon. members on that side really cast their minds to the issue of teachers that they can consider it right that the teachers' case exclusively should be put over CBC and the Government not for one moment asked what its case might be.

Now we get down to this talk about ministerial interference. To the best of my knowledge there is no interference. This seems to be a magic word – interference. I am just going to say this, Mr. Chairman: CBC is owned by the people of Barbados, but the people of Barbados at any given moment only have one way of expressing themselves, and that is through their representatives elected to the institutions created by the law and constitution of the Island. The Opposition could have had a chance to go on the Board of CBC . The Opposition rejected this at the start of Parliament. They said they were not going on any of the Boards of Government, so I am not hearing any Opposition member criticise us if there are no Opposition M.Ps or others on the Board of CBC. There are other members who are members of the

Democratic Labour Party. The President of the Democratic League of Women, Mrs. Truss, was not only kept on but was re-appointed as a member of the Board of CBC. There may be others who are Dems, I do not even know. But to return to the point of interference, it is suggested that Ministers must not interfere. What could possibly be meant by interference? You give a directive that broadcastings must be balanced; you hear there is going to be no balance in a particular area. Are you not entitled to ring the Chairman and if you cannot find the Chairman – the Chairman can be a very busy man, he is a busy lawyer, he gets around and about and you may not be able always to find him at the many telephone numbers, his constituency office, his house or at his Chambers – you ring the General Manager. I am not speaking necessarily of myself; certainly I am not speaking of any Minister other than those who have responsibility. I have often rung the General Manager. I believe the Minister without Portfolio speaks to the General Manager. We would prefer to speak to the Chairman, but there are situations which arise which create difficulties.

Now I have already said that I am not bringing the past into play to restore the balance in the present, but the hon. member for St. Michael South who is so passionate a democrat today – he has always been on the side of the angels in the matter of CBC of course, I remember when it was taken away from him and I remember the violence of the debate in the House when I tried to refer to it once – but he is so passionately on the side of democracy on this occasion that I would ask him to look at something else. You know roughly the same people are in the news room who were in the news room under the old regime, but all the instances referred to by the hon. member for St. Michael North East, all the occasions referred to, not only with Ministers but Minister's wives, if you do not mind me saying so, Mr. Chairman, they all used to ring CBC and complain about the news. How come these same people never told the Nation this? How come these same people did not know that it was wrong for a Minister to ring CBC, but all of a sudden, now we are in power, they know it is wrong.
3.00 p.m.

Why did not the hon. member say that common loyalty would dictate that the same people who complained to the Nation should in fact complain to the Chairman and rely on the Chairman to defend their case. They used to take all sorts of directives from Ministers, non-Ministers, and yard-fowls and they never complained. I have never heard of Mr. Hall, complaining that a Minister told him what to write when the Democratic Labour Party was in power, but all of a sudden now everybody has every piece of information, every call from a Minister suddenly is known, on the Opposition Benches and appears in the Nation. We have been very patient in the matter and we are fighting to put things down on paper that the News Editor can read, so that he does not have to run about asking for directions or otherwise. We are struggling with that.

The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, has sent me certain questions to deal with. Some obviously cannot be answered because he is asking what Senator Barrow did. Now I am going to give you an example of this same news story about Grenada so that you would have an idea of what we had to put up with at CBC. I was telephoned at home.

Dr. HAYNES: My handwriting is very difficult to read and I can actually ask you the questions so you can answer them if you prefer.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am reading the first question which relates to CBC being called to stop further publications of a release. Now I would say what apparently actually happened. A News Release was made by the Democratic Labour Party relating to Grenada. Barbados Rediffusion rang me and politely asked if I had any comments on it; Rediffusion, not the Government Station. I gave them a statement. CBC got the Opposition release and broadcast it. They never thought of asking the Minister of External Affairs nor the Prime Minister. I called Mr. Agard, my Press Secretary, and I said, "Denzil, please ring Rediffusion, get the words of the Statement I have given to them and let the rest of the Media have it."

The next day I gathered that there was a discussion about carrying my statement on CBC. I am informed, and I have no reason to doubt, that the News Room was told, they could carry the Democratic Labour Party's Statement but they should carry the Prime Minister's as well, so the News Room did not carry either. Now who has a complaint in that regard? The Opposition, or the Government who did not have the opportunity of having the Prime Minister's response broadcast. You see, you hear things and when you hear them from polluted sources you get a little cancer in your ear. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central should be concerned with getting out that cancer, not speading it.

Now we understand it is necessary for all Newscasts to be forwarded to the Government Information Service the following day? The Government Information Service is making efforts to collect the news that goes out about Barbados. We have asked Reuter-Cana to supply us with News on Barbados. We are negotiating to pay for it. We have asked CBC to supply us with the stories. They do not go to the Prime Minister's Office. I can assure hon. members of that. They go to the Government Information Service Office. I think they asked me recently how long they should be kept and I said so many and so many months. I cannot conceive what is wrong or bad about that. Do you mean that CBC has something to hide? The 7.30 p.m. News is seen by 80,000 people and they want

to hide it? This is a matter of commonsense, Sir. The British Broadcasting Corporation has a whole machinery preserving "As Broadcast" scripts. When I worked there I remember all the complications of having to send out 3 copies to the appropriate Departments. I really cannot see what is objectionable about that but if hon. members want to make that a matter of accusation, you cannot stop them.

The next question the honourable Member asks is: "What Ministers have been sending to the station to find out who covered what stories?" I do not know what Minister has tried to find out who covered what story. I have enquired among my colleagues and I believe that sometimes it is the habit, as indeed it was when I was in Opposition, among some people to ring CBC and very politely ask what was in a story. Sometimes you ring and ask for a cricket score.

Yesterday we were trying to deal with the Grenada situation. I was here in the House of Assembly and asked the Minister of External Affairs to keep in touch with CBC, who were themselves keeping in touch with a rally which Mr. Bishop was holding in Grenada to collect certain News. This was while I was on the telephone to Mr. Michael Manley as I wished to tell him the News. Are we now really to be criticised because we ring CBC to find out something, not to tell them? Or because we ask "who is covering the story, ask him to ring me"; or "who covered the story I want to find out so-and-so?"

The hon. member for St. John can ask Michael Manley whether when he was speaking in the House yesterday, I was not on the telephone to Mr. Manley saying "I am listening to Dipper speaking and at the same time I am waiting on Henry to find out from our Broadcasting Station what Bishop has said." If these things now are to be carried in little petty gossip style "he say, who say, I say" and that sort of thing what then is to become of us?

Next question. Whether instructions were given on Monday to play down the Barbados Union of Teachers? I cannot possibly answer that. I know I was very angry that CBC allowed itself on Monday to be used as a Mobilisation Centre for a sick-out without the Ministry of Education having an input.
3.10 p.m.

I didn't give any instructions, but I was angry then and I'm still angry now. I gave no instructions. "Whether yesterday the staff demanded a meeting with management to discuss the question of an interview by Mr. Nigel Barrow and yourself" – meaning me? If the staff wants a meeting with Mr. Nigel Barrow and me, they will get it. They have something to say to me, I have something to say to them, they will get it, and I only hope the Estimates will allow me to deal with it this very week. No meeting has taken place that I know of.

Sir, you know this business of bias in journalism is a very difficult thing. I was at the BBC during the Suez crisis, I remember all the bitterness that went on when the BBC was accused of being too pro-Arab merely because it tried to put the Arabs' case. Ministers used to ring the Overseas Service of the BBC when the Palestinians who worked at the BBC threatened to go on strike if they were not allowed to say this and that. It is not confined to Barbados; what is different about Barbados is that for the first time we are making a desperate effort to try to balance CBC but the events of recent weeks and today's debate as reported to me are convincing me that we have taken on a task which is practically beyond human capacity, that in certain people's own interests and without any loss or anything like that, that it may be best to ask people to consider their positions. Whether they within themselves feel capable of handling responsibilities if they have such strong political feelings in particular directions. That is absolutely all I can say.

I read things about somebody going to Montserrat. I have never heard in my life that that gentleman going to Montserrat had anything to do with politics. I regret that he has gone, I would be glad if he were here, I have never had it suggested for a second that it had anything to do with politics.

Now, a question by the Honourable Member for St. Michael South relating to the Mobile Cinema shows in St. Thomas. The answer is that during 1978 there were two shows at Southborough playing field, four at the St. Thomas District Hospital, three at Glendale Children's Home, three at District D Police Station and three at Bagatelle; that is fifteen in all. During 1979 there have so far been two at the Children's Home, one at Bagatelle and two at the Police Station. I hope the hon. member is satisfied. I don't think that 20 shows in 15 months is unreasonable for a parish with over 6,000 electors.

Mr. Chairman, CBC is an intractable problem where this matter of political influence is concerned. I am letting the Chairman know that I think we are reaching very near the end, we cannot go on in a situation where a man in a job is under torment because he has not got it in him to deal with political issues in a balanced way, and his superiors are in torment because they want to be fair to him and do not want him to suffer economically in any way whatsoever. I am saying that and I am saying it in a quite considered way, I very very much hope that we can reach some conclusion where all hon. members will have a fair deal. Hon. members opposite must know, you must know that you get a fairer deal from CBC than we ever got; you must know that. You have access; the present Leader of the Opposition has never been insulted by calling a Press Conference and CBC refusing to attend, that has never happened. He has never been insulted by calling a Press Conference and have a Minister go on

immediately after him and take up a piece of paper to say that he was lying. (Dr. HAYNES: It happened to me in the bye-election). The hon. member for St. Michael South Central doesn't seem to wish to draw the obvious conclusion. Perhaps he was quoting from page 65 on that occasion as well; that is all I can say.

But can hon. members remember an occasion in 1975 when as has now been accepted, a matter which has now been accepted. Can hon. members recall a newscast at CBC opening with the words from Mr. Trevor Simpson, "Lies, Lies, Lies – this is what the Leader of the Opposition has been accused of telling," and so on? The hon. member for St. John has never been insulted in that way on CBC; never! *(Aside).* No, I don't mind that, if a man says "Keep Dipper Skipper" after he has got in, I don't mind that, the man might be looking forward to his duty free car and so on, so I cannot complain about that, but hon. members opposite have to know that they have access to the Corporation. Indeed, the people who seem not to have access to the Corporation are hon. members on this side. Nobody from CBC ever rings to ask any Minister anything, they never ring to get a comment, they come and they follow us faithfully when prepared speeches are made, they broadcast stories on CBC, that reflect on the Government, they never think to give the Government a chance to say something; and this is a problem the Opposition doesn't have because the Opposition is not doing things. The Opposition is in a position of criticism, its interest is getting its comments in, not its actions and activities, so the Opposition has never complained that it has been misrepresented. What it has said is that its representation on this occasion, I gather, has not been fully presented, but I believe I have explained that, that having been given leave to broadcast both statements the News Room then declined to broadcast either, and so you see, Sir, we get these debates that go on for hours and hours, people forget, Eric Sealy's political meetings get filmed, Eric Sealy appears on TV in connection with the bye-election campaign of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central was given every opportunity to put his case to the people. Even Haddock was given an opportunity. These are dignities and privileges which were never accorded to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Leave me out of it, I had no say with them when they were in power on television and the media, leave me out of it.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Of course you had no say, Sir, and it really is unkind to ourselves, because this debate now has clearly brought a matter to a head, and it is unkind to ourselves for us to be criticising ourselves in this way. The CBC Board, I believe, is as fair a Board as you could want to pick in all the circumstances.

3.20 p.m.

I do not think there is a single really partisan person on that Board *(Asides)* I do not think anybody considers Lawson Bayley an outstandingly partisan figure – except perhaps the lady to whom I have just referred, but still we are going on and on with these unreasonable criticisms. The Ministers have duty to maintain standards, to make sure that the directions in maintaining balance are observed and to stop CBC from making an ass of itself. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael North West has already dealt with one matter with which I am very glad not to have to deal.

Dr. HAYNES: I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the fact that a certain directive went to CBC from the Minister of Information, and were it not for the intervention of, I think, the Chairman of CBC, it might have run CBC into a lot of financial problems in relation to copyrights, etc, and I think you need to look very carefully at the activities of one of your Ministers.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: That is day to day management; I cannot entertain complaints about Ministers. I can only say that I have some trust in the hon. member for St. Michael North West as the Chairman, I have trust in Senator Enid Lynch as Deputy Chairman, I have trust in members of the Board – Mr. Gibbons the financial man, the Chief Information Officer, Mr. Truss, Mr. Lawson Bayley representing journalism. I invited somebody from the Advocate to sit on the Board and they said the Thompson organization would not let them. The public will have to judge. I know I received almost as many complaints from members of our party about CBC now we are in power as when we were in Opposition. It means you just can't please everybody, but it also means that the Opposition's case is being put with sufficient force on CBC to make us feel on this side that we are doing a better job of balance, of fairness and of ensuring democracy than at any time previously.

I regret I was not here for the entire debate, but I am sure the public will judge in this matter of CBC and will see that we are trying our hardest to restore a little fairness and balance to the publicly owned media in this country.

The question that the sum of $195,927 under Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office – (2) Government Information Office stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5 – PRIME MINISTER's OFFICE
(3) ELECTORAL OFFICE

Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (3) Electoral Office – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $479,700 under Head 5 – Prime Minis-

ter's Office (3) Electoral Office stand part of the Schedule.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I beg to second that and would like to say that I read in the Press that the Leader of the Opposition has called for scrutineers to accompany the enumerators who are carrying out the exercises under the Electoral Office. I could have wished that he had written to my office or raised the matter in the House on an earlier occasion, because I raised this matter in the House many years ago, around 1965, I think, and asked Mr. Cameron Tudor to agree that scrutineers accompany the enumerators. So this matter was given some prominence in the Press and I really think we should give it a little thought. The Government on that occasion did not agree with the idea. If you have recourse to the debates you would see that I drew attention to the Jamaican example where scrutineers accompany the enumerators. The Government has absolutely no objection to scrutineers accompanying the enumerators, but it is not something I can achieve when I know of the desire of the Opposition to have this only by reading about it in the newspaper as a matter of attack rather than a matter of request. The enumeration exercise has been put off on several occasions...

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: If the hon. member will give way, in the first place we were not even aware of the enumeration. The House was not informed of the enumerators, the dates of their appointments and so on, and there was no way we could know. I certainly did not know about the enumerators or even that registration was taking place, so I do not see how the hon. member can ask me to write a letter about enumerators. I was not in the House when he raised the point, but had I been here at the time he got that answer from the Deputy Prime Minister he probably would have got a different response from me.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I spoke about enumeration in here a lot. Since September last year I have been trying to explain about the enumeration. The hon. member must have some knowledge of the fact that there are enumerators since he is able to say that they are all political appointees; he must know who they are if he knows what their politics are, so I cannot altogether accept his innocence in that regard. But at least I can give hon. members the assurance that the Chief Electoral Officer will be told in no uncertain terms – and this will be a directive he will be glad for -- but we must not have a situation where persons who are electoral officers take part in the election process by appearing as nominators or seconders of candidates. I went into the polling station in Redmans Village in 1971 and there was a lady, a Mrs. Carmichael, who signed Mr. Boxill's paper, and there she was receiving votes, and threatened to call a policeman to order me out of the polling station. I do not believe that the country will even see a recurrence like that, or a situation like in the case of the hon. member for Christ Church West where either two or three of his opponents – referees, nominators or seconders – I think subscribers is the electoral term – turned up as electoral officers. But as far as scrutineers are concerned, at this late stage I would like to do what I can.

But before I finish I must deal with the experience of the hon. member for St. James who in 1976 while the count was going on, after the Barbados Labour Party had fourteen or fifteen seats, was trying to persuade the Returning Officer to count the votes and the Returning Officer said he would have to ask the Attorney General. So we have had to put up with a lot of that. All that I can offer hon. members is that I will ask the Chief Electoral Officer if it will be possible for him – since the programme must start in the first week in April – to give any indication of enumerators routes and operations and if he can make available at an early stage the names of those enumerators so that they can come under the scrutiny of hon. members opposite, whether individually or as a political party.

It is intended that there will be a Registration of Political Parties Act and that political parties will have a legal entity. At present they are no more in law than non-proprietary members' clubs. That is the present status of political parties, but the parties represented in Parliament are the parties which are qualified. I am prepared to do the best I can and will ask the Electoral Officer to make arrangements for early scrutiny of what is being done in the enumeration.

I fully agree with the exhortation of the Leader of the Opposition that if the enumerator does not come to your house, make sure you seek him out or the Chief Electoral Officer. Make sure you do not encourage the enumerators to put down the names of people who do not live in the house or have gone away for more than five years, to make sure that there is no padding of the list. On the other hand, also make sure that nobody who should be on the list is left out. I would join with the Leader of the Opposition in this. We have the same interest as he has in having an accurate electoral list; we want an accurate list. And I can reveal to the House that I have so much confidence in the Electoral Office and the determination of those at the top to maintain a fair electoral process that I have offered technical assistance to the new Revolutionary regime in Grenada for sampling of their list or giving any assistance they need in having a proper electoral list drawn up for the new elections which we all hope they will have.

3.30 p.m.

I therefore sincerely urge on hon. members on the other side to believe that this Government has absolutely no wish to have other than the fairest possible electoral practices in Barbados. We have no desire, if we are going to win an election, to have any suggestion that we won it

by unfair means. We want the election to be fair so that we can win it fair and square and without any accusation of foul play from that side. Not in Barbados is any Opposition going to use the excuse of a rigged election in order to mobilise violence in order to overthrow a Government.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to ask the Minister responsible for the Electoral Office a question. Yesterday there was quite a debate on the subject of passes for the Port. I would just like to know what is Government's policy in respect of the availability of the computer print out of electoral lists for members of Parliament. I understand that these come out once a year and one was recently issued. I wonder if these are available, particularly to members of Parliament and what is the Government's policy in that regard. Members of Parliament have a particular interest in the electoral voters lists.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They can still be bought. The law still provides for them to be bought. There is no reason why you cannot buy one as you have always been able to. As a matter of fact you will get it at a less cost now because you will get one list at one time. You can go and inspect your monthly list and make your emendations and your additions. The law relating to the availability of these lists has not changed.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Just briefly, Sir, I would like to support the Hon. Prime Minister on this aspect of looking at the whole electoral practice in Barbados. Political parties would have their problems. I do not know if members of Parliament are well aware of the fact that we have something like ten political parties in Barbados. You have Mrs. Gertrude Eastmond's political party. You have the PPM under Mr. Sealy. You have Mr. Bobby Clarke, Mr. Reggie Hunte and Mr. Cally Mottley; and then you have the PDM, the BLP and the DLP and two others. I think that the Hon. Prime Minister was not aware of the fact that we have so many parties in Barbados. I think that the salient point which the House should take into consideration is that.

Mr. GREAVES: On the question of registration I believe that the Prime Minister has an opportunity now to give the House some detailed explanation about the kind of registration that is taking place. As I understand it, the Government proposes to carry out registration of all persons and there will be a special ID card of a particular colour which would I believe have the age of 16, and I think another colour which would give the age of over 16. I am wondering if the Prime Minister does not think that it would be in everybody's interest to give detailed information, because it is a matter which is of some concern to hon. members.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately I am not up to date on what took place on Sunday. What I do know is that we are planning differently coloured cards for different classes of people. I do not know at the moment what has been decided in respect of using particular coloured cards for foreigners. I do not know what has been decided on using different types of cards for different types of adults. I can tell you now what I do know. Hon. members will recall that this is not the first time that persons who are not voters have been registered; but registration is now necessary because of the prospect National Health Service; and children whose faces change quickly are not suitable for photographing since there are not eligible to go to vote. Their features change, and that is the reason for having a different coloured card for people under the age of 16 because of the rapidity that child's appearance changes.

Now, this information will be coded. You will not be able to look at the code and say that the person is so and so old, but if you can read the code, the personal numbers will be only the last four digits. I think that the last three digits will show whether you were born in Barbados or not. This is a system based on the Swedish system and it will be for life.

3.40 p.m.

There is a dash in the number. When you are over a hundred you will turn in your card and it would become a plus sign because if you did not do that you would get duplication of a number. The only way you can get duplication of a number is people who live to be more than 100. The whole process is still being analysed. All sorts of refinements are put up, and you have a special code of numbers for persons who acquire citizenship by registration, by descent and by birth. There is all that in it. I am not, as I said, sure of what the recommendations are going to be on this point. There is nothing that seems mysterious about the numbers. There is no provision for changing the number if you change your sex, but if hon. members would like that done I can put it to those responsible. There is a Committee under the Chairmanship of the Head of the Civil Service but everything that you hear concerning a number has been thought out. We have been giving thought to this for well over a year and we have really been trying to get down to what is required in a major exercise and of course final exercise, because when we subsume the National Insurance numbers with the electoral numbers and use them also for the purpose of national health we will not have to give new sets of numbers. I do not know if the Chief Electoral Officer proposes to print everybody's I.D. number in the new voters list or whether he will return just to printing the numbers in succession or allow the cards to be used. I am not sure whether this has been finally decided yet, but all these possibilities are under consideration, and if hon.

members would like a lecture or an opportunity for a little seminar, I am absolutely sure I can arrange for it to be held.

I can see the hon. member for St. Lucy might have an interest in it over and above that of being an ordinary member of Parliament because he as a workers' representative may be interested in this matter. Perhaps I will canvass the views of hon. members whether it would not be in the interest of the House to have an opportunity of getting a little technical instruction on exactly what is involved in the new numbering system.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I heard the Prime Minister mention categories of numbers and I was wondering if in this registration of numbers prisoners' numbers will be included, or if he can give some indication if anybody who has a number from Glendairy Prison will be accommodated on that card.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The Government of Barbados far from seeking to classify persons forever as prisoners based upon the peccadillos of childhood is giving more consideration to legislation which will direct that after a certain time a man is regarded as having paid his penalty to society than it is to seeking to hound down people for the misfortune that they may have encountered earlier in life. It seems to be a matter of amusement. I do not see it as a matter of amusement. What I know is that in this country we are extremely fortunate that our penal institutions and our systems of justice have always had a very powerful reformatory aspect on those who pass through them, and I think that we should congratulate ourselves that so many people who may have convictions in this country have convictions on only one occasion, and so many people who may have become prisoners have taken their place as outstanding citizens of Barbados and as people of whom we can all be proud for having overcome very serious difficulties and handicaps to achieve the position that they are in today, not only in Barbados, but we have citizens who have had misfortunes of the sort referred to by the hon. member in youth who have made their mark in this country, in the Caribbean and in the entire world, and I congratulate them. There may be many who can only say "there but for the grace of God go I" and that should be our attitude I think in these matters and not seeking to run down and drag down our institutions and our people who are respected widely in society.

The question that the sum of $479,700 under Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (3) Electoral Office – stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 5 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (4) ARCHIVES

Head 5 – Ministry of Education and Culture (4) Archives – was called.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Head 5 (4) – Archives is headed up in my copy to "Ministry of Education and Culture"; it should be headed by "Prime Minister's Office. I do not know how that happened because it would not be in Head 5 if it were not. It has been corrected in the Errata. It has been transferred to the Prime Minister's Office along with the responsibility for the Barbados Museum. We think that this more precisely attaches itself to the Government Information Service than to the Minister of Education, and we have therefore transferred it appropriately. We have a Capital Head also related to Archives. I will deal with that when it is called.

I beg to move that the sum of $54,446 under Head 5 – Prime Minister's Office (4) Archives – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to be long on this, but I am not certain that I understood the arguments clearly for the transfer of Archives and the Museum from the Ministry of Education to the Prime Minister's Office and the connection between those and the Government Information Service. It appears to me to be a bit strange that you would have a Ministry of Education and cultural and educational institutions such as Archives and Museum would be transferred from the Ministry of Education and Culture and into a Ministry which is already burdened with a large number of subjects. I am wondering if the Minister responsible could expand a little on this. I hope it is not a case that some subjects are being taken away from a particular Ministry and given to another Ministry which may have additional Ministers. I am not certain. I am just speculating in this. We now have a Minister in the Prime Minister's Office, so we are following the Trinidad model. We have not heard a designation. We have a Minister in the Prime Minister's Office and I am wondering if these subjects are being put into that Ministry to increase his workload. I myself believe that Museums and Archives represent institutions which are cultural in their nature and educational in their nature, and I am not certain they are Prime Ministerial in their nature, but may be so. 3.50 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member's beliefs are a matter of opinion, I think so because the hon. member has answered himself. There is a very heavy workload on the Minister of Education and my beliefs are that the subjects of the Museum and the Archives are as readily attachable to Information as to Education. After all, the Ministry of Information is not a Ministry of Propaganda. It is a Ministry which has to deal with culture.

I think that hon. members when they see the film which the Government Information Service is preparing about the first free black village in Barbados, at Rock Hall in St. Thomas, they will appreciate the very fine work that

can be done by the Information Office in what is basically the field of cultural information. I think the hon. member should be prepared to accept that it is a proper function of the Ministry of Education to make a film about those early days of emancipation. I am sure it would be a proper function for them to have custody under a common Ministry of the Archives relating to a period and the exhibits in the Museum.

Certainly, I happen to think, Mr. Chairman, that as far as bringing in the Museum is concern, that a new initiative is needed at the Museum and also at the Archives. It is not to be regarded as any reflection of inability on the last three Ministers of Education. Mr. Sleepy Smith apart, we have not had an incompetent Minister of Education since Mr. Cameron Tudor but the Ministers have been very heavily over-worked and I think that the hon. member for St. Michael South would be the first to admit that he was not able to give any time during his period to go up to the Museum to see if the feathers were falling off the stuffed birds, if it were not justifiable to bring into Barbados birds which were not represented at the Museum, whether the state of the grounds at the Museum were not such as to see if the Government would give a little supplement to purchase furniture, as the case may be.

I myself, Mr. Chairman, in my very small way am attempting, since I have the vote for works of Art, I am straining a little bit to buy Maps for use in the Prime Minister's Office which are of archival interest. We own Maps of Barbados which do not exist in the Museum. I have one or two Maps, two of my own and one of the Government's in my office. I think the hon. member should have a new look at the relevance of the Archives and the development of the Museum and see that the Minister should have a less weighty responsibility on him.

There is talk at the moment of establishing a Government Micro-filming Centre. It is nice to be able to know that there is a Minister who can deal with this and not have a more pressing Department to occupy his time and attention. I think there are programmes which Governments could usefully carry out of a cultural nature and a nature unrelated to the economic development which could sometimes best be handled by Ministers without portfolios or a Minister who brings talent to his task without having any Departmental worry which would clog up his energies in other directions.

I do not wish to revert to CBC any longer but I felt very strongly when I was Minister there that the whole structure, and I do not mean employment, I do not mean the staff, but I mean the structure of the Corporation, the Act itself needed revising. I think I can go on record here in saying that I believe that CBC should have a Share Capital like the Barbados National Bank or the Natural Gas Corporation but in a different sphere together and I have said that I believe that shares can be offered to the Barbados Workers' Union.

I must tell you, Mr. Chairman, as Minister of Finance and as Minister of Defence and Security I have just simply not been able to follow up. All I have done is to write in the course of a year, I believe, about eight or ten times, insisted that this be done. I just do not have the time, day to day to sit down and set out my ideas clearly on this concern. I think that the burden of work that attends certain Ministries should be well known to any former member of Cabinet and I think these areas need their own Ministers. I think this is how they look at it. I do not think that the Archives felt they should have their own Minister. They had a good Minister, they felt, until Sleepy Smith came along but they might have felt they had their own Minister and I think that is what we are giving them now.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear these remarks about sharing the workload and it is a pity that the member for Christ Church South Central is not here today because he might well want to make a claim to be relieved of certain workload elements. Unfortunately, I thought that the Hon. Prime Minister was still introducing Head 5(3) when I was outside but the Minister to whom this will be assigned might well be fully occupied with the electoral boundaries over the next 18 months or so. I am not discussing Head 5(3), Mr. Chairman, I notice the movement of your right hand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is it on the draw?

Dr. HAYNES: However, I want to say this that I must state my public objection to the attempt by the Hon. Minister of Finance to take away certain subjects from the Ministry of Education, including the planned removal of Culture because despite the very serious attacks made on me by the member for St. George South in this House, as a senior member of the family, I have the responsibility to make sure that he is not treated in that manner. I will call on the Hon. Prime Minister not to continue this process of embarrassing the Hon. Minister of Education by removing.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will ask the hon. member to withdraw that. You cannot accuse the Prime Minister of improper motives, of doing something to embarrass a member. No, it must be withdrawn.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to embarrass anybody.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will embarrass yourself with the Chair. Please withdraw.

Dr. HAYNES: I withdraw the remarks. All I am saying is that I am somewhat concerned that in the area

in which the Hon. Minister of Education has functioned most efficiently in the cultural area that it will be removed from the Ministry probably to force his resignation from Parliament. I feel I have a duty, despite attacks made on me which I have to over-look because of my seniority. I have a duty to make some public expression on that matter.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, a lot of what has been said I have not really heard but I can assure the hon. member that nobody in here or outside can force me out of Parliament. Only the people of St. George South will determine that.

The question that the sum of $54,446 under Head 5 – Ministry of Education and Culture – Archives (4) – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

4.00 p.m.

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE – HEAD 105 PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This amendment relates to the micro-filming centre that I spoke about, and it reads as follows: "Under Item 2 – Archives delete the figure '30,000' and insert '105,000'. Delete the total '132,300' and insert '207,300'. Under the heading Explanatory Notes amend Note 2 by the addition of the words: 'Also provides for the establishment of a Micro-filming Centre'. Under the heading Analysis of Expenditure, Plant and Equipment should be changed to '187,300' and '132,300' should be deleted."

Item 1 – Plant and Equipment. The equipment at the Government Information Service in the filming department has become out of date and it is necessary to have a video cassette recorder. These things do cost money and we are seeking to provide that and to buy another video camera for the GIS. These things of course are also related to development in other departments, in fact there are three Government Departments. I discovered that the Audio Visual Aids Unit has equipment CBC and the GIS don't have, that the GIS has equipment CBC doesn't have and so on, and we are trying to rationalise it, but we do need to spend over $100,000 in buying this. In the end it might save money, we just had to send Mr. Byer, a very capable photographer at the Government Information Service who has done so much good work in the past in caring this equipment, we have had to send him to London to assist in the editing of film that we have to send up to London to be edited, and I hope that we will be able to establish facilities down here which would save that kind of money, save trips abroad and the despatch of film abroad, and so we are giving them $200,000 in equipment.

While I am on my feet, I hope there are receptive ears to hear and I hope they have ordered the equipment already and not waiting until the end of the financial year so that perhaps it may not come in time. As far as I am concerned, Sir, the money will be released next month if the occasion arises.

At the Archives, we are constructing a block down at the site and we are also buying further plant and equipment for the preservation of records as set out in the Note, but we are moving towards this Microfilming Centre. Again, when we get down to it, Sir, every year you get requisitions; I think the first year we were asked for over a hundred filing cabinets, the following year I managed to persuade Government Departments to cut down their demands to only 40, but the number of filing cabinets that you would have to buy every year if you give all the departments all they ask for would pay for a microfilming centre in two years, and I think it is time for us to make up our minds which of our records can be microfilmed and microfilm them accordingly so as to save pressure on storage space in Government Departments. There are also of course numerous documents and books down at the Archives itself which can be microfilmed for archival purposes as opposed to the mere purpose of storing the Government records.

I have every hope that this money will be spent during the year, Sir, and that we will be able to report in next year's Estimates that we have got a good way on with this project.

I beg to move that the sum of $207,300 under Capital Expenditure – Head 105 – Prime Minister's Office – as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

HEAD 15(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,398,204 under Ministry of Education and Culture – Head 15(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two matters which I want to ask a question on relative to the Direction and Policy Formulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture.

I believe that the time has come for us to leave it to the Government to set out some very clearly defined directives for the educational programme in this country. One becomes very concerned about the quality of people who are coming out of the school system and about their ability to be able to function and to operate effectively in the society, and it is a matter of some very serious concern. One has come across – certainly I have come across and the member for St. Michael South West who is not in his seat was discussing this here today – we have been noticing, and it has been drawn to our attention, the number of people who are at present coming out of the school system at the primary level in particular, and some who have been coming out of the secondary level of education who are finding it very very difficult to be able to read and write, and indeed some of them are illiterate, and when one finds this kind of situation one must ask very very clearly oneself a number of questions. I know that one could argue that in two and a half years' time a child's school career does not begin and end, but the point is that whether or not the Democratic Labour Party had been in charge of education in this country for X number of years the fact of the matter is that we have to be concerned about the position now, we have therefore to be concerned with setting down some very clear guidelines, outlining our purposes, and the methods by which we propose to achieve certain objectives.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we have got to be able to develop and devise an educational system which will provide persons emerging therefrom with a developed critical faculty, the ability to be able to look at a problem to be able to arrive based on a certain judgement and certain experiences to be able to bring to bear, at a well reasoned and well balanced position, and that I think is a very important aspect.
4.10 p.m.

That is I think a very important aspect, and I also believe that we have got to place much more emphasis on being able to produce people who can function and play a meaningful role in the society. One has to be very concerned with the fact that at present there are still large numbers of people who on leaving school cannot realy fit into what is required in the society. Only yesterday one heard the Minister of Education making the point that within a couple of months, because of the building boom which he is predicting, Barbados will probably have to import artisans – carpenters etc., and this I believe is one of the most serious indictments of the educational system that one can have. Here we have a situation where in spite of the large sums of money spent on education we are at a situation where we are talking about importing carpenters, masons, electricians etc. This is a matter of national concern which must concern each and everyone of us, and I believe the time has come for us to get some very clear and detailed outline of the kind of policy we will be pursuing in order to deal with this particular problem and more fully equip people who are going to be the leaders and future workers of this country. I recall that when the present administration took over the reins of Government a policy was initiated that fourteen-year olds who were previously not allowed to remain in the primary school system would return to school up to age 16. If I remember rightly the school age was extended to age 16, and I think it is two and a half years since that policy has been put into operation. I believe therefore that the Minister of Education should be in a position to give us some progress report about this particular policy matter, because I have been told that particularly in the all-age schools there are a number of problems and at some centres set up in the country where some of these fourteen-sixteen year olds go to school there are a number of problems. For example, I can speak authoritatively of Speightstown where a number of children at the present time undergoing some form of education or at least attending a particular building for purposes which should be educational, a number of people who have been watching what has been going on in that particular area are concerned about what appears to be the aimlessness of the students of that institution. There are reports that some leave to go to Farley Hill for activities relating to horticulture, but rather than go there they go to the East Coast Road or on jolly rides, and students from that area are found at all hours of the day walking about the shops in Speightstown. We would like to know what kind of planning has gone into this programme and whether there has been any success with it, because I believe that when it comes to expenditure of taxpayers' money we have to be satisfied that maximum use is being made of it. I am not at all attacking the idea of returning the fourteen-year olds to a learning situation but it has to be properly supervised and administered, and I think there is need for a clear policy on this matter.

While on this matter of schools which have been designated as all-age schools, I believe for example that pupils of the Speightstown Boys School and of some other schools of around the age of sixteen, one gets the impression that the teachers and pupils who should be involved in giving training and education to these people do not really know what they are required to do and are not provided with the tools and books which would enable the pupils to have a useful day at the school, so that one must therefore question the policy. I think there must be very clearly defined policies in this particular area because it is no use having children in school just for the sake of being there but doing nothing, for that is one way of turning out people who have little or no hope of becoming involved in national development. This can cause considerable problems in the society because you are producing people who cannot make a contribution to the society. So one must therefore be concerned about this.

On the question of policy formulation and direction I would like to raise some other issues. Under Item 10

there is a sum of money we are being asked to vote and the Note says "Provides for cost of public examination at Educational Institutions, refund of Examination fees to pupils of Private Secondary Schools, expenses of local School Leaving Certificate and other miscellaneous expenses".

I want to pay a little attention to the Local School Leaving Certificate. This is something which has been in the schools for some years now but yet I am not sure of the status of the School Leaving Certificate within the entire policy of the Ministry of Education, because it has been drawn to my attention that a person having the School Leaving Certificate who wants to go the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic still has to sit an examination to get a place at the Polytechnic. I am not sure if this is due to pressure on that Institution or whether it is an attempt at sifting out in spite of the School Leaving Certificate, but it would seem to me some kind of importance must be given to the School Leaving Certificate or it would not be worth having. So I would like to get some indication of the objectives of the educational philosophy at this time.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply to the points raised by the hon. member, he quite rightly states that the educational system in Barbados has in recent years been turning out a number of children ill-fitted to take on the responsibility of work and adult life. He also stated that it could not be a matter of what has been done in the educational system over the past two years because you do not produce a finished product in education in two years, so that the problem is one of long standing.

I do not profess to have the answers for all the educational problems in this country. It is common for politicians to pretend to know everything about everything, and in education everybody seems to be an authority – the teachers, the parents, everybody seems to have the solutions to the problems, and I am coming to a very difficult position of having to evaluate a series of conflicting opinions as to what position I should take on educational policies. Even among the professionals in my department there is not always a common position on any one issue. Having stated that perhaps I can now deal with some of the problems involved.

I have no doubt at all that many of the problems in educational output in this country are based on the low priority that has been given to primary education by the last administration. There was a time when a good Seventh Standard boy was good enough to do almost anything in Barbados. This is no longer true, so something must be happening in the system at the primary level. 4.20 p.m.

I am not trying to get at anyone. I am not trying to get at any individual or group of individuals; but in the old days many of the people who graduated from the secondary schools went into the teaching service because there were no opportunities to go to universities, to go into business places in Bridgetown or into the banks and so on; and many of the best graduates from the secondary schools found themselves in the teaching service. I could call a list of names eminent educators in the primary system of 20, 30 or 40 years ago. You are getting this situation now because there are greater attractions in the business places, in insurance companies, in banks, airlines and so on which offer more attractive jobs than the teaching service.

Before the end of the day I will make a few confessions about the position in the teaching service and what the needs are, and what will have to be done if we are expected to raise the standards to what they used to be before and not to have it said that our educational system has reached so low a depth that we should be alarmed. We still are producing students of excellence. And I believe that we will continue to produce them. If I may go back for a moment or so to the genesis of the problem where our primary educational system is concerned, it was a total disregard for primary education in the last few decades or so.

There was this headlong rush to build more secondary schools and to find more secondary school places, and to upgrade the status and put everything in secondary schools; and in the process there was some disregard for what was happening in the primary schools. It is not only policy which is responsible for this, because a number of parents still feel that their child was special if he or she was going to Combermere, or Lodge School, or Harrison College or Queens College; but they never thought that their children too were special if they were going to St. Bernard's Primary of St. Augustine Boys', or Selah or Beulah; so it is partly the fault of the parents; and it is evident even at the secondary level that if a parent has a child going to Harrison College and one going to St. Leonards, that the one at Harrison College is going to get everything that he wants – a tennis racket or a hockey stick, several changes of clothes and a lot of money for lunch; but the one going to St. Leonard's Boys' is made to understand that he is not as good as the other fellow and therefore he has got to put up with a lot less.

That has a lot to do with the attitudes of people in Barbados. Now, I am making a very conscious effort to redress the imbalance. I am trying to throw emphasis back upon primary education. When I visit schools in this island – and I have been doing so in a consistent way for the past few years – not like my predecessors in office who every time that they are going to visit a school must carry an Advocate photographer and the CBC-TV people. I do it quietly; but I visit the schools on a regular basis, and I am absolutely alarmed at the prevailing conditions

at the primary schools in Barbados. I go as far as to say that there are a number of primary schools in Barbados that are unfit for any children to go to for education.

I do not want to spend too much time on this Head; but there are about 119 primary schools in Barbados, and it is imperitive that the Government spend money for the maintenance and upkeep of a certain number of these schools to make sure that the state of disrepair does not happen all at once. Very little money was spent by the previous administration on the upkeep and maintenance of primary schools; and we have the situation now where people who go to high schools, go in pleasant and amenable surroundings and who go home from high school in good, pleasant and amenable surroundings. They take up a few certificates at high school or at secondary schools and then they have to go and teach in a primary school where the toilet is in the yard, and the teacher gets wet when going into the school from the yard. A number of these schools are not enclosed, and therefore the neighbours can see everytime that Miss So and So leaves to go to the toilet; and that is one of the reasons why well qualified teachers are reluctant to go into the primary schools teaching service. That is why they will go to work at Barclays Bank or at the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce because they do not have to walk through the rain to go to the toilet in the yard nor do you have the neighbours keeping a tally on your movements.

These are some of the situations that I am finding in some of the schools in Barbados; and I want to declare right now that the capital cost of putting these schools into a proper state is so great to right the imbalance, that it is inconceivable that we can redress it right now. If I had $20 million to put all the schools into an acceptable standard, that money would not be enough.

Take for example the West St. Joseph School. I went there only last week Friday, and I was utterly appalled at the conditions that obtained there. I have asked the officers in my Ministry to give top priority to the improvement of that school; because I cannot in good conscience be responsible for that type of building as a part of our educational system. The member for St. Lucy raised the question of the 14 plus children who were returned to school. I have spoken a lot about that on platforms and in this chamber.
4.30 p.m.

All through 1975 and 1976 I was literally beseiged by people in certain sections of the Island, some of them literally in tears crying out against the fact that their children, their young daughters and sons were being turned out of school at the age of 14, they were not prepared to do anything. It seems that the eight or nine years they spent in school had not prepared them for a single thing in this world, and they were worried about what would happen to them. The parents were worried about what would happen to their 14 and 15 year old daughters who were left around the house doing nothing when they went to work with very little hope of gaining remunerative employment. I was literally beseiged with this type of complaint and I said during 1976 on the political platform of my party that if I were elected to Parliament it was one of the first things that I was going to see about. I was not doing that for the parish of St. George nor my own constituency of St. George South, because they were relatively free of that sort of thing, and as soon as I came into my Department, and God knows why I landed the Ministry of Education, I was in a position to do something about it. As I said before, I made no bones about it. I asked the officers in my Ministry about putting these children back in school and I was told it could not work, that they were familiar with it, they knew the problems, they knew why they had to be turned out in the first place; the schools were overcrowded, there were problems with them and all that and they could not put them back in school. I said to them, "do not tell me there is something that cannot work; with me it has got to work, and I want to know by such and such a date how much it is going to cost, how much furniture you want, how much overcrowding there is, go out and look at every Government building that is unoccupied and turn some of the bigger and more commodious ones into classrooms". I told them all that. Tell me how many more teachers you want and in what areas you want them; give me the total cost, and when I did that I think they told me the figure was $385,000 to put them back in school.

I got at the Ellerslie Speech Day in October last year and made an announcement that they shall return to school from the next week and then I got on the telephone and called the Minister of Finance and said: "I made a commitment today; you will either back me up or let me go, but I have made a commitment to these children to go back to school. Fortunately the Minister of Finance who has got a conscience and who saw the problem told me not to worry about it because he felt this was a sort of commitment that we make and Government was going to honour it. The hon. member for St. Lucy raised the question of what is happening to those 14 and 15 year olds who returned to school. Well two years have passed since then so they are no longer in school because our plan was to keep them until the age of 16 so that those who went back to school in October, 1976, have now passed the age of 16 and have left school.

Mr. Chairman, questions will be raised about the usefulness of it. I will tell you one of the things I told my officers at the time when I asked for them to be returned to school. I said I did not want any academic curriculum for them. These were children who had failed at History, Mathematics and the Social Sciences and this sort of thing you were teaching then. All children do not have equal ability and naturally that is not their thing. Try and devise a type of curriculum that would assist these children in being

prepared for work. What I wanted them to do was not to go and put them back in a classroom where they would be bored and fed up over academic subjects, but to teach them vocational subjects, teach them to do things with their hands so that they could go out and make a living when they finished. I am happy to say I have been having a close look at it to see what has been happening to these children, and the evidence is that they have been able to find jobs more easily than the ones who got two or three "O" levels. If the hon. member wants the information, I will give him what information I have in writing if he asks for it. It is infinitely easier for these children who were put back in school and who were turned out of the school by the Democratic Labour Party administration, and to use the words of the hon. member for St. Lucy, children who were made to feel that they were not wanted and that they have no say in national development, that is how they felt when the DLP threw them out of school, for them to get jobs, and they are finding jobs in areas where there is a national need.

The hon. member alluded to the statement I made in here yesterday that we are on the threshold of a building boom in Barbados and there is a shortage of skilled workers in Barbados. Our educational policy over the last 15 years has been turning out a lot of people from secondary schools in the Island with one "O" level in Scripture or in all sorts of irrelevant and unnecessary subjects for the level of ability and aspirations of these children, and with no emphasis at all on the real and genuine needs of this country; so when you turn them out of school with one or two "O" levels they cannot get work because they want clerical jobs and the people who get clerical jobs are the ones with four and five "O" levels, not the ones with one or two. We are now getting applications from building companies in Barbados to import labour from the LDCs, artisans, carpenters, masons and so on into Barbados because they cannot find skilled Barbadians to do the job, and if that is not a crying shame, I do not know what is. With this building boom that is starting when carpenters and masons are going to be earning $300 a week, you cannot find Barbadians trained to do the job, not because they do not want to be trained, but because they were never given the proper facilities for training. They were never made to understand that, according to the hon. member for St. Lucy, children are not good at Latin, French, Mathematics and History should not be made to feel that they are unwanted and have no part to play in national development.

The policy of this Minister is to make these children understand that whether or not they are good at mathematics or geography, they have got something in them that will enable them by proper training and handling to make a significant contribution to the development of this country. It is a shame, Mr. Chairman, to hear a member of Parliament talk about the vast majority of people in this country in such pejorative terms. You see, unless you had been to a high school like the hon. member and picked up a few "O" levels, you are unwanted. It is the responsibility of all of us and I am not only talking about members of Parliament but of every decent thinking person in the society, to let every man know that his niche is cut out in this Island, that he was born here and has a stake in it, and that whatever his education he has got a right to demand part of the economic cake in this country.

Now I am going to make another point here, Mr. Chairman, in respect of a point raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I agree with him that children in uniform are seen in streets at all hours of the day, and it is causing me a great deal of concern. I am going to come before Parliament before the summer recess with the Education Act to take a look at it again, and I am going to want to have greater powers for school attendance officers.
4.40 p.m.

I am going to give significantly greater power to School Attendant Officers and indeed I will ask the Minister of Establishments for more posts because I drive around the Island and I see children hanging out all around the corners at 10 o'clock, or 11 o'clock, or 12 o'clock in school uniforms and I share the concern of the hon. member for St. Lucy in that regard and I will do something about it but you have got to understand, Mr. Chairman, that a lot of these problems are problems of our own creation and of the people of Barbados.

I have not heard sufficient noise being made about the attitude of the Teachers who are members of the Barbados Union of Teachers and the irresponsible way in which they are handling the children in this country. I will not go into it at this point. I will go into it later on the merits of the case of the Teachers with the current dispute with the Government. I will go into that later on. I have nothing to hide. I will tell you exactly how I feel about it.

I believe it is wicked for the Barbados Union of Teachers to stage what they call rotary sick-outs, because the Ministry of Education does not know before hand which schools are being affected. Therefore, we have to wait every morning until about 8.45 a.m. to 9.00 a.m. in the Ministry to receive telephone calls to hear at which school very few Teachers have turned up, so we cannot plan before hand. I heard the Prime Minister earlier in the day making the same point.

You have a number of little children, five years old, some even four years old, who are leaving home to go to school only to get to school and to find out that the Teachers are not there. The parents have already gone to work. These children have got to run about the streets and put themselves into all sorts of danger because of what I call the uncautionable conduct of the Barbados Union of Teachers. I am not talking now about their stand on their salaries and all of that. If they are going on

strike, let them go on strike and I would know that they are not coming to work and I will shut the schools, but it is unfair not to tell us before hand which schools they are going to affect, but they let the children go out there and find themselves in all sorts of danger because they do not turn up.

Let me say something. There is a Nursery School in Barbados. Now we are dealing with the little ones, the pre-primary ones, the little ones who need the Teachers to change them, to feed them and to teach them proper toilet habits and would you believe that they were Teachers who did not turn up to Nursery Schools to look after the little children? All we are saying, Mr. Chairman, is that if our society, is prepared to accept that sort of thing, well we are all doomed. That is what we are putting up with.

The hon. member for St. Lucy is asking us to produce children in this country with a certain quality, children coming out of the schools with certain standards of value and at the same time those children are going into classrooms where Teachers are saying they are sick when they are not sick. They were some old time virtues when they used to tell you that honesty is the best policy. When I was going to private school I was always made to understand that my Teachers walked 10 feet tall and you could look up to them and respect them. They were people whose words were gospel and now what we are having are Teachers who are ill-treating the system and are telling little children in the schools: "I am sick", although they are not sick and you are asking me to improve the quality of the children coming out of the schools in this country.

Perhaps I may at this stage, Mr. Chairman, say one or two things about what we propose to do to improve on the educational system. You will know, Mr. Chairman, that last year we negotiated with the World Bank for a considerable loan to start a $28 million First Educational Project. The hon. member for St. Michael South who used to be Minister of Education at one stage got in here sometime earlier this year or last year I think it was, and made some comments about they had started these negotiations with the World Bank and we only concluded them. I think the hon. member knows better than that.

It was way back in 1972 when the Democratic Labour Party administration was to get a World Bank Loan for Education in Barbados and the World Bank told them "we are not lending you any money". Either the Minister himself or the then Minister of Finance, the hon. member for St. John, can get up and deny it that they were told categorically in 1972 by the World Bank that they were not lending them any money. They had plans for building a Secondary School but they said "nothing doing" and then the hon. member for St. Michael South said we picked up something. Well you see what happened was there was a new climate in Barbados. Barbados had regained its respectability and confidence and therefore the International Lending Agencies like the World Bank were far more willing to do business with the new Government than with the old one. After all, nobody on this side had gone up to the World Bank in Washington and cursed all of them to the face. None of us has ever done that. We have now started on a First Education Project through the World Bank and the emphasis has been thrown back on the Primary Schools.

I am not particularly interested, Mr. Chairman, in building myself monuments. I went into St. John and I found a school at the bottom of the hill called St. Margaret's, a school that could be a Secondary School with a lot of empty space in it. There was no need for a school in St. Margaret's; none at all. I have read through the files and I see nothing to convince me that there was need for any school in St. Margaret's. St. Margaret's was in the constituency of the then Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister and if the Prime Minister cannot get something, who can?

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order, Sir. The school in St. Margaret's was put there as a result of the findings of the Planning Unit of the Ministry of Education and the member for St. Michael South will tell the hon. member that far from my trying to get it in St. John, I asked them not to proceed with the building of the Comprehensive School in St. John because there were other parishes who had greater priority than St. John although there is need for a school in St. John right now. There is no question of putting a school in St. Margaret's at my behest at all. There was an old dilapidated building which you can see for yourself there which was in danger of collapsing on the heads of the pupils and that is why the school was built in St. Margaret's.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I believe the hon. member for St. John, as usual, distances himself from his Minister. That is quite right. He is now throwing the weight on the then Minister of Education. The hon. Minister would say if you want a school in St. John, I will give you a school in St. John. I am going to build a new school at Mount Tabor, St. John. You want a new school in St. John, you will get one.

4.50 p.m.

Do you want one at Gall Hill? Why didn't you give them one when you had the money to spend? I will build one at Mt. Tabor because I find that the school at Mt. Tabor is in such a disgusting state of disrepair that it will act as nothing more than an albatross round the neck of the hon. member for St. John. I am not going to represent my constituency that way, I will tell you that, and if you want to know that I am not going to represent

my constituency that way, I am going to build a new primary school in St. George too.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of explanation. The hon. member has got to make up his mind. First he accuses me of putting a school in St. John, now he accuses me of not putting a school in St. John saying that he is not going to misrepresent his constituency the way I did not represent mine, for 21 years. The school at Mt. Tabor belongs to the Moravian Church. Where the school is needed in St. John is where I stopped the construction because of other priorities; that is, between the parish church and Gall Hill, that is where you need a school in St. John. There is a playing field there already.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I don't think the hon. member seriously believes that he can outwit me with words, because I am saying again, Mr. Chairman, that the school which was built down in St. Martin's was completely unnecessary at the time it was built. That is my own view, and there is nothing contradictory about it to say that I will build a school in St. John at Mt. Tabor because that school is not in proper condition for anybody to attend in this age.

When the hon. member talks about misrepresenting, I am not going to misrepresent my constituency, I am going to build a primary school in St. George at the Glebe or Walkers that will cater to the St. George Boys' and St. George Girls' Schools, because the Boys' School will be handed back to the Anglican Church – they want it for a church hall – and there are other substantial developments being done in the area of the Girls' School and that will pass on. Anyhow, let me get back on the rails.

The hon. member for St. John cannot keep me off the rails, I am going to make sure that something is done about the state of primary schools in Barbados, and to that end in four years I am going to build ten new primary schools in Barbados, and I want to hear any time in the history of Barbados – one of my colleagues behind here tells me I may not be around long enough to see them finished, but I will start them – I want to hear any time in the history of Barbados that ten primary schools have been built over the space of four years, and I am going to build ten of them, and I will let the hon. members know this. I am going to take into consideration primarily two criteria in building these schools, and let me make it quite clear that none of them is political. One is the demographic consideration, the build up in population in new areas, and the second criterion is the state of existing primary schools. Some have to be replaced because they are so bad that they constitute a hazard to children and we will replace them. That is one criterion; the other criterion is demographic, the build up of areas like Eden Lodge. One of the most densely populated areas of Barbados is that area of Spooners Hill, Eden Lodge, Grazettes, Cave Hill, the whole area up there, and one of the areas that has a heavy population concentration is the Wildey area. The people from Chapman Lane have gone up there, the Pine is there, they are building a new Wildey housing development, and the whole area of Clapham, Forde's Road is very heavily populated, so I am going to build a school in the Wildey area and I am going to build three schools in the north western part of St. Michael. One at Woodstock in Spooners Hill, one at Eden Lodge and one at Cave Hill, and I will also build a school at St. Saviour's in St. Andrew, and we are going to build one at St. Anne's, somewhere in the Parris Hill area in St. Joseph and we are going to build one in the Jackson area.

Now, I have been hearing from the hon. member for Christ Church East that he wants one at St. Patricks. I went and visited the St. Patrick's Schools about three weeks ago, and I would not tell you the conditions under which children are made to suffer in primary schools because of an unfeeling administration. I visited St. Patrick's Boys' School and the graveyard is abutting and bounding the nutrition room, you could literally reach from the nutrition room into a freshly used grave. Six feet away approximately from where the children have to sit down and eat their school lunch was a grave that somebody was buried in the afternoon before. Was there no heart at all in the Democratic Labour Party administration? And I go up to the Girls' School and I see the same nutrition room in the Girls' School that was three feet from the highway. If a truck passed the people at the counter of the nutrition room could almost reach out and touch the truck that has passed, and the hon. member for St. Lucy really has the heart to get up in here and raise questions about what we are doing, and directing a policy and all the fancy words he used, a clear objective of the educational programme of this country.

The first thing you have to do with the children is house them. The days have long passed when you can take children out under a tree with a textbook and sit down and teach them; they do not understand that any more, and if you are to meet the rising expectations of the young people in this country you have to upgrade the facilities in which you will seek to impart knowledge into their heads. And do you want to know about the clear objectives of the educational programme, Mr. Chairman? Not only is the trust going from secondary and tertiary education to primary education again, but the whole content of what we are teaching children in schools has got to change. Children must be educated for work, we cannot afford the luxury of teaching children in schools a lot of hifalutin concepts that are totally irrelevant to what they have to do after they leave school. I still can quote from Virgil, if you want a few lines from Virgil I can still quote them, but they didn't teach me anything when I was going to school about electronics, they didn't teach me anything that if my car breaks down I would

know what to look for, they didn't teach me anything at all functional and pragmatic, but I am insisting, whatever the cost, that there must be a new direction in that area that children must not only be thought the fundamental academic subjects, but that they be taught technical and vocational subjects that can better equip them to live their lives as men and women when they leave school. *(Asides).*

Do not worry about the hon. member for St. Michael South, the trouble with the hon. member for St. Michael South who was Minister of Education for many years, is not that his head was not screwed on right and that he did not have good ideas, but that he was severely inhibited by his then leader, the Prime Minister of the day, the Minister of Finance, who did not like anybody who could think. I like to give Jack his jacket, the hon. member for St. Michael South was not as bad as all that, but he operated under severe constraints and inhibitions imposed at the whim and fancy of the then Minister of Finance, so I am going to be easy on him for the time being.

5.00 p.m.

There is one other point the hon. member raised, about the School Leaving Certificate. The School Leaving Certificate, I can tell the hon. member, is not entirely satisfactory to me. I am not too happy about it, but it serves a purpose. The hon. member asked what is its status and says that it does not serve any purpose, yet in the next sentence out of his mouth he says it is necessary to have the certificate in order to gain entrance to the Polytechnic.

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. The point I made was that people who possess the School Leaving Certificate still have to sit an examination.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I don't know what point that is. When I was going to school, even if you had fifteen "A" Level certificates you had to sit an examination to get into the University of the West Indies. The Polytechnic has got a certain capacity. There is a limit to the number of people who can go to the Polytechnic, therefore it is not unreasonable to ask for a qualifying examination to fill the places. But that will not last much longer, because come April or May I will be going up to Wildey to turn the sod for the construction of a new $20 million Polytechnic and I think I will be able to double the number of persons who can avail themselves of study at the Polytechnic. So that perhaps it might not be necessary when that is done to have a qualifying examination.

The hon. member also wants to know about objectives. Education is one of those areas where one speech is never enough to spell out what is happening in the area of social policy, and what is happening is that we are spending over $70 million a year on education. But let us look for a moment at what is happening in another area. We are not only providing a new thrust in primary education but we are seeking to make the teachers, particularly in the primary school, better trained and providing more opportunity for primary school teachers in Barbados. We are having in this educational project certain extensions and upgradings of the facilities at Erdiston College; we are going to provide more rooms, more workshops, more laboratory facilities, more staff and we will be able to cope with a larger number of teachers who need training. And this is a good time to say this, because the teachers are making a case and I heard the Prime Minister in here today quite rightly flogging CBC for their one-sided coverage of the teachers' dispute. But do you know, Mr. Chairman that teachers who go to Erdiston College to be trained for two years are paid for the two years? Tell me how many other people in Barbados receive full pay when they are away from their jobs studying? Very few. But you do not hear that; you do not hear that at any given time during the school year 300 teachers are away on paid leave, receiving their pay and studying either in Barbados or abroad, and Government has to bring in 300 substitutes and pay them. I mention this because as far as I can recall Barbados is the only territory in the West Indies where teachers are paid full salary when on study leave, but when you hear them talk you would believe that somebody is gouging out their eyes.

You hear about the question of overlap, which I cannot deal with because it would be improper while an industrial dispute is on; but as I said earlier I have a few things to say about the situation. It can go on record now, and if the media feel like giving it coverage I believe in the principle of the overlap that the teachers are claiming, the overlap between reducing Erdiston graduates and university graduates.

5.10 p.m.

However, Rome was not built in a day. This question of the overlap of the teachers was put to Government as far back as 1969. There was an on going negotiations dispute, correspondence, communication, whatever you feel like calling it between the Government and the teachers over the question of the teachers overlap since 1969. In 1976 the Democratic Labour Party administration made an infinitesimal concession to them. They quarrelled and then shut up. The hon. member for St. John said that he was not wasting any more time with them. He came into Parliament and legislated and said that is the end of it. So from 1969 this point was being taken up with Government.

We have to ask ourselves why they have chosen since the Barbados Labour Party has taken over the Government for two years, to take this type of action.

From 1969 they took up the issue of school meals – that teachers should not work in school meals because it was not their job. They had ongoing discussions with the previous administration for numbers of years on that; but they never got away with it; but they wait until this Government got into power to say that they have nothing more to do with school meals, and it does not matter if the children of this country are served with school meals or not.

It is also ridiculous that we have got teachers who are saying that it is not their job to mark registers in the schools. If you want registers marked, pay some clerks to come in and mark them. They have gone so far as to say that it is not the teacher's job to hold prayers – pay a pastor or a preacher to come in and say them. You have teachers going as far as saying that between 12 and 1 o'clock p.m. is their lunch hour, and they have no responsibility to the school; and there is one school where all the teachers, except the headteacher leave at 12 o'clock, the lunch hour, and go to a neighbouring rum shop and sit down until 1 o'clock and then go back to school to demonstrate that between 12 and 1 p.m. they have no responsibility to the children of this country.

I am not talking as any Minister of Education now. I have two children in primary schools of the Government, and I expect the teachers to look after them between 12 and 1 p.m. If my children get hurt on the playing fields or at the school between 12 and 1 p.m. (ASIDE: Why not?) He wants to know why not. The hon. member seems to think that he is talking to some of the dunderheads in the Democratic Labour Party. He cannot bait me. I am not threatening anybody. All I am saying is that I expect, as the hon. member for St. Lucy expects, and the taxpayers in Barbados who are paying those teachers would expect, that when they send their children to school during the day that the teachers would look after them; and they expect that between 12 o'clock and 1 p.m. when those children are running around and playing and likely to be injured on the playing field and so on that the teachers will be there to look after them.

You have not heard anything yet, Mr. Chairman. In the fullness of time a lot more will come out. I have been very forebearing on this issue to the extent to which I have been accused of being too soft, of holding out the olive branch, and putting up with a lot of nonsense. I want the public of Barbados to know that I have got reports of at least one teacher who has got into the school and telling children about smoking marijuana and drinking the weed. At least one teacher in the schools of Barbados. I have got at least one teacher reported for saying...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hope that the gallery would not let itself be carried away.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have got a report of a teacher who tells children in his class that by the time that he is finished with them every piece of furniture in that school will be destroyed. You do not know what we are involved with. You do not know what we have on our hands. The moment you touch them, everybody says victimisation. Everything will come out in the wash. That is the sort of situation that we have existing in the schools. You have teachers who go into the Ministry for meetings with Ministry officials and have the gall to insult senior officers of the Ministry as they will.

It cannot last. I am waiting for a little time of blowing off, a blowing off period; and then I will have to take such ruthless action as is necessary to bring back some integrity in the whole teaching service in Barbados. I have said repeatedly inside my Ministry, and I have said to my colleagues and members of the public at large that I do not believe that the Teaching Service is like bus conductors or other Transport workers or Sanitation workers and so on. If they go on strike, if bus conductors and bus drivers go on strike, people will be inconvenienced for as long as the strike goes on; and then when the buses start to roll again every thing will be back to normal. If the Sanitation workers go on strike the garbage piles up for a while, and when they go back to work they will clean it up. It is not so with the Teaching Service. That is why I think that while I have got to expose their weaknesses, I have also got, as Minister of Education to point out the importance of the Teaching Service in this country; and let me say for the record that the bulk of the Teaching Service in Barbados, the vast majority of teachers in Barbados are good teachers, dedicated people committed, and whom I will have no trouble at all in defending against the criticism of the public at large. The vast majority of the teachers are dedicated and are doing a good job, as far as I can see. I want that to go into the record.

Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of Heads under Education, and I would wish as I go on, to deal with the areas *seriatim*. I believe that it is very easy for me to go on talking under this Head endlessly, about Education, where it is going, what we are doing, what are the problems and so on; but I believe that this is a convenient time to call it a day and allow other hon. members to bring up further points as we go through Head by Head so that I can further inform and instruct people like the member for St. Lucy – not people, the member for St. Lucy on what is happening in the Education system in Barbados.

I beg to move that Head 15(1) stand part.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I believe, that this has been a very good day for the Opposition. The Gov-

ernment benches have been so provoked, and giving such a set of criticisms that they have been on the defensive for most of the day. Indeed it is heartening to be sitting on the Opposition benches because when I was sitting over there, approximately where the hon. member for St. George South now sits, I have never had any plaudits, praise or commendation from the Opposition, except from the most enlightened member over there at that time, the member for Christ Church West.
5.20 p.m.

He was the only one who recognised at that time and had the necessary balance to realise that a very good job was being done for education in this country by the Democratic Labour Party. Now today praises.....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: If the hon. member would give way, the hon. member would remember that during his time of administration not only did I commend him on secondary education, but I pointed out the defect in primary education and also reminded him that he had accumulated a deficit from Mr. Cameron Tudor who had successfully done nothing, but talked a lot during his period as a Minister.

Mr. SANDIFORD: All I am saying is that today now it has come thick and fast. From the Prime Minister we heard that there have been some Ministers in the past Democratic Labour Party administration who have done a very good job. This is a matter of record, Mr. Chairman, and now the present Minister of Education has said that I had my head screwed on right but he is trying now to put some distance between myself and the former Minister of Finance.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I said that the hon. member had his head screwed on right but that the hon. member for St. John is now trying to distance himself from him, not me.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Be that as it may, I know who is trying to distance from whom because I raised a matter under Archives today that I noticed that Museum was swiped away from the Ministry of Education and Culture, and the only reason why culture was not taken away is that it would look too bad. But you know what happens. When you had the conference and the hon. member for St. George South was one of the contestants for presidency of his party, the ground was cut from under his feet, and after the Prime Minister effectively cut that ground from under his feet and of the hon. member for St. James too, he came back then on the Sunday and said "God bless Louis Tull, God bless Lionel Craig" whoever they may be, Mr. Chairman. I want to say this much. In spite of all the praise that has been showered left-handedly, backhandedly or otherwise, I wish to make a few points in rebuttal of some of the criticisms made. First of all this is not the first occasion on which primary schools will be built in this country. Barbados has a good record as far as its primary school system is concerned and this has been the work of successive Governments in this country. It did not start in 1976; it did not start in 1961. This is a matter of history and if we do not recognise this and if Ministers of Education do not recognise this, if they are so fore-shortened in their historical perspective, I think we are very likely to go off the rails as far as our planning and development for education is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I pay a tribute to the work that was done in education particularly at the primary level over the years in the previous Labour Party, the first Labour Party administration and before that as well, and quite naturally I give very high praise to the Democratic Labour Party for the work that they have done as far as primary education is concerned and as far as all other sectors of education are concerned, but I believe the hon. member for St. George South has a problem, and you could detect it from the way he was speaking today because he tried to generate some heat, tried to generate some steam and seemed to be quarrelling with himself rather than presenting a very balanced approach in this particular debate.

Let us look at this question. One matter raised was the St. Patrick's Girls' School and some talk about a grave next to the nutrition room or something like that. The Democratic Labour Party did not build the St. Patrick's School. That school was there, well I cannot even tell you off-hand when it was built, but it is one of the older schools in this country and it was certainly there under the first Barbados Labour Party administration. I do not know about the graveyard. We certainly did not open the grave there yesterday. I believe the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs – that also is not in your Ministry any longer – may know more about that, so we absolve ourselves from any blame in respect of the matter he is raising. If a grave was opened next to the nutrition room yesterday or the day before or some time like that, how can you blame the previous administration for that? I think we should have some type of sanity in these debates, and if you are trying to make a point, there is no point in trying to overstate it.

As far as the new primary schools are concerned, I have heard about new schools at Eden Lodge. There is nothing big about that. The Democratic Labour Party developed Eden Lodge and we left the facilities there; the land, the site was identified for a Nursery School and for a primary school. You have not bought any land to put any primary school on. That was part of the good planning which you inherited and your problem now is how to get these new projects going to appear to be doing something new. The Democratic Labour Party never claimed that it would solve all of the educational problems in this country, and when in 1981 you demit office and we again take over the reins of Government including the

Ministry of Education by constitutional means, we will have to deal with some of the problems that will be left, because you will not be able to solve all of them. In fact, you will be so taken up trying to implement the sound policies that we left for you that you would not have time to develop any new ones. You have had a good inheritance and there is no need to quarrel about it. Your Prime Minister recognised that today and you yourself have recognised it now. So the land was provided for a new primary school at Eden Lodge. All you have to do, you are on such good terms with your Minister of Finance, is to get some money put up the school. We would welcome that. It was part of our plan.

Now I heard something about Woodstock, Spooners Hill. Maybe that was for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Lucy who may not know, but I myself alone with my Permanent Secretary and others in the Ministry paid more than one visit there and we went to the same site that you are talking about and identified it as a site for a primary school in this country. You see, we were thinking ahead; so there is no point in saying that we were making no provision. That is two out of the three where we already had a site, so all you have to do again is to put the school on the particular site because we laid the foundation for it. You have gone to the World Bank to get some money and you are giving the impression also that we did nothing for primary education in this country.

I recall that one of the first schools that I built as Minister of Education was at Good Shepherd in the parish of Saint James and the hon. member for Saint James knows about that. We put up a new school at St. Bartholomew. We put up a new school at Hindsbury, we put up a new school at Vauxhall in Christ Church, we put up a new primary school at the Farm, we put a new primary school at St. Christopher in Christ Church, we put a new primary school at Lammings in St. Joseph, we put up a new school at St. Elizabeth in St. Joseph, we put up a new school at St. Margarets, but it seems as though you do not understand. Ask your officers, they are there in large numbers. How can you say that the school at St. Margarets was not necessary?
5.30 p.m.

The member for St. John was quite right as far as the Secondary School is concerned because we had a plan of building Secondary Schools to meet the population and for the disbursal of Secondary Schools as well in the parishes which did not have them, but he said, and I believe he was wrong, he said leave St. John out, we will take care of that later. He was quite right when he made his intervention but what he failed to say as far as St. Margaret's is concerned is that that School, according to the Report, and there was a Report on the conditions of primary schools in this country.

If you search your Ministry Files you will find that there was a Report on the state and condition of primary schools in this country and our programme for replacements was based on that Report in terms of the condition of those schools. St. Margaret's was one of those schools which was earmarked for renovations and repairs. That is exactly what we did. Not only that, you were in the Other Place at that time and there was an Agreement with the Anglican Church and on the basis of that Agreement that Church Schools were to be reverted to the Anglican Church. We set out on a policy of handing back those schools and St. Margaret's was one of those schools. It was a Girl's School.

The same way you are talking about handing back the property at St. George Boys' to the Anglican Church because it is a Church School, and the property of the Anglican Church, so was St. Margaret's, so that was following a policy and you could understand that. When you come and give the people of this country the impression that the school was built down there simply because it was in the constituency of the member for St. John, I think that is a great unbalance. I believe so genuinely, and I think you are trying very hard in the Ministry of Education. *(Asides.)* I do not know, perhaps you can make that point. I am not too clear about Welch Village.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I wonder if the hon. member will give way. The hon. member for St. Michael South is totally lacking in courage because he recommended that Welch Village School be closed down. He was Minister of Education. It had 27 children in it, four Teachers, a couple of dogs, a maid, a sweeper and a School Meals worker, something like that and he recommended that it be shut down because they only had 27 children and the hon. member for St. John, the big maguffy, because the election – no, I would not say that.

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: I would just like to explain something to the hon. member arising out of that. I mentioned Welch Village for this reason. If he knows the topography of the constituency of St. John, one of the reasons why the replacement school had to be placed in St. Margaret's was the proposal to close Welch Village as well so you could not close all the schools under the hill and have the small children walking 2½ miles up to St. John Mixed School. That is the point which I was trying to remind the hon. member for St. Michael South and it was a proposal to which I agreed provided there was a school replaced at St. Margaret's. How could you close all the schools under the hill?

Hon. L. R. TULL: I just want to make this point, Mr. Chairman. I started by saying that the hon. member for St. Michael South was lacking in courage because the facts are that the hon. member for St. Michael South, as

Minister of Education, recommended closure of the Welch Village School because there were only 27 children in it and that the hon. member for St. John overruled him and said keep the school of 27 open with 5 employees and I am saying so and I am not giving way in this.....

Rt. Hon. E. W. BARROW: On a point of order. The hon. member is not correct. I never overruled the Minister on any point. I am the person who supported the whole idea of closing the school at Welch Village. I asked at that time for a bus service to take the children from Welch Village up the hill to St. John's Mixed School because these were toddlers, 5 and 6 years old and I asked that a bus service be instituted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Point of order taken.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be easily turned off this because credibility is at stake. The hon. member for St. Michael South made a submission to the then Cabinet on the closure of the Welch Village School and it was turned down and it was not because a 1976 Election was about to take place. It was just coincidental that the Elections were not too far off and the member for St. John made representations against the closure of that school.

I do not like to divide an Opposition. That is a bad form but since the hon. member for St. John has the nerve to get up and deny it all I can say is that the hon. member for St. Michael South got on the Floor of this very Chamber and supported the statement that I am now making. Let him get up and deny that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I can only say, Mr. Chairman, I do not know. I think that Welch Village School is a very small item. It is a small school in the total educational pattern and I am not really going into all of that about Welch Village. All I can say is produce the files and let us see the facts you are talking about. Bring them down tomorrow and we will be able to judge.

As far as courage is concerned, you do not like to divide the Opposition and I do not like to divide the Government side either because you have got up and you have said do not mind what the Prime Minister says or the Minister responsible for Establishments, as far as I am concerned I believe in five increments up and that is what I believe so you have two different Ministries now speaking in different views.

Hon. L. R. TULL: On a point of order. The hon. member for St. Michael South has dropped to a level that I did not believe he was capable of. I have said nothing at all in here all afternoon about any five points of any scale, whether it is Jacob's Ladder, the Teachers' scale or anything. I made absolutely no reference to any point of any scale in my contribution this afternoon and the hon. member knows that so I wish he will withdraw it.
5.40 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: If he asks me to withdraw it, I do not have any courage, I will withdraw it, but everybody knows he says he believes in the overlap, and the overlap is five points up the scale.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The only reason why I will waste my time to get up and comment on this type of specious comment is because at this time the negotiations are so sensitive that I would not want any misinformation in respect of this to come out. I categorically deny that I have said anything to do with any points up any scale. The hon. member for St. Michael South is the kind of person who seeks to create havoc when it is unnecessary and I wish he would not make this type of untrue allegation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will rule on this because I distinctly remember the Hon. Minister saying that he wanted the Press to publish that he believes in the overlap. However, he never expanded on it so I think it would be unfair to say he talked about five points.

Mr. SANDIFORD: All right, he is appealing for light, so he will get light. Mr. Chairman, I rose merely to deal with a number of points, one of which is the impression that was created that the Democratic Labour Party did nothing for primary school education. Our record, in terms of primary school construction and the extension to primary schools is an extremely good one, and any charge that we did not pay attention to that particular area of education is unfounded. I do not have all the information here with me, I have enumerated some of the new schools and some of the extensions that were carried out, but it is not really necessary to try to give the impression that nothing was done before this present administration came into being. You have a job of work to do, go and do it. If you are negotiating with the teachers now and you are having problems, do not come and blame the previous administration, deal with the current problems, you are the Government and if it has been going on for a number of years all the more reason why with the brains of the Great Combination you could seize the issues involved and come to a speedy conclusion on these matters. You cannot go on blaming any inheritance, and the last person who should talk about an inheritance and blaming that inheritance is the Minister of Education, because you have a sound educational system, you have to carry out reforms and all the reforms are set out there for you, the Education Bill. He is coming down shortly with it, he said, the Education Bill is there and I do not know what is his problem, he says he is coming with more powers for the School Attendance Officers. It cannot take you that long to deal with School

Attendance Officers, do you mean it is going to take you longer to deal with them than you can deal with the little children who are jumping over into the Careenage and diving for coins? I heard him speaking very strongly on that, but I do not know what more he has to do in order to get his problem through.

I repeat again that I held discussions, and my officers were also involved in discussions, with the World Bank about a loan for education in this country. There is no doubt about that and I do not need to go back into it, if you have gone back to the same source, I have initiated it so you have got to follow it from there. It is the Democratic Labour Party administration which joined those international institutions, including the same UNESCO to which you go from time to time – and which I am very pleased that after the groundwork that has been laid before a distinguished Permanent Secretary and Caribbean public servant has been able to get on to the Executive Board of that educational body – but that is as a result of the solid groundwork that has been laid before by the previous administration.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Sir. For the benefit of the hon. member the last Government objected to anybody serving on the UNESCO Board; they had a policy against this. Mr. Algy Symmonds who was the then Permanent Secretary was being put up and it was said they did not want anybody to serve, and we took a decision to appoint people to the Board.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not want any references to any person in an official capacity. Let us observe this.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, there was really a lot in this. I was trying to find out the points that were really made and I have dealt with most of them. It is said that the 14 year olds are finding it easier to get jobs, those who were re-absorbed. I have asked a question on this matter asking for some statistics relating to this and related matters and the question has not yet been answered, but I wonder if the Minister said he could supply the information. He has not supplied it and I look forward at some time in the not too distant future when he will supply the information on the point made by the hon. member for St. Lucy. I do not think there was anything else.

5.50 p.m.

If the Minister has a problem in relation to negotiations, he and the Great Combination are quite capable of dealing with this... *(Aside)*...There is no longer any Great Combination? Well, he and his other Ministers are quite capable of dealing with such matters, so I will leave them to sort out that particular problem, but, Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a particular matter here, because we have had a long statement from the Minister of Education, and certainly up to the time I was in the Chamber I did not hear any reference to the curriculum in the schools; I heard a lot about school buildings, but there is one aspect as far as the curriculum is concerned to which I would like to make reference. I believe it is necessary in this country to keep a constant and ongoing look at the subjects taught in our school system, and that there should be a continuing programme of curriculum development. It was within that context that I set up a National Curriculum Development Council, and I am wondering whether the Minister can tell us what curricula have been prepared for the schools. I am particularly interested now in the area of religious and moral education. I heard the Minister make reference to people with one subject in Scripture. I do not know if he has any objections to the subject of Scripture or Religious Knowledge, but I would like him to know that there are not many people around with the subject Scripture; it is not as easy as people think. *(Asides)* There is a schoolmaster behind there agreeing with me that it is a difficult subject. I am particularly interested in religious and moral education because I think that for the fabric of this society to mend, lest any signs and symptoms of degeneration and deterioration, any falling away of standards might set in, it is necessary for us in our school system to ensure that education in those areas is relevant to the development of children, and I would like to know what is being done in those particular areas. May be the Minister can tell us how far he has got in implementing the massive educational reform programme introduced by the previous administration.

I have made reference to the Education Bill. I make reference now to the Common Entrance Examination Report by the Shorey Committee and wonder when he will get around to implementing the proposal in that report. Like him I will have a lot more to say on education if I am provoked. I can speak as the hon. member for St. Michael North West that there is no one in this particular Chamber, except the professional officers in the Ministry, who would know as much of this subject as I do, and if I find that this debate does not stay on the rails I will have to come and pull you back on the rails.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is my function; do not trespass.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, after that sterling intervention by the former Minister who was identified with the educational policy of Barbados in the 1960s and 70s, I think I should not have too much to add. However, I regret that constituency duties did not permit me to hear all of what the Minister had to say, but I wish to begin by referring to a remark made by the Hon. Attorney General, which I am sure on reflection he could not have meant that the former government objected to people from Barbados serving on international Boards. It just does not make sense that the Barbados Government would have made a policy decision not to serve on UNESCO, and the hon. gentleman must know that as far as the Caribbean is concerned, who serves on what Board is a matter discussed among the

Caribbean states, so I think that was a rather cheap shot to throw out for those who do not know better. As a matter of fact, I think that all of the professionals in education and other areas will confirm that during our regime we went out of our way to see that our people shone on the international scene. *(Asides)* I would not bother about the aside by the hon. member for St. James because when we are discussing the international scene that would be too far out of his reach.

I would like the Minister of Education to pay some attention to one of the areas that is of concern to a large number of people in Barbados. I feel that in 1979 there are people coming out of the school system, and despite the fact that we claim to have the highest literacy rate in the world, I am making the contention that the literacy to a large extent is not functional literacy. We are finding that large numbers of children coming out of school today are incapable of what is described as functional literacy. We do not hear anything about the CXC exams. I believe that a number of mothers and fathers across the country would wish to get some more information on Government's policy with regard to the CXC programme. I read in the newspapers not so long ago that there was some rejection of the CXC by the heads of some secondary schools in Barbados. I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that it would be very strange if in fact we in Barbados find that our children who arrive at the age of 16, 17 or 18 are taking two types of examinations with different possibilities of results. I have never heard anyone making a policy statement on what happens beyond CXC. Will the Minister state whether after the first experimental CXC exams the Government is likely to decide on CXC as the examination which will be taken for secondary education or whether it is intended to have a dual arrangement and whether after CXC there is going to be a continuation with A–Level or some form of higher certification beyond the Ordinary level. I do not pretend to have any expert knowledge or information about this, but I have some concern that while CXC has been put forward as a desirable examination and while reports from the experts suggest that it is going to be better than the examination we now take, very little has been said about post-CXC examinations for students, and I would like the Minister to shed some light on this. I am not myself certain that I understand the new system by which everybody who takes the examination will get a certificate. It seems to me from what I have been reading that a child reaches age 16 or 17 and takes the examination...*(Asides)* I know, Mr. Chairman, that when one is discussing education it is bound to be boring to the hon. member for St. James. If we were discussing salt fish and that sort of thing it would interest him; but I ask for his indulgence for a few minutes.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, all I told the hon. member is not to discolour the high debate which went on between the former Minister and the Present Minister; that is all I said.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, whatever else may be said for the hon. member, you have to admit that he is undaunted. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that a number of persons in this country are concerned about this matter.

Another area on which I believe the Minister should shed some light is the question of the use of school property in the community. It seems to me that in all these years in Barbados we have been misusing the capacity of our schools. When schools are closed at 3 or 4 o'clock in the evening they remain and plant and equipment not serving any purpose until 9 the next morning. I believe that except for the St. Leonard's area where there are some after-school programmes generally speaking the plant and equipment are not in use. And I find something is happening in the community when headmasters and headmistresses are reluctant to allow people from the surrounding community to make use of the property. I understand concern had been expressed in the past about vandalism, but it is my understanding that such vandalism has been curbed to some extent by the introduction of security personnel. There are security personnel around the property for St. Leonard's School, but in spite of the security personnel I find that applications made by *bona fides* social groups in the community to make use of the playing field have been constantly turned down. My advice is that the Ministry has shown some willingness to accommodate these requests but that the headmaster at the Boys' School feels that he is unable to grant the requests. But I am not dealing only with that particular school and that headmaster but only quote that as an example. I feel that the plant and equipment of schools should be made available for community use where this is possible without destruction of the property. I believe that to give young people – many of them graduates of the same school – an opportunity to use the grounds around these schools will help to enhance the total education of those people. I do not believe that as soon as a young boy or girl has graduated from a particular school he or she should cease to benefit from that school; and I find it strange that a young boy or girl might have been able to play at that school when a pupil, and that school is five or ten yards from where the person lives, but after leaving school they can only watch that playing field but not use it. I agree that there must be a careful approach to the use of the property and that those who apply to use the property must abide by the rules set, but I think it would be in the interest of the total community if there is a clear policy that all can know and understand with regard to the use of school property after school. I notice that whereas in the past it was possible to make one application for the use of a school building – I am now talking about my political party, – for example, we now have to make a new application at the end of each year. May be there is some good reason for such a policy, but I think it would be useful to hear the reason.

Mr. Chairman, there is the whole question of co-education in Barbados, and whether we like it or not a

large number of pupils in this community are concerned at what appears as a dualism in the concept of coeducation. I remember when I was part of the Government of this country the question of coeducation arose with regard to certain schools and it appears to me that there is a great amount of dilly-dallying in this matter. I believe Barbados should have a set policy on co-education; I do not believe that a child who goes to St. Leonard's School or Ellerslie or one of those so-called newer secondary schools should have coeducation as a must, but a child who goes to one of the so-called older secondary schools should have coeducation as an option. It seems to me that I have heard for long time that it was the intention of the Government to have co-education. That intention has been translated after some consideration into coeducation at one school. It is my contention that despite the so-called problems involved we have seen from the results of places like Lynches Secondary School, the Modern High School, Rudder – the point I am making is that all of these schools were coeducational and we have seen the results of those schools; we have seen people who have some out of those schools and who have made a significant contribution to the community. Lest anyone should feel this is some personal chip on one's shoulder, let me say that any consideration for coeducation at the so-called better schools will affect me personally because my own children go to one of those so-called better schools. But I believe that if we in this Chamber – I think I can speak for the hon. member for St. Michael West whose constituency borders mine – I am sure he has gone to his constituents and we tell them that the educational system in Barbados is among the best in the world. We tell them there are certain principles which apply to all Barbadians and yet when our constituents see these principles being applied they are forced to come to the conclusion that there is still one law for the Medes and another law for the Persians.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the Minister himself is pro-coeducational. What I cannot understand is what is the difficulty in implementing this programme if he is for it. If he says he is not for it I have no quarrel with that. What I have a quarrel with is if he announces that he is for coeducation and then you see this dilatory approach to its implementation. Such a situation is bound to continue the challenge which has existed between certain types in the community – types in the social sense. It is bound to continue that schism which has led to a particular syndrome in our community and it begins not when our people become men and women but it starts when the children are going to school.

6.10 p.m.

It is not history that when we went to camp, I think I went a little before your time, during the Cadet camp we used to have one long division. The hon. member is asking me to keep the debate high so I will not divide it this way, but you will recall that at those camps the white boys from Lodge used to be off in one corner, the black boys from Lodge used to be with the Combermere boys....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You did not have to go to camp for that.

Mr. TAITT: Fortunately I did not manage to go up to Lodge too often. *(Asides).* I know, he was a head boy at Lodge School, so he knows this thing well. When you went to Lodge School to play a football or cricket game, when the game was finished you had to try to find the truck quickly, you felt so strange in that atmosphere, but I am not getting into that at this point. That will come out another time. The point I am making, Sir, is that when we were 11, 12 and 13 years old, we were aware of differences in what were supposed to be secondary schools. I believe the time has come in this country when we must take a decisive step to change the social structure of our school system.

Now I want to say this: I once discussed this with one of the great headmistresses; I am told she is a great headmistress but I have never had the opportunity of discovering it and she had the courage to say this: she said "Look, I want to tell you very bluntly I am not against coeducation, but I do not want it in my school. Two reasons why I do not want it in my school is because my time will soon be here and I really do not want the trouble of having to initiate a programme of integrating boys and girls at age 11, 12 and 13." Now this is honesty. I understand that; she has a few more years to go and she has to look after what you could consider her personal environment. There is nothing wrong with that, but Mr. Chairman, the Government is in a different situation because whether it is that Minister of Education or this former Minister of Education or a new Minister of Education, Barbados must go on, your policies as we have seen outlined here this evening in this debate laid down by one Government are bound to find fruition in the implementation by another Government even if it is the question of overlap. It is bound to reflect itself, therefore when we set educational policy, we cannot even set it as in the context of setting a trade policy, because you can shift a trade policy overnight, you can even shift a foreign policy overnight, but when you set an educational policy, if you should attempt to shift that policy, overnight, even though you might shift the policy, the results of the policy will not start to shift until some time hence. Put another way, what I am saying is that one of the reasons why you will find that there is not a great deal of debate on education between this side and that side is because we do not believe that education is something which one ought to take and make a political football. We believe that education is fundamental to the growth of the country as a whole because what kind of educational policy you have will determine what kind of new generations you will have ten or fifteen years or twenty years from now. So that if we raise questions for the Minister's consideration, those questions are not only raised as politicians, they are raised as Barbadians querying, probing, questioning, wondering,

what kind of Barbados we are going to have fifteen years from now or fifty years from now.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that my time is running out and I crave your indulgence to let me wind up. The history of this country so far as education is concerned is well known and most Barbadians who have had an opportunity to go to higher training are familiar with the divisions in education, and it is not necessary for us to reiterate them every time we get up, but what is important is that now we have an opportunity to make an input into our own educational policy, we should use the opportunity to make sure we remove from the system all vestiges of the colonial era and the colonial system. I am not one of those who would tell you that from an educational point of view there was everything wrong with the colonial system, because clearly the colonial system permits us to be able to expose ourselves at least in the English language in the way we do it in here from time to time, but as you very well know, that system had a number of built-in social deficiencies and those deficiencies found themselves in the heart of the educational policy, and I am saying to the Hon. Minister especially on the question of co-education he must make a firm statement.

I recall when the former Minister attempted to introduce the Community College on which I will have more to say later on Mr. Chairman, he was not able to sustain the support of a number of people in this country even though he was right. He stood alone. I want to make it clear on this question of education that if the cap fits, you have to wear it. I do not care who I am speaking about when I say that. Mr. Chairman, the hon. member here will tell you that my position on this has been consistent. I do not have to worry about him who gets up and says one thing outside and when he comes in on this floor says something else. We are not going to go down that road because the Hon. Minister knows that as the hon. member threatened him earlier, if he does not behave himself he will take off his clothes.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member was right on the policy of Community education, and when we come to discuss the Head I will go into more detail on what I mean by that. But all I am saying is that we have a glorious opportunity to make a definitive policy that will be at least as long lasting. It took us over almost 100 years to interfere with the Education Act. We formulated an Education Act. The Hon Minister said he wanted to look at it. I see nothing wrong with that. I think he should look at it because I believe when that Act is passed it should be an Education Act that can last us for almost the same length of time as the one that we will be repealing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will speak again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I just wish to speak for a short while on the question of primary education and coeducation in this country. I should like to remind the House of the position of the National Commission on the Status of Women with which the Minister and his policy makers are fully aware, which has come out very clearly in favour of a policy of coeducation, and it is one of their strong recommendations that Barbados should move completely co-educational both at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels, and indeed I should like to commend the Minister on the start which he and his officers have made in this scheme without any hesitation and indeed working against great odds. I well remember that in 1975 the former Minister said he would be pursuing such a policy. Unfortunately for him he was removed very soon from the Ministry and his successor did nothing about it in 1975–76, so that this Minister has started work on the policy of co-education and he has got very strong support from the National Commission on the Status of Women.

Let me say that the eight schools which he is building is an important step along that road, because he has to make adequate provision for the children before the policy can be fully implemented, and indeed I welcome his assurance that as the Cabinet Minister with responsibility for the schools within four years he would have built ten schools which would be in comparison with the nine built at primary level by the past Government over a period of fifteen years, and I think they will be there for everybody to see. As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity of accompanying him on some of his journeys in selecting of sites and I know that his officials took the Saturday, their own time, in order to show the urgency they were bringing to the start, and on behalf of the residents of Bonnetts, Forde Road, Lower and Upper Clapham and Sargeants Village, some of the most important people in this country, a good constituency, may I congratulate him in selecting a site very near to my constituency since we need improved opportunities in that part of the constituency and we would welcome very soon the establishment of a new primary school in the Clapham-Wildey area.

6.20 p.m.

I want to say that although the Church has made a great contribution to education in this Island by the provision of physical buildings and Teachers and at one stage paying the cost of Primary Teachers I believe that a lot of the Church Schools which the Government still use are now inadequate. I have already spoken about the St. Matthias Schools. I recognise that in the next four years perhaps Government may find it difficult from its own resources or even from Lending Agencies to construct a new primary school in that area but St. Matthias area is one that must be looked at very seriously for combining the Boys' and Girls' School.

The Minister has already taken steps to rectify some of the defects at the St. Matthias Boys' School. For instance, Sir, I do not think that people recognise that there is no playing field available for the children of St. Matthias Boys' or Girls' Schools. I wrote to the present Minister of the matter some months ago and not only did he find the time with his officials to come and inspect and look at the

site but I congratulate him and his Department on the fact that already I can see notices in the newspapers inviting Tenders for fixing a playing field. That is action. Sir.

The people of St. Matthias, the people of Rockley and the people of Worthing View can rest assured that within two years you will see action from the Ministers of Government, not even in my own responsibility but quick response from Ministers of Government on areas such as these and he did not have to get the Prime Minister's approval on these matters. I once wrote to the then member for St. Michael South Central, Mr. Sleepy Smith, about roads in my constituency and he got up and told me that he would like to but things were difficult but he would fix one. He was slapped down by the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John, who said he cannot say he is going to fix anything that the member for Christ Church West has to come to him first. That contrasts with the style of Government that you have in this Government now which is completely different. People sometimes find it difficult to understand that you have men who are real men. They are not afraid to tell the Prime Minister or one another if they are wrong or things of the sort.

We do not have to wait until we are out of Government to disassociate ourselves from things like that. We recognise that within any Government or group of men we will have varying opinions. We try for a consensus but we obviously allow people some individuality and I hope we have put to rest for all times the fact that there is a Government run by one man. That has been put to rest. That is part of the direction and formulation of policy. This is part of the educational policy that this must now be taught in schools.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member is raising the question about Government being run by one man. Does the hon. member really believe that somebody used to run the Ministry of Trade, Labour and Commerce other than myself? He really believes that? He cannot be really serious.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: What I sometimes wonder is if there was anybody running it at all, Sir. Anyway, Sir...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must know when to duck from a bouncer sometimes.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I just want to assure the Minister that my Ministries can be at his disposal to give and play any supporting role needed. We will be only too willing to join with him in trying to advance the cause to which he is so fully dedicated.

One final point, Sir, and it is on Direction and Policy. I am glad to see that he is looking towards a change in the reorientation in educating people for a standard of living. I think it is important and in this respect I once again would like to thank his Ministry for the quick response from my Ministry for setting up the Para-Legal Training Programme. Let me say that only today I got a letter from the Commonwealth Fund For Technical Cooperation saying that Professor Williams who will be the Advisor to the Ministry of Education and myself for three months will be here in April and it looks as though we will be implementing the Para-Legal Training Programme at the Community College by October, this year, Sir.

He is responding, Sir. His Ministry is vibrant, Sir, and we have to give him credit. I know that hon. members might not want to hear the bells ringing out so soon that we are performing so well, that we are combining so well and that the Great Combination, although at times they poke fun at it, but there is no doubt, Sir, that he is making his strokes and making them well even in this field and I want to commend him on his quick response and on behalf of the constituents of Christ Church West, I would like to thank him in particular for responding to our needs in that constituency. I want these words to go out in time for at least the people of Christ Church West.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I will try to be very brief in my reply. There are a number of issues that have been raised by hon. members and I will take them as they come to mind. The question of co-education was raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South West. The Government is firmly committed to the continuous spread of co-education in all schools in Barbados. The hon. member was a little bit worried about the policy and to use his words "what was responsible for the dilatory action" but he in a way answered it later in his speech when he was talking about something else because he said you cannot change a trade policy overnight or you cannot change a foreign policy overnight. The Minister of Communications and Works could start to build a highway and then when he has reached a certain point he finds he is going in the wrong direction he can dig it up and start again. In education it is not like that. Decisions have to be taken with extremely careful thought because wrong decisions quite often affect the whole generation.

Although we are committed to co-education we feel safer in its implementation if we can look at all the problems involved in the institution of co-education and even if we look at the physical problem, it is all very well for the hon. member to talk, but if we are going to make what was once a Girls' School a Boys' and Girls' School then you have to think in terms of having separate toilet facilities for the boys. You probably have to find a cricket pitch for them and that sort of thing. We are on our way.

I was making a note here as he raised his point and in the two areas that we have worked on, the Foundation Boys' and Girls' Schools have been amalgamated. The St. Martin's Boys' and Girls' Schools have been amalgamated.

(Asides.) I will tell you about Harrison College. I know you have a chip on your shoulder. The St. Martin's Boys' and Girls' will be amalgamating this coming September and the St. Luke's Boys' and Girls'. St. Michael's Girls' School will become co-educational this September.

Now the hon. member is asking about Harrison College. I think he knows my views about Harrison College. I do not hold any special brief for Harrison College. I went to school there and that is all. Harrison College will be enjoying no special privileges from this present Minister of Education. I do not intend to interfere with the standards. I certainly do not intend to see it as a privileged school over and above any school in Barbados. The reason why Harrison College is not going to be co-educational in 1979 is two-fold.
6.30 p.m.

First of all, Harrison College has to move into the present Ministry of Agriculture buildings at Crumpton Street, but it seems that the Ministry of Agriculture will not move out in sufficient time this year to allow us to do the type of structural renovations of amenities to start co-education this year. That is the first reason. And the second reason is that if you are going to make Harrison College co-educational, my own view is that Queen's College should be made co-educational the same time, because if Harrison College becomes co-educational and not Queen's College the girls would win most of the places into Harrison College, because Harrison College takes 112 a year and the girls would get more than half of those places, and in addition to that they would get all the places at Queen's College, so I am expecting either next year, 1980, or the following year, but more likely next year to make these two schools co-educational. The Lodge School will become co-educational either in 1980 or 1981, I do not know what the hon. member is worried about.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation. The hon. member obviously never understood my speech. He said that he is waiting for Queen's College to go co-educational before he allows Harrison College to go, but he says at the same time that Lodge will go co-educational. Mr. Chairman, if by going co-educational it will relieve the discrimination against women, that is what co-education is designed to do, among other things, so that I do not accept that the failure to put in five toilets – because there are women who teach at Harrison College, so they must have at least a sick bay – but they have MCW and no matter what is said about them they ought to be able to put in five toilets in five days.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The Minister of Communications and Works will not let that escape, I am sure. Anyhow, I am not quarrelling with the hon. member, I am just explaining what steps we have to take before we make the schools co-educational, but we will continue, it is not going to happen in a year, two years or five years, but we have started and we will continue.

Another question has been raised about the CXC. The hon. member wants to know what happens after CXC. After CXC will be CXC, then CXC, then CXC, because the Caribbean Examinations Council examinations will replace all overseas examinations. It is not a question of co-existence, there will be a period of co-existence until the Caribbean Examinations Council is in a position to examine in all areas and as soon as they are in a position to do that they will no longer be writing overseas examinations.

Mr. TAITT: I wonder if the Minister can tell me what examination would they be taking as a higher level examination after ordinary level? Would there be a CXC equivalent to the 'A' Level?

Hon. L. R. TULL: There are going to be two levels for the Caribbean Examinations Council. In the initial stage we are using just the lower level, and that level is above the existing ordinary level of the General Certificate of Education, and the higher level will also, from what I have been reading from the reports, be at the level that is slightly higher than the existing 'A' Level. How that is worked out in view of the level of the courses at the University is a matter that has not yet been resolved.

In respect of the use of school property, and I know he is talking about the St. Leonard's compound, I have a problem in that regard. We have said that the schools should be used by the people in the community; it is part of our policy. We believe that there is a shortage of social meeting places for the people of Barbados, and we believe that the schools are bought and paid for by the taxpayers of Barbados and therefore they are entitled to their use. That is our broad policy. On the other hand, there has been a great amount of vandalism in the schools, and I am advised by my professionals that I should tread easily in some areas.

I said in my opening speech that there is a lot I do not know, and I am in this case leaning very heavily on the professional wisdom of the people in the Ministry, and they have pointed out that in many cases where the schools have been given to youth groups and community groups a lot of damage was done to the schools and therefore we have to be extremely careful about the general use of school buildings. I would like to see the day when the schools can all be used by the people of this country.

Mr. TAITT: I take the point of the school buildings, but it really grieves me that the children are denied the use of the pasture even though there are Security Guards, even though they have a club, even though the parents have said they would be responsible

for any damage. All these things have been tried and it just is not reasonable that the ordinary playing field cannot be used by the children.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I Share the hon. member's concern. He is pushing an open door, I believe that the facilities of the school should be used by the public, but there are certain considerations that we cannot lose sight of. The hon. member talked about the compound at St. Leonard's and it is difficult for me to separate the playing field from the rest of the premises there. St. Leonard's has been one of the worse hit areas by vandalism, by bad behaviour and so on of any of the schools in Barbados. If you want to hear about young men in a district going during school hours at the St. Leonard's Girls' School into the classrooms and interfering with the children, jumping through windows, breaking up netball games, threatening the Head Teacher, beating up the Security Guards, that is St. Leonards. I am sure that the hon. member has come up against that kind of thing. They go into the classrooms and defecate in the classrooms; that is what they do at St. Leonard's, so I am sure the hon. member would appreciate the difficulty under which I operate. I would like to have a sort of truce down there in the St. Leonard's area where young men in the area feel that the school is community property and they are part of the community and there can be harmony between the teachers, the children and the community. The hon. member cannot lose sight of these peculiar difficulties.

In respect of the use of the playing field at the schools, I cannot sit behind my desk at Jemmotts Lane and pass judgment, but I have got to defend the Head Teachers, and when the hon. member says that he understands the Ministry's policy is this but the Head Teacher is giving problems, I am responsible for the Head Teachers and the Head Teachers are out there knowing what is going on and I have to lend some ear to what they are telling me. I am sure the Head Teacher of St. Leonard's Boys' and the Head Teacher of St. Leonard's Girls' are in a better position than I am as to what type of action is taken down there.
6.40 p.m.

I will promise the hon. member that I am going to make a review of the situation at St. Leonard's in respect of use of the playing field. I will review it next week, and I will take a decision on it; because it is not fair to the people in that part of St. Michael that there is no playing field anywhere in the immediate environment. This is an area totally without a playing field, and it is a built-up area. I believe that if they want to play football in a serious way, on the pasture, that they should be accommodated, all things being considered. I do not want the boys to play football and the next day you cannot hold school because half of the class windows are broken up. I will review it, and I will give the hon. member and his protegees in this area some decision in three or four weeks as to what will be done in that regard. Another question was raised by the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am not making a speech. I am just attempting to query the Hon. Minister on a particular point. I am a parent with two children at school. I want the Minister to tell us if the CXC Certificate qualifies students to enter overseas universities. I would be grateful if the Minister would give me some information on that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the CXC examinations will be written this year for the first time; and the University of the West Indies and the University of Guyana have already stated their full approval of those examinations; and indeed, the Vice Chancellor of the UWI, and I think the Vice Chancellor of the University of Guyana are both represented on the Caribbean Examinations Council. So, there is no problem of recognition of the CXC Examinations.

In respect of the universities outside of the Caribbean, the attitude by the British people has been that they are going to wait until after the first examinations have been held before they state whether they will recognise this or not. Now, we feel that these overseas examination boards, these boards in Britain are holding the CXC up to ransom because they make a tidy piece of change out of administering these overseas examinations; and they do not want to be thrown out of the area because they will lose a considerable amount of money; and their attitude of not giving immediate recognition to these examinations is probably based on that. They say that the recognition will be given after the first set of examinations.

Let me just say that examination boards in Britain have been involved in a lot of the initial planning of the CXC, and Britain has played a major role in setting up the Council, advising, that sort of thing. A number of examination boards in other countries like West Africa and so on have also been involved at advisory level in the setting up of the Council. So it is actually no problem with the examinations, Sir. Let me go further, if the UWI is going to accept the CXC Examinations, I cannot see how other countries, other universities in Britain and so on would find it difficult to accept them; because the UWI has a very high reputation as an educational institution among university bodies throughout the world.

Now, one of the problems of instituting any new system is this problem of recognition. The University of the West Indies was opened in 1948 at Mona; and we went through the same difficulty. People were asking would anybody recognise this university; but it did not take long before we came down that the academic levels of the UWI were acknowledged by the whole university

community. I have no doubt that the same thing will happen with the CXC.

Let me just say for the record that recently in Britain there was a decision taken by the Secretary of State for Education in Britain that the examination bodies— there were 22 examining bodies involved in GCE level examinations; and there was so much inefficiency, so much difference in standards between one and the other, and so chaotic was the system, that the British Government decided to reduce the number of examining bodies from 22 to 8, and decided that the State would have far greater control in the establishment of standards.

Now, if the British Government is unhappy about what is happening about examining bodies in Britain, why should we in the Caribbean continue to be tied to those examining bodies when the British themselves say that they are not satisfied? Related to this point is the question asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South. That is in relation to curriculum. It is important that in a newly, independent, developing country we should try to develop our own cultural and educational ethos. It is no longer defensible that we in this country should be leaning on institutions of foreign countries. It is a matter of national or regional pride that we should have our own national examinations brought up to the standards that are held by any examination council or body in the world.

Mr. TAITT: I did not wish to interrupt the hon. member at this point, a point with which I think we will all agree; but I wish to ask him in this context why is it necessary to indulge in what to my mind can only be a form of inferiority complex, to set examination standards for our children higher than those set by the same bodies which we have been leaning on for so long? There must be some basic reason why a child from Barbados or some other part of the West Indies must now get a higher standard than an English child or a Japanese child or some other child. I see this as a form of inferiority complex. We are equal to anybody else, and our standards do not have to be higher to be accepted. I think that the Minister said that they **will** be going to what apparently is scholarship level. That is not fair to our children. I wonder if the Minister would advert to that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the simple answer to that is that it is not an inferiority complex. If anything, it is a superiority complex. We believe in this area that our standards should be higher than anywhere else but let me answer the question asked by the same hon. member. He asked about the certification in the case of how well or badly you do the examinations. It does not matter how high the level of the examination is where you are speaking of grades all down the line — A, B, E, F and so on.

I would also like to point out for the information of the hon. member that this is a situation that presently obtains in the GCE. *(Aside).* That does not make any difference. It does not matter if it is right or wrong. I am not saying that it is right or wrong. As a matter of fact, I am not making any value judgement on it; but that is the situation which obtains at the moment. You can pass any value judgement that you like; but at the moment in the GCE Examination they give you a certificate for whatever you do. They even give you a certificate for failing. This is nothing new.

When the hon. member talks about the levels that are being set, the fact that they give you grades for what you do, minimises the point made by the hon. member about standards. It is not a question of inferiority complex or superiority complex. It is a way of getting recognition by keeping your standards high.

Mr. TAITT: If the hon. member would give way, I would like to make a point of elucidation. No one is saying that the standards should not be high. We are not discussing whether the standards should be high or not. The point is that we are going to initiate a system where the standard has been set higher than anywhere else. Taking into consideration all the drawbacks which face developing countries it is an unreasonable and unfair imposition on the children of this region. The point that the Minister is making is not necessarily valid because what he is saying is that because you are going to get different grades you should not be worried about standards; but what it means is that our children will get Bs and their children will be all A children. It means that when you go into the wider world, our children will be regarded as B children while theirs will be regarded as A children. I have seen this operating to our detriment. I have seen it operating in North America.

We are the only people on earth who seem constantly to be putting down our own, while in the other countries they are always saying that they are the greatest and the best. I am satisfied that this is a slavish mentality. It means that you have to have higher standards to go to the UWI and higher standards in the CXC Examination; and when our people leave the West Indies and go into the wider world they have a certificate which shows that they are at B standard — and B standard out there is not the same that we set for ourselves. We are no longer slaves. We are a free people and we must think of the West Indies for the West Indies. That is the only point that I am making.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, why I must admit that I thank the Hon. Minister for his reply to my question, I must let him know that there is a rumour going around that with the standards of these examinations being kept so high, there is some motive behind it; and the motive is to reduce the number of students who can enter even into the universities of the Caribbean. I can only tell you the rumours that have been going around. If you are going to set the standards higher, you will no

doubt see the problem we will face, and that many people who in the past would qualify to enter the university, they may not have the qualifications to get there.

My second point is this: Let us assume that Mr. X does not want his child to be educated in the Caribbean.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am not sure in my mind that the Hon. Minister had finished speaking. I thought that you were on a point of order or a point of elucidation.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I very well take the point that the hon. member for St. Philip South is making; but it is not a question of inflexibility. At the moment the Council has said that the level that has been laid down will be just above the O Level standard. They will not be enough to qualify a person to go to the UWI. The hon. member can accept that there need to be no real genuine fears as regards the examinations set by the CXC; and if there are any complaints as detailed by the hon. member, I personally will intervene. I will be making the position of Barbados quite clear on that.

As regards the hon. member for St. Michael South West, I do not know why he keeps saying that if you set high standards it is a disservice to your people. The hon. member may not know that standards in one university can be different from those in another. Indeed standards in a university in one town can differ from the standard of those in another town.

Mr. TAITT: That is not the point that I am making. I am not saying that you should not have any standards. What I am saying is this. Let us assume that there is a world standard. Is it merely because that we are black that we have to prove that we are better than anybody else? I am merely asking if our standards have to be higher than those of Oxford or Cambridge.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member will not sit and listen. You cannot go into a university in Britain unless you have advanced certificates at Grade 2.
7. p.m.

You do not require that level to enter the University of the West Indies. I think all that is whistling in the wind. All these matters will be resolved in the fullness of time. All I need to know is what are the genuine fears of the people of Barbados in relation to these examinations, and I will bring the authority of my office to bear on what will be an equitable, fair and reasonable position for all the people in Barbados who write examinations. This CXC cross-talk for the last fifteen minutes has made it necessary for me, Mr. Chairman, not to bother to develop a lot of the other points raised by hon. members, like the National Curriculum Development Council as asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South. I am tired. I am not answering that now, but I will give the hon. member the answer tomorrow morning. I do not believe that I should have to work so hard in one day.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I really do not feel that you should stake out the Chairman either.

Hon. L. R. TULL: If the hon. member would be good enough to remind me about the question, I will answer. I will tell him what curriculum guides have been published by the Ministry, what the National Curriculum Development Council has been working on, what changes they recommend. I will give the hon. member all that information tomorrow.

The question that the sum of $6,398,204 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that this is the end of your day's task, and I would like to pay credit to the way you conducted the affairs, and I must comment on the whole atmosphere of Parliament today. The debates were lively, the Opposition charged, the Government defending and counter-attacking and driving them back to the wall, and most of all, what I thought made my heart feel very happy was when I saw a little signal between the former Prime Minister and the Prime Minister to have chats behind the Chair. I saw them in very deep conversation... (Mr. CHAIRMAN: And the Leader of the House.) No, Sir, the Prime Minister and the former Prime Minister were standing up behind the Chair talking very closely. All these things made me feel very happy, and then to bring it down also, for the first time for many years I have also had a cordial discussion with the Leader of the Opposition. That made my day a very happy one. I should like to say this even further before I ask you to report progress that it is like a cricket match; we attack each other here on the floor, but whenever we are finished we all go to the dining hall and eat, drink and talk, but the supporters must understand that they are not to kill each other for politicians. I want the Gallery in particular to understand that. Just now we are going to be in the dining hall eating and drinking and the supporters will be downstairs to cheer some and jeer some, and I am only appealing to the supporters in the Gallery to remember that politicians do not curse each other inside the dining hall, they eat and drink.

Sir, with those very kind remarks, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Education for a very stirring contribution, and beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, speaking on the motion to report progress, I could not let it pass without acknowledging that it must have been a great day.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, if I may just assist my colleague in the Rules of this Honourable House, I do not think he can speak on your reporting progress. He can speak on the suspension, so I would just like to enlighten him.

Mr. TAITT: It is not a matter on which there is need for contest. It is also true that he was not entitled to make all the comments which he made while putting a motion.

Hon. L. S. ÇRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have made a motion and if you need advice you can seek the advice of the Clerk.

The question that Mr. CHAIRMAN do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow, Thursday 22nd March, 1979.

I should like my colleagues on the other side to advise their colleagues who are not in their places at this moment that because of a Cabinet Meeting tomorrow morning we will come at noon and expect to work late tomorrow night.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the motion for the suspension I wish to make just a few comments. I was very appreciative of the hon. member's statement that he was happy that there was some cordiality expressed from his side to this side today. I myself was not here or party to the discussion, so I do not know what the discussion was, although I have reason to believe it had to do with what time we would meet tomorrow. What I would not like to happen because we have some supporters in the Gallery and you have some supporters in the Gallery is this: I do not like this snide reference which suggests that we permit ourselves to give the wrong impression to those people. What we debate in here is one thing, what happens on the political platform is another thing, but the impression must not go forth that we are involved in any kind of conspiracy to defraud the electorate. I am not in that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I do not want to hold you up because it is time to go. All I am trying to explain to the public is that we are friends inside the lounge; do not mind the pussy-footing inside here. It is as simple as that. What is this big debate on saying something that I think is of some interest to you? You are my friend, and the hon. member for St. Michael South sits, eats and drinks with us ...

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Deputy Speaker, the same hon. member on more than one occasion has told me "you could never be my friend."

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: In here.

Mr. TAITT: I am still speaking.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought that was a good note on which to end the sitting.

Mr. TAITT: I think it is important that it be recorded because subsequently when the record is being used for political purposes, it will be pointed out how when the hon. member made that statement there was nothing said on this side. I am very serious, Mr. Chairman. I have heard where an hon. member over there made some remarks which the hon. member was heard, when they were said, to say he knew I could never be a friend of that hon. member: (Hon. L. S. CRAIG: You know you are a television star. Why don't you sit down?) On that note, if he calls me a television star, I am not going to question that.

The question that the Sitting be now suspended until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, 22nd March, 1979, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

7.10 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply, and to that it now reverts.

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

HEAD 15(2) – SCHOOLS (i) PRE-PRIMARY, PRIMARY AND SPECIAL

Head 15(2) – Schools – (i) Pre-Primary, Primary and Special – for the sum of $7,148,683 was called.

HON. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(2) stand part.

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

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question there are a number of questions which I would like to ask, of course bearing in mind what the Minister has said on the question of the thrust in the area of primary education. I am wondering if the Minister would be in any position to further give some indication on the area of pre-primary education. I know that yesterday he spent a lot of time on primary education; and I think that it is generally accepted that pre-primary education is fundamental to the development of children; and therefore plays a very important role in the education of children. I know under the Democratic Labour Party administration the amount of attention which was paid to nursery education. We have reached the point where a lot more time and attention must be devoted to this particular area.

You are aware, Mr. Chairman, for example, the first three or four years of a child's life are extremely important. It is amassing knowledge which a child of that age can assimilate. The way in which this knowledge can be assimilated must have some bearing on the quality of a person who eventually will have to play a very important role in the society. I hope that the Minister will be able to give some indication of the direction in which we are supposed to go. It would seem, Mr. Chairman, that there are about 114 primary schools; and I am wondering if the Government would not give some consideration to adding to these existing schools in the pre-primary department so that the children in districts where these schools are sited will be able to benefit.

There is no doubt that this would be of tremendous importance to parents who would necessarily be looking forward to this kind of assistance. I am suggesting that the Government should give some consideration to extending the existing primary schools for this area of education. Where in this area of primary education there is no room for extension, consideration will have to be given to the pre-primary area of nursery schools.

If I can move on and look at other areas, I would like to just put some questions concerning the areas of primary education. The Minister has indicated that there will be a thrust by his Ministry in the area of primary education. That is where the emphasis is going to be placed. He indicated that the Ministry would spend a lot of money in building these schools. Most certainly on our side we would want to support the construction of primary schools. Indeed we understand the challenges of one aspect of primary education; and we have to look at the other factors that are involved. Let us look at the other factors and problems, and let us hear from the Minister how he proposes to deal with these problems.

Take for example the textbooks which are used in primary schools. On the whole question of the ability of children to read and write and reason, there have been complaints from teachers about the lack of books in primary schools. They have complained that the grant has been reduced. This places teachers at primary schools at a further disadvantage; so I believe that the Minister should give us some indication as to what is happening in this particular area.

On the question of Item 4, Adult Education, Mr. Chairman, to move to another aspect of this Head, this is an area which I have some concern about; and it is an area to which I have had some exposure; and I am a bit surprised that Adult Education has taken a very heavy reduction – a decrease of $289,668. The vote is now $275,000; and I am wondering if the Minister could explain that; because I want to suggest that when one is talking in terms of education, one has to realise that it is important at the primary level, the secondary level, the tertiary level in the whole educational process, because the educational process is continuous.

I am sure that if the administration cares about the citizens, it should make more money available for adult education. There are classes for adult education around the country. We have a number of areas in which there are evening classes. It seems that there will be a reduction in these classes. Let me look just briefly at the evening classes and at some of the problems which arise there. There are complaints that there seems to be no definite policy in this area. I would say that this area of Adult Education is a very important area. There have been people who have been able to leave the evening classes and move into jobs in this community. I cannot understand how the Government can make a reduction in this area.

12.20 p.m.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that this country has got to pay some very serious attention to the area of the production of secretaries. Good secretaries are needed in Barbados. It is extremely disturbing and very pathetic when one has to interview people who apply for secretarial jobs. A number of them find it very difficult to type with any degree of efficiency and proficiency and this is a matter which is of utmost concern. I believe that the Government should be involved in providing a very urgent, if needs be, crash programme in this particular area, because a good secretary in my view is of extreme importance to any businessman, to any Minister or to any person who has to administer an office, and when therefore we are critical of the reduction in the vote for evening classes, we see this as a reduction in the possible production of a number of people, good highly qualified secretaries who would be able to come into the work force and take up secretarial jobs. I know for example that the Community College is there to do this, but it may not be convenient for everybody to attend such classes at the Community College. I am not at all suggesting that there is some kind of attitude which some people adopt on the question of secretaries and secretarial training. The Minister yesterday raised the question of the approval of parents. Some parents may first have the idea that their child should benefit from secondary education, and then if they cannot get into the academic stream they would do a little typing and a little shorthand without recognising that this is important. It is not a question of doing a little typing and shorthand because as I said, everybody will not be able to get into the Community College, so that I should think some attention has to be paid to the evening classes, and certainly attention must be paid to up-grading the quality of teaching and the service which is offered in this particular area.

Mr. Chairman, a number of students have complained for example about the lack of proper record-keeping at the Evening Institute and evening classes, where if a teacher is changed for one reason or another, the person may have to go overseas, the new teacher who comes on does not know where to pick up from, and this may be one of the problems which is experienced in the evening classes. I would think that the Ministry should emphasise that there should be some proper keeping of records of the work which is done. This would be in the interest of everybody, both the teacher and the pupils.

The question of typewriters is another matter which must be of some concern to us. I understand that teachers experience some difficulty in getting the typewriters serviced. Some typewriters I am told have not been serviced for three years, and if you are forced to work on a typewriter which is in need of service, this will obviously retard the progress of the person and make it very difficult for the pupil to acquire the skills which are necessary in this particular area. While I am on my feet I am wondering if the Minister would give some consideration in all the centres where shorthand and typing is taught to making available an electric typewriter, because I think this is now more or less accepted as one of the tools which the typists should use. We are in this age of advanced technology and most secretaries would be confronted with an electric typewriter and would experience some difficulty in the initial stages as to how it is handled.

There are two other points, Mr. Chairman, which I should like to raise. I see here under Item 7 that there is some money which is provided to cover rental of land used for gardening and playgrounds, and I want to make a little plea for two schools in St. Lucy. One is Selah Primary School. There is a playground attached to the school. I think it is school property but for some time now I have been asking and in case the Minister would get up and say I did not ask under the D.L.P. regime, let me assure him that I did, to have the playing field attached to the Selah Primary School levelled. It is a reasonably big playing field; it is used unlike the playing field at St. Leonards by the people from the school and also by the people who live in the Crab Hill, Grape Hall and surrounding areas of St. Lucy, so it is used by the community. I think its use could be much more effective if the ground could be levelled so that the people and the pupils can play their football. They do play at present though with some difficulty. They are aware that a lot more can be done on the ground if it is levelled, and I should like to ask the Minister if he would give some consideration in the not too distant future to ensuring that this playground is levelled.

One last point and it is to do with Item 10 which includes provision for practical education, domestic requisites, medical expenses and so on. Now this is a matter which I think all of us should be concerned about. Children at school will at times get into problems and get cut or meet some accident and may have to be taken to the doctor. My understanding is that some headteachers experience some difficulty in this area of not being able to have money at their disposal to meet this particular contingency, and I am wondering if the Minister would give some consideration to probably revising the present practice where a bill is put in and the money reclaimed, because some headteachers have been experiencing difficulty in being able to get the money out. There are one or two headteachers who have been embarrassed in sending children to doctors, and I understand for example that at the Speightstown Boys' School they owed the doctor some money, and what they do when children are injured is to get the doctor to put the charge on the parents' bill. I think it is a matter which we should look at very carefully and try to iron out because it is these irritations sometimes that could cause all sorts of

problems, and I suggest that the Minister take a note of that and give some consideration to it.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want to speak on this particular topic and I want to get on the record of this House the work of the previous administration in the area of primary education. The Government has announced that its thrust in education will be in the area of primary education. There has been criticism in the past and there is an implication in the present that the previous administration paid little or no attention to primary school education.
12.30 p.m.

Yesterday I was speaking from memory about the projects carried out in Primary School Education and the thrust of the previous administration in this area. I have had cause and the Minister need not get too worried. I carried out my own research and I am now going to say what work was done in the field of Primary Education and I will tell the Minister of Education this, the member for St. George South.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is aware, of course, that he cannot under the Standing Orders repeat statements which he made yesterday.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am aware of that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you want to take the opportunity to clarify or elucidate something I would allow a little flexibility.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much. We will be very flexible. We are very flexible in this Session. We are being very flexible because according to my watch and the clock over there, it was well after 12 o'clock when this Session started so we have to be very flexible. Technically this may be an illegal Session. I do not know, so we are being very very flexible today so I hope we can be very flexible, very flexible today, Sir.

As far as Primary School Education is concerned, I will tell the Minister this. He has ample opportunity to carry out the thrust in the field of Primary Education and he will have to do a lot of work to equal the thrust in Primary School Education that was effected by the previous administration. If he can equal that thrust and surpass it then this country will take hats off to him. He would be doing a very efficient job and I would be the first person to congratulate him and I wish him well on this.

As far as school construction is concerned, without the aid of a World Bank Loan, we were able to construct the following schools: Good Shepherd Primary School; Stow Primary School and its replacement, when the Stow Primary School was taken over by the Springer Memorial Secondary; Charles F. Broome Primary School; St. Bartholomew Primary School and St. Margaret's Mixed School.

We started Roebuck Primary School. *(Asides.)* You just deny it. Get up and deny it. We left all the plans in there for you and you went and built on shifting sand and increased the cost of the project tremendously.

The St. Christopher Primary School; The Primary School in St. Joseph at Lammings; and the Primary School at the Farm.

Now these are almost about 12 Schools, no, 11 Primary Schools and then we added substantial extensions at the Christ Church Girls' School and the Vauxhall Primary School.

In the Primary Schools there has been almost one Primary School per year for the 15 years that the Democratic Labour Party was in power. Yesterday you were talking about building one school per year. In the primary sector alone the Democratic Labour Party administration opened at least one school per year and it is in addition to that.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. My friend's mathematical prowess is lacking today. I know like me he studied Modern Studies. I have been going through the Schools that he listed and even giving him Roebuck Primary which he did not build, that is only nine, Sir.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You apparently did not hear the Stow Primary School and the Stow Primary replacement. That is two schools, not one. You studied Modern Studies too. Those are the Primary sectors. When we add the extensions to buildings and I just gave one example at Christ Church Girls' School, and we add the numerous temporary classrooms, you will see that the St. Clements' Senior School has a big extension down there and St. Margaret's School. Mr. Chairman, I said 15? There must be more than 15 in the Primary sector alone and when we add our building thrust in the Secondary sector it will be realised.

I will watch for the next 10. *(Asides.)* There is no thrust in the Secondary? I am dealing only with the Primary. In addition to that, we set up a number of Nutrition Rooms. We fixed a number of roadways at a large number of schools giving them roadways where there were not and giving them paved roadways.

As far as the Nursery level is concerned, the whole Nursery School Programme is a programme initiated by the Democratic Labour Party. *(Asides* – so what?) So What? The hon. member for Christ Church East is asking "so what?" You ask your spokesman out there,

"so what?" The point I am making is that there seems to be some implication that we did nothing for Primary School Education and now they are going to carry out a massive programme in Primary School Education and from the information I have given I am telling him that he will have a lot of work cut out for him to do, to equal the work that has been done by the previous administration.

As far as the programme inside of the schools are concerned because we were not only concerned with building schools, we initiated a programme of Science Education in co-operation with UNICEF to up-grade Science Education in the Primary Schools. All of that is work done by the previous administration. A substantial programme was done in the maintenance and repairs to schools.

I would just like, Mr. Chairman, to clarify something said yesterday. The Minister launched an unnecessary and unworthy attack on the construction of a school at St. Margaret's and I was able to confirm that that school was in a very bad state of repair, the roof was leaking and the stairs were in a dilapidated condition. The whole fabric of the school was in need of substantial repairs. In addition to that, it was Church property. It was decided that it was necessary to construct what was virtually a new school on that site and allow the Church property to revert to the Anglican Church in accordance with the Anglican Church Act and it is unworthy for any Minister of Education, if he does not know the facts, to come in here and suggest that it was put up for political reasons because of the member for St. John. I have the information. You have yours and I have mine. The only problem is that I know a little more about these things than you do. *(Asides.* – "I have yours and mine here"). You do not have very much. You have all of mine. That is your problem.

We increased the number of Teachers at the Primary School level. We removed the discrimination against women and I would have hoped that the member for Christ Church West would have spoken very feelingly on this matter.
12.40 p.m.

The great work was done by the Democratic Labour Party in removing discrimination in the teaching profession when male teachers, Head Teachers and other teachers were paid at a higher level than their female counterparts for doing the same job. Sometimes we believe that the work for equality as far as women are concerned started with the great lover of women, the member for Christ Church West but he himself knows that this is a much longer tradition....

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order. Does the hon. member want me to exclude him from being a lover of women, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order. Are you sure you mean lover or champion?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I had better settle for champion. That is it, Mr. Chairman. We set up a number of programmes for improving the curriculum in the schools, we had agricultural science syllabuses out and these were in the schools, we had a gardening programme going at the schools, and from time to time new curricula were put into those schools. We increased the promotional opportunities for teachers and we reduced the ratio of teachers to students. All of these represent a substantial thrust by the Democratic Labour Party administration into the field of primary education. Now, we did not have any World Bank loan, our assistance was in the nature of three schools as a result of the very good relationship that existed between the Government of Barbados and the Canadian International Development Agency, but for his thrust he needs now a massive loan from the World Bank.

We were able to carry out that programme out of the economic resources of this country and without the aid of such a loan. I would like the Minister when he is replying to. indicate at what primary schools roadways were fixed during the past year. I would like him to tell me what is the ratio of teacher to student for the infant schools, for the juniors and for the secondary; I would like him to tell me how many all-age pupils there are in the schools and whether contrary to the policy as enunciated by the Barbados Labour Party the number of pupils in the all age schools and the all age schools themselves have been increased. Maybe while he is at it he can also tell me how many schools – we have heard a lot about vandalism and why the St. Leonard's Schools cannot be made available to groups in that particular area – while he is at it maybe he can tell me how many schools have been broken into and the value of any articles and so on missing during the past year. All of this is information which any Minister who is up to date on his Ministry would have at his fingertips, and I hope he wouldn't take four and five months to supply that information, as I note there are a number of Questions on the Order Paper relating to Education and it is taking that amount of time in order to answer those questions.

I will pause at this stage because we have a long, long day. The Prime Minister has been challenging us from time to time that we do not discuss Education, and he was inviting us over here obviously to put his Minister of Education on the spot, because I do not know what is going on between the two of them, but obviously all is not well within the court of Denmark; he is inviting us to discuss Education, I don't know why. Anyhow, I say no more at this stage.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Minister of Education about St. Clement's Senior

School. I remember when I was a youngster going to school there there was a little playground below the school and between the school and the St. Clement's Church property, but since the extension which was put on by the Democratic Labour Party was done that playground is no longer there, but above the school, to the east of the school there is some open land which I know that the pupils have been using without any particular authority, and I wonder if the Minister of Education would give some consideration to approaching the owners. I think it is owned by Lisle Ward and the Estate of Dan Springer, if he would consider approaching the owners about the rental of that particular area, I am sure they would make it available at a very very low rental.

The member for St. Michael South has asked me whilst I am on my feet to enquire from the Minister of Education why was the adult education programme, that is, the evening classes, at Bay Primary School closed.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply very briefly to some of the comments made by the two hon. members who spoke on the other side. I have always understood that the debate on the annual Estimates provided opportunity for the Opposition to criticise the policy of Government. They had their chance over the period of a week to look at the policies of Government, to tear them to pieces, to be critical and so on, but what I have seen from the hon. member for St. Michael South who was a previous Minister of Education is a rather lame attempt to defend the past Democratic Labour Party record in Education. You would have thought that the hon. member would be getting up and saying such and such is wrong with the present policy of the Government on Education. This is wrong or that is wrong, you should do this thing this way, you are wasting money, you should put priorities here; none of that.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. What you are doing to the teachers now is wrong, let me tell you that, but I dealt with the points which you made. I cannot tell you that everything is wrong because you are only following the policy that was left. Do you want me to say that it is wrong to build primary schools? That is right, all I am saying is that you are carrying out our policy.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member makes two major concessions. One is that the Ministry of Education is doing all right, there is nothing to criticise about it, and I hope that goes down for the record. He said that we are following a good policy and everything is going right, and I am glad to hear that. The second thing he is saying that what is happening to the teachers – and I don't know precisely what he means because so many things are happening to them I really don't know what he means in this case – but if he is referring to the present industrial dispute between the Government and the teachers, he should ashamed to get up in here and make that type of comment, because ever since he was Minister in 1969 not only the Barbados Union of Teachers, but the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union, two Teachers' Unions, have been making the repeated claim from 1969 until 1975 when the hon. member was summarily dismissed from his job at the Ministry of Education and told about it by messenger, from 1969 to 1975 the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union were negotiating with, quarrelling with, disputing with that administration and that Minister – that member who was Minister at the time – on the very question of overlap.
12.50 p.m.

The hon. member who has just sat down over a period of six years as Minister of Education gave the Barbados Union of Teachers only two points up the graduate scale.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I believe the hon. Minister is misleading the House. He is saying that there was this issue going back to 1969 and that there were repeated requests about the overlap. The question of the overlap was raised in 1969 among a number of other things but it was not a major issue that surfaced in the negotiations; it became a major issue in 1975 after the re-classification exercise and the 1976 salary negotiations and you had to deal with the greater part of that. That is the record. It was not a major issue because if the teachers....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that he is now making a speech.

Mr. SANDIFORD: No, Sir, I merely wanted to state the facts of the matter.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member's position with respect to 1969–75 is well known, for the then Minister of Finance and Establishment did not take him on; he had no say. But it is a fact that there was an on-going question about the settlement of the overlap between the Government and the Teachers Union as far back as 1969, and all through those years the Democratic Labour Party got away with it. They gave them two points on the scale over a period of two years and the Union made a little noise and then kept quiet. The Barbados Labour Party has been in power for two years and has offered them two points. The Democratic Labour Party gave two points in seven years and the Barbados Labour Party gave two points in two years; but they are saying no they do not want it and they have resorted to sick-outs. Two points by them in seven years, and two points by us in two years and yet

the hon. member has the nerve to get up in here and say we are not giving adequate attention to the teachers' claims.

But let me get back to the point I was making before this intervention by the hon. member for St. Michael South. You would have thought that they would come in here and perhaps criticise policies, but I have not heard one single criticism of the policy on education. Hear what the hon. member for St. Michael South said: "The Minister of Education criticised the last administration for neglecting the primary section of education." I make the charge categorically that the previous administration allowed primary education to slip during their term of office. The hon. member answered that by saying that he built schools, thereby providing school places, etc; that they built nine schools during the fifteen years, so he was paying attention to primary education. But let me say this: It was the hon. member for St. Lucy, his own colleague, who said in here yesterday that there are a number of children coming out of schools who cannot read. The hon. member for St. Lucy said that the school system had turned out a number of unwanted children who felt they had no part in the national development. That is what the hon. member for St. Lucy said, and as I have said already, if there are such children coming out of the schools now, they are children who went to school 90% of their time under the Democratic Labour Party administration. Since I was Minister of Education only two classes have come out of school, 1977 and 1978. I am in total agreement with the hon. member for St. Lucy that standards have been slipping and that there are numbers of children coming out of the schools who cannot read or write. But you cannot blame the Barbados Labour Party for this; those children were going to school from age six to sixteen under the Democratic Labour Party regime. I would like the hon. member to tell the people of this country how many children who took the Common Entrance Examination in 1973 got nought; I want to know how many children at age eleven during the time that the hon. member for St. Michael South was Minister for Education took the examinations and did not get a single mark in Arithmetic or English.

Dr. CADDLE: Can the Minister say how many children got zero last year or the year before in the examination.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I would like to ask the hon. member whether it is a fact that the only time that the students of a certain school failed to reach Barbados Scholarship level was during the regime of the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation. We are getting a lot of pseudo-educational argument which anyone who follows the matter of education in this country would be ashamed to think that the Minister of Education is using that type of argument.

1.00 p.m.

Now, as far as persons getting zero in education, if you use the type of test that was being used for the Common Entrance Examination, children would be scoring zero. That type of test was introduced somewhere in 1959, under the Barbados Labour Party, and they will continue to score zero under that type of test. As far as Barbados Scholarship is concerned – I am elucidating this point very quickly on the Barbados Scholarship.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The next Head is on secondary education and perhaps we can make a longer speech then, rather than make a speech of elucidation now.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I do not know why the hon. member is getting up and interrupting all the time. He gets us and he does not deny anything that I have said. If he wants to get up and say that I am wrong let him do so; but do not get up and agree with me each time. He has agreed that a whole lot of children got nought for many years when he was Minister of Education. He agreed that for the first time in the history of Barbados, students did not reach Barbados scholarship level when he was Minister of Education. He gets up in here and agrees with that and then tells us a lot of foolishness about how he built a school and that is all right. I build schools here there and everywhere. You built nine Primary school in 15 years, and this Minister will build 10 primary schools in four years. *(Aside)*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us keep the asides down to zero.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Let the hon. member understand that my academic career is far more eminent than anything that he could ever aspire to. If he wants me to lay down my academic career on the line I can put it against that of anybody on that side and it would stand up.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would be grateful if the academic careers are at primary and pre-primary level could be dealt with. I do not think that academic careers are relevant to the debate.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Now, Sir, let me just answer a few points made by the member for St. Lucy. The hon. member for St. Lucy referred to nursery education; and he quite rightly said that pre-primary education is very important because of the early development of children these days. I want to say something to the hon. member for Christ Church East which I think was unfortunate. He did not seem to understand the difference between a

nursery school and a day care centre. I have always understood the difference between a nursery and a day care centre, but the hon. member placed the two together which caused a little confusion to me; but what a lot of people, including the hon. member for St. Lucy do not understand – I have the grammar and the syntax, do not worry about that – but what a lot of them do not understand is that there are nursery sections at Primary schools in Barbados where children under five are attending the nursery wings of primary schools. There are 2,615 under the age of five who are attending these primary schools. Everybody seems to think that the only place you get nursery education is at the three nursery schools at Eden Lodge, Government Hill and Erdiston, although there are 2,615 children who are receiving nursery education at the existing primary schools.

I want to say to the hon. member that as much as I appreciate his concern for an increase in the number of nursery places in Barbados, it must be pointed out that the cost of nursery education is extremely high. I think that the hon. member for St. Michael South raised the question of the teacher – pupil ratio in primary schools. I do not remember exactly what it is. It might be one in 30 or somewhere around there. If he wants to know, let him send down a substantive parliamentary question and I will give him an answer.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order. Clearly, Sir, at a time we are discussing the Estimates and the Minister indicated that if we want to get an answer we must put down a substantive question, it is an affront to this Hon. House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not accept that as a point of order. The Minister is not omniscient. All I understood the Minister to say in relation to a number of questions asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South – questions that followed closely one after the other – for details of figures, was that the Minister does not now have those figures available; but he has no objection to reply to a substantive question along the same lines.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect. At Estimates time of all other times during the year, this is the time when you expect the Minister to come down and give an account of his stewardship and bring in his experts.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am an humble fellow. I do not know everything. That is the difference between myself and the hon. member for St. Michael South. He knows everything about everything. I do not know the exact ratio at the moment. It is in the region of one in 30. The hon. member is not accustomed to hearing politicians say that they do not know everything; but I am one who does not know everything. As I have said, the pupil teacher ratio in primary schools is about one in 30, but I think that the ratio in nursery schools is about 1 in 8. Therefore the cost of nursery education is far higher than the cost of primary education; and although the Government sees the present need for development in that area, we are committed to the further expansion of primary education in Barbados.

I was talking about the question raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy. It is in relation to books at primary schools. As far as I understand it, if there was a shortage of books in primary schools it was because we in the Ministry were receiving requisitions from the headteachers of many of those schools too late. I hope that the hon. member if he is really serious will understand that we in the Ministry will have to wait until we get requisitions from the headteachers as to what books they want; and when requisitions come in late, obviously they will receive them late. He also raised the question of a reduction in adult education.

1.10 p.m.

There are a number of answers to the reduction in this regard. First of all there have been springing up all over Barbados a number of evening institutes, like City College. City College is a supposed centre of education somewhere in Bridgetown run and operated by the hon. member for St. Michael South and I would have thought that by the Rules and Standing Orders of this House the hon. member would have got up before he had started to talk on the education debate and declared his interest.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order. I assume you were on a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: What is the point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He is objecting to the reference you made about declaration of interests. I do not think that rule is intended to cover a situation like that. That is my view. Anyhow, let us have no acrimony over it.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I take it that you know the circumstances and do not want to hear them.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is special education. Does that come under this Head?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rose to object to the imputation that I had a direct pecuniary interest in this particular item that is being discussed and that is offensive to me. It is untrue and I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the remark and that they be struck from the records.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I always hear these spurious points of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have to rule on that first.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I am trying to give you the facts. You have to be informed to rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If you will only take your seat, I will rule. I do not deem the allegation against the hon. member that he has a direct pecuniary interest can be reasonably construed in such a light, but I equally do not believe that there was any kind of conflict of interest which would require the hon. member for St. Michael South to have made a disclosure to the House, certainly not in this case, and I would ask that the references to the hon. member's conflict of interest be withdrawn by the Hon. Minister:

Hon. L. R. TULL: I will accept your ruling.

Mrr. CHAIRMAN: You will do what?

Hon. L. R. TULL: I said I will accept your ruling. Mr. Chairman, you will know I do not care if you chase me out. If you want to chase me out I am willing to go because I am tired.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: So you withdraw the allegation?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Did you ask me to withdraw the allegation? I said I accepted your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: My ruling was that you withdraw the allegation.

Hon. L. R. TULL: That was not the ruling, you know. What you said was that you asked.....

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

Hon L. R. TULL: I withdraw it and I will bring it out in the other item when we get to it that deals with Evening Institutes and all that. If you want me to withdraw it, I withdraw it. I have all day.

The question of adult education was raised and I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that the reason why there has been a reduction in the amount of money that is being spent in that area is because there have been springing up in Barbados a number of evening educational institutions including City College of which the hon. member for St. Michael South knows a whole lot, and I will tell you about the rest of it later on. We have a lot of places like City College, the Metropolitan Night Institute, the "O" Level Institute and a number of them that have been siphoning off numbers of people who were traditionally going to the Ministry's evening classes, and that is one of the reasons. We have also been finding that at a number of courses we are running there has not been regular attendance, and often the instructors turn up and not the people in the class; so we have had to cancel a lot of classes for that reason.

We have also had the question raised by the hon. member about typewriters and their servicing. Now typewriters that are used consistently day after day by people who are learning to type have a very short life span. We do admit that we are having a problem of finding people to service the typewriters and for this very reason I have made it known in my department that I am prepared to give a course or a number of courses of training to people either locally or overseas who are interested in typewriter maintenance, because we see this as a problem and we are offering available bursaries and scholarships to get people who can take up a six months or a one year course to pick up the skill of maintenance of typewriters. In this regard let me say that we have had discussions with the Ministry of Overseas Development in Britain and they have offered us £200,000 in aid for technical equipment and under this we are including typewriters. I am hoping that during the course of the next financial year many of the difficulties in that regard will be minimised when we take up this grant from the British Government.

Now the hon. member for St. Lucy also raised the question of medical expenses for children who are hurt. I share the concern of the hon. member. I myself have been taking some secondary thoughts about the existing policy in relation to medical expenses for children who are hurt at school, and I hope that some time in the very near future a more reasonable system can be worked out so that we can get around many of the problems that we are currently facing.

Now there is another question that the hon. member for St. Michael South raised and it is about the St. Margarets School in St. John. He gives the argument that it was a church school, but so are scores of other schools in Barbados. He gives the argument that it was dilapidated. This is true of scores of other schools in Barbados. These are the two reasons he gave for building a new school at St. Margarets. I am not even going to quarrel at this stage about the building of the school. I did that yesterday already. If they felt justified in building a school at St. Margarets, why did they not take into consideration the demography, how many people lived in the area and how many children would be likely to go to the school! The result is that the school is largely under-utilised and there are a number of rooms in that building that are not being used, all because of a monumental building down under the hills in St. John for somebody or other. That school at St. Margarets is big enough to be a secondary school. It is not the type of school that is necessary for primary school people in Barbados, and I want the hon. member to get up and challenge me on that because I have been to the school

and I saw that it is not being used. (Dr. CADDLE: Make it a secondary school.) I am not making it into a secondary school because I am not building any secondary schools in St. John. If the Democratic Labour Party Government wasted the people's money in building a school that they have no use for, that is their business. The hon. member for St. John can get up and answer that. He spent the money.

Again I am going to travel far and wide. I understand that the hon. member for St. Michael South said the Democratic Labour Party administration had its thrust in primary education, and the gist of his argument was that they put up a few buildings. If the hon. member is honest with himself, he will know that repeatedly over the last three or four years everybody who has an inkling of what happens in education have been saying that the primary element of education in this country has been neglected, including his friend, Dr. Leonard Shorey, including the same Barbados Union of Teachers, including the Barbados Secondary Teachers' Union, including the Association of Secondary Headteachers, including all the headteachers in the primary schools. All of them said that education at the primary level was neglected over the period of years in which the Democratic Labour Party was in power, and the hon. member has the nerve when his good friends in education, the ones that he appointed in top posts like Mr. Rudolph Goodridge at the In-Service Diploma Institute at Cave Hill say that, to get up in here and make that type of statement.
1.20 p.m.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I recall bitterly your ruling and it was very clear on this question of commenting and using names of persons in their official capacity without having written under the appropriate sections. I think the Hon. Minister knows better, Sir.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Rudolph Goodridge is not a public officer. I do not know why the hon. member is wasting my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order 28(10) (b) if reference is to be made to the character or conduct – of course I interpret this word "conduct" to mean "adverse" conduct – of any person in his official capacity you must deliver to the Speaker written prior notice of the proposed reference and the notice set out must be signed by the member giving it. I will just ask hon. members again to contain themselves if they have to think, even of persons in their official capacity, far less to refer to them.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I rise on a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You can only elucidate something which you said already.

Mr. SANDIFORD: He has given away.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: He has given away?

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I was not aware that he gave way. I had ruled and myeyes caught yours but I did not realise that the Minister had given away. I do not believe so.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I will just press on.

Mr. SANDIFORD: You gave way. Now are you saying that you did not give way?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please contain yourselves. No cross-talking. Continue the debate, please.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I am going to give the hon. member a chance in a minute. I am going to listen to everything he has to say. I have to go back, Mr. Chairman, because I have to travel far and wide. I will go back to the question that was raised before the interruption about the thrust in Primary Education that the hon. member for St. Michael South was boasting about. I have pointed out to the people who I say were complaining about the lack of regard for primary Education in Barbados and I included all the Teachers' Unions. I included all the Experts in Education so I do not know where the hon. member has been. Let me tell the hon. member what we mean by up-grading education at the Primary level and operating a new thrust there.

We do not only mean that we will build schools. They are necessary and we will build them but the hon. member should know that for the first time this Government, this Ministry of Education, has instituted a Course at the University at Cave Hill, a Bachelor of Education Course for Senior Teachers, and Head Teachers in Primary Schools (*Asides.*) I am saying that we have instituted a new Course for them. I am willing to give way to the hon. member if he wants to get up and deny that. I am glad to sit down.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I want to elucidate a point which I made in relation to the building of schools. The great thrust in education which we have heard about.....

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I thought the hon. member was rising on a point of order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: After you gave way you cannot expect him to rise on a point of order then. You gave away everything. Alright, please. Do not let us get involved, please. Just make your point quickly.

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am making my point quickly. We have heard about a thrust in Primary Education and that thrust is related to the building of Secondary Schools which the Government was embarking on in relation to a World Bank Loan and I pointed out in my address that we also built a number of Primary Schools without that aid. That is the point as far as that is concerned. I also indicated elucidating the point about Training.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, I want to hear you on the institution of a Course at Cave Hill. That is the point that the Hon. Minister really gave away on. You are not answering that?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I am talking about instituting a Course at the University of the West Indies for Primary School Teachers leading to a Bachelor of Education and I am saying that a Course leading to a Bachelor of Education has been available within the University of the West Indies for quite some time. If he wants me to give him the number of Teachers who were sent abroad on that particular Course I will do so. We have instituted...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member will now take his seat. You will have another opportunity.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I have told the hon. member not to tamper with me and he would not hear. This Ministry has introduced for the first time a Course at Cave Hill, a Bachelor of Arts in Education for Senior Teachers and Head Teachers, a Course which did not exist under the Democratic Labour Party Administration. *(Asides* – We left the programmes there). That is what I am saying. You left the programmes? Everything you left. That Party never did anything. All it did was to leave things.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, under the same World Bank Project he is talking about, one of the components in that is that money is there for the Education, Administration and Management Courses for the training of Senior Teachers. Now I do not know if the hon. member will get up and claim that too. This is the sort of thing that we are interested in hearing because these schools are no longer places where you teach the 3 R's under a tree. They involve a great amount of administration and management and we find that one of the problems in the schools and why they have been turning out the poor quality of people getting zeros in the Common Entrance Examination when the hon. member for St. Michael South was Minister was the fact that the Head Teachers and Senior Teachers were not trained in Management. They were not trained in Administration and therefore a number of the normal problems were compounded by that lack of training.

We are seeking to set that right and when the hon. member for St. Michael South wants us to get on with the Tertiary Institutions, I want him to get up and explain his position in relation to all of them because it seems to me that nothing that I am doing is not something that he has left.

In addition to that, my Ministry under the same World Bank Agreement, negotiated by my Department, not the Department of the hon. member for St. Michael South when he was there, under that Agreement there will be an expansion and up-grading of the facilities at Erdiston Training College. We consider the training for Teachers at all levels to be vital for the improvement of the standards of Primary Education for the schools in Barbados and we are putting emphasis in that regard. There is a lot more to be said under the other Heads, Mr. Chairman, so I will just deal quickly by sentences with the other points raised.
1.30 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Lucy raised the question about the playing ground at Selah and indeed the one at St. Clement's. I must let the hon. member know that I have not yet in my journeying visited these two schools, but when I do and I see the need in respect of these schools they will be weighed in the balance of all the priorities of other schools in Barbados and if the balance is in favour of those schools I will give the necessary instructions for the levelling and extension of the playing fields.

There is just one other point I noted here, and this is the question of the Welch Village School; I am back on that. The evidence that they wanted to hear yesterday is before me. The hon. member for St. Michael South – and I don't know why he doesn't desist from this sort of behaviour – he knows that he recommended the closure of the Welch Village School in St. John because there were fewer than 30 children in the school and there were five employees at the school. There was a Head Teacher, a Senior Teacher and a third Teacher, a School Meals Worker and a Janitor; five employees for 27 children, and the hon. member for St. Michael South recommended the closure of the school, as he should have, and I am saying that they took the decision not to close it at that time and that it was coincidental that it was just before the 1976 elections and there was some feeling in St. John in that area of antipathy, hostility, to put it a little stronger, about the closing of the school. I don't mind that, but the thing about it is that the hon. member for St. Michael South got up in here last year and said that because of certain electoral considerations it was not closed at that time. I was trying yesterday to remember the phrase that he used, because of these electoral considerations it was not closed at that time, and it was closed subsequently because yesterday they didn't seem to know whether it was closed or not. It has been closed, and that is part of the overall policy of my Ministry, to bring some sense of planning and integrity and rationality – to use the word I

hear here from behind – into the school system of Barbados.

We have 119 primary schools and I propose to close at least 18 of them, because you go to some primary schools in Barbados and you can drive a truck through them without touching the children; a lot of empty space, and in an adjacent area is another school that you can drive a motor car through, and I believe that I have got a duty in seeking some cost effectiveness to put schools together. *(Aside).* One hon. member is recommending that I go ahead, but I have gone ahead, I have started in my own constituency. You see, I have to accuse the hon. member for St. Michael South all the time of not having the courage, but I have enough courage to start in my own constituency, and I am going to close as from the end of this academic year the St. Luke's Girls' School and the girls will go and join the boys at St. Luke's Boys' School, and when I have investigated the ownership of that school I will then seek to make that school a social centre for the people of Melverton, Frenches, Byde Mill and Drax Hall and so on. I believe in the maximisation of the resources of Government, and we are also amalgamating some other schools. I mentioned some yesterday, the St. Lawrence Schools have been amalgamated already, the St. Martin's Schools will be amalgamated this coming September, and that is part of our plan not only of shutting down ineffective, money wasting units, but also to put boys and girls together in the implementation of our policy on co-education.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(2) stand part.

The question that the sum of $7,148,683 under Ministry of Education and Culture – Head 15(2) – Schools – (i) Pre-Primary, Primary and Special – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

HEAD 15(2) – SCHOOLS –
(ii) SECONDARY

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $13,591,907 under Ministry of Education and Culture – Head 15(2) – Schools – (ii) Secondary stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, what I have to say on Secondary is fairly brief because we debated the policy to a large extent yesterday, but there are some aspects of secondary education in Barbados at the moment which I believe require a deeper and more and perhaps a wider examination than the current Estimates seem to suggest will be the case. I heard the Minister say that the thrust is going to be in primary education, but I take it that that will not be at the expense of the sustained effort which was carried out by the last Government in bringing secondary education to a wider and larger sector of the community.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my views on the social chasm which exists in the provision of secondary education is sufficiently well known as not to merit repetition under this Head. *(Aside)* It is, put very simply for the benefit of the hon. member for Christ Church East who claims that he has never heard it, that there are two kinds of secondary education provided in this country, if not three kinds, and that the vast majority of people are not exposed so far to the first kind. I will go no higher than that, but I want to deal more specifically with an area of confusion which the people of Barbados now face arising out of two distinctly opposite statements made first by the Minister of Education on the one hand, and the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance on the other hand. I was under the impression that the Minister of Education at some point had made a definitive policy statement on the Lodge School; I am also under the impression that soon thereafter the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance pulled the rug from under his feet with a statement which, if it did not repudiate what the Minister had said, demonstrated that the Minister is not in control of the portfolio, as he leads us constantly to believe. It has to do with the closing or unclosing of the Boarding School at Lodge School, if you will recall, and I am sure the Minister must recall it, you announced very clearly that that was going through the eddoes and within days almost the Prime Minister said in essence that the Minister could only be making sport.
1.40 p.m.

The more important point I want to mention has to do with the question of approved secondary schools. Now, Sir, the concept of giving assistance to the approved Secondary Schools is one with which no citizen of Barbados can quarrel, because for obvious reasons and taking into account the historical development of education in this country it would be impossible to provide total physical accommodation for all the people who require it, given the resources of our country. But it seems to me that if one accepts the philosophy of giving assistance to the approved Secondary Schools, that to a large extent the educational policy of the Ministry of Education must permeate into these approved Secondary Schools. In the United States of America and other countries it has been a bone of contention for many years, and indeed it had to be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States that the right to education for a child is one of a parent's fundamental rights. That may be so for the United States, and I am not here to argue

whether the saying of prayers in schools is something that ought to be in contention. But I would say this: There are a number of practices held over from days long past which are still going on at schools in Barbados and which cannot redound to the social health of this community.

Mr. Chairman, in the context of declaring an interest, let me say that I have no interest in any approved Secondary School. Let me say that my knowledge of one of the approved secondary schools has been heightened by the fact that two of my children went to that school. When they first returned from the United States it was said that that school permitted the easiest transition from the United States system to our system. But I must say that after two or three years, as the Speech Days of that school came around, I used to sit in horror as I heard the little children doing their school songs at that particular school. So that no one would accuse me of being frivolous, I would mention that the name of that school song is "Jerusalem" and the school is St. Winifreds, and the song goes like this:

> "And did those feet in Ancient times
> Walk upon England's mountains green,
> And was the holy land of God
> On England's pleasant pastures seen?
> And did the countenance Divine
> Shine forth upon our crowded hills,
> And was Jerusalem builded here
> Among these dark Satanic mills?
>
> Bring me my bow of burning gold,
> Bring me my arrows of desire;
> Bring me my spear, O clouds, unfold,
> Bring me my chariot of fire.
> I will not rest from mortal fight,
> Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand
> Till we have built Jerusalem
> In England's fair and pleasant land."

I do not say this to villify the school. Let me say I am satisfied that the school is one that provides a good education. But it is precisely because in the pursuit of a good education it would not have dawned on the management of that school that that kind of school song is detrimental to the total education of a Barbadian child and that the fact that this kind of education would contribute to some of the social tensions that persist in our country.

The history of St. Winifred's is known to everyone and bears no telling at this time; but if you go to St. Winifred's you will see where social change has been created. If you look at the forms as they go to assembly from day to day you will see at what point racial integration in classes begins. I think it has now reached the fourth form and there you can see the entire mix. I am sure that by next year St. Winifred's will have become a fully integrated school. But that is not the gravamen of my statement. What I am saying is that the psychological framework within which these children are being taught is one which cannot redound to the present Minister of Education, the past Minister of Education, to any Minister of Education. It seems to me, at the risk of interfering with what someone may say is a fundamental right, that the Ministry of Education might find it necessary to examine some of the practices at some of these independent schools, not so much to direct them as to how they must teach or what they must teach but rather the environment that they bring to the pupils of the schools. It is a fact that most of the children who graduate from St. Winifred's will lead useful lives because the curriculum is not restricted to getting "O" Levels; rather it includes a fairly acute thrust into the area of Fine Arts and similar fields of endeavour, and in that connection the Ministry of Education can learn something from that independent school in the context of teaching certain aspects of what is desirable in education. But the Ministry will learn precious little compared with what the Ministry can inject into that school and I feel that the Ministry's attitude to independent schools should not be one of having agreed to pay a certain percentage of their graduate teachers salaries and having made sure that their facilities are reasonable, keep them at arms length after that. I believe that the tenor of the Education Act was to bring all education under the ambit of the education authorities and I have it on good authority that although the Act was not promulgated, officials of the Ministry find it convenient to use portions of that Act as if it had been promulgated. I am not able to give the Minister any specific examples of this but I have been told this by no less a person than the Headmaster of an independent school and I take it he is not likely to make such an observation without good grounds. But for what it is worth, I feel the Ministry's attitude to independent schools, bearing in mind the Ministry's promise to build ten new schools, they will not be able to have supply meet demand in terms of school places and the Ministry will have to take a much more involved view of the approved independent schools.

Let me give an example: There is a school called St. Gabriel's. I happen to be a member of the Anglican Synod and for the last five years the reports coming out of St. Gabriel's have clearly been the report of a school going downhill fast. It will not be long before the Synod makes a decision whether it is going to be a primary school only; indeed I am fairly sure that they have been forced to close the secondary section of the school. When you come to the Christ Church High School consistently the quality provided there is not the quality one finds in Government secondary schools. It seems to me that the Government should wherever possible take a step forward and become totally involved in the provision of education for those children whose lot it is to go to some of these approved independent schools.

1.50 p.m.

I wish to say a word about the unapproved independent schools. It is a responsibility of the Government to see that no child is exposed to what can only be described as commercial indecency, a rip off, by being given the impression that he or she is being given a secondary education, when all that it is doing is providing a way of life for some man or woman or a group of persons who claim to be in the teaching profession. We have a number of those schools. I feel that it is time that in Barbados where a person wishes to open any school, he or she should have to apply for a licence. They should have to be inspected by officials of the Ministry of Education, and that certain standards of accommodation must be met, and a number of things commensurate with what is required in a secondary school before any such licence is granted.

Mr. Chairman, it is basically wrong for a child who was unfortunate at the primary level and who therefore got one of those "noughts", and who went to another school because we in this country have been told that if you did not go to some high school you are a social outcast. So you will have a number of children of the age of 19, 20, 21, who will tell you that they went to St. something school that you have never heard of. They write a letter of application for a job. You ask them if they wrote this letter of application and they say yes; but they could not even get the "Dear sir" right.

I have seen some in my constituency who alleged to have gone to high school who could not read as well as some of the children from primary schools like Wesley Hall and St. Leonard's and those schools, and these are children of 19 and 20 years old. The reason is that we have allowed in the interest of freedom institutions to grow up in this country under the guise of secondary education. I hope that the Minister will not get up and say that we allowed it under the Democratic Labour Party. The Democratic Labour Party took a step towards the control of these schools. What I am asking the Minister to do is to carry that step all the way and look at the Education Act so that we can have an education policy which will take account of all the children of our society. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to waste the House's time. Thank you.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a number of points under this Head. The first one that I want to draw to the attention of this Hon. Chamber is the matter of discipline in these Industrial Schools. If one has been observing closely what has been happening in these schools, one would agree that the lack of discipline among the children in the schools has become a matter of concern not only for teachers but for the parents of these children. From my observation it would appear that this problem at the moment is more acute in private secondary schools, than in Government Secondary Schools; but it does exist in Government Secondary Schools; but the problem seems to be exaggerated by the habit of many school children resorting to the practice of taking drugs.

When I was Minister of Home Affairs, under the previous Government, this matter was brought to my attention. It was then connected to one of the Government Secondary Schools in this island. I have been following this matter closely, and it seems to me that more and more children are resorting to this practice of taking drugs, particularly the one known as the "weed" which is marijuana. We have a problem in some of the schools where children are peddling the drug. There is one private secondary school in the southern part of this island where not long ago they had to expel five children from the school. There was also a problem in a secondary school where one of the children was slashed with a knife by someone entering the school and making enquiries as to so and so. He wanted to get in touch with him on this particular matter.

It has also been brought to my attention that there was one youngster from the western side of Barbados whose father was in the habit of importing the mechanism known as the one armed bandit and who has also been involved in the peddling of drugs; and that when the police went to the particular school to question the individual, the father and a lawyer turned up at the school and asked not to make any particular statement on this matter.

I am talking now as a practitioner. I have met many people in my day to day practice, young people, teenagers, who have been affected by jobs to the great concern of the parents. In Barbados we have a habit of sweeping these things under the carpet, or as the saying goes, sinking your head into the sand and by doing that, pretending that these problems do not exist. If we continue to do that, we will wake up one day and find that we have a problem of great proportions. We will find that we have a very big problem destroying the society, and the remedy will not be easy to be found.

2 p.m.

I am inviting not only the Government but all responsible people in this country to start taking a look at this problem before it gets out of hand. It does exist and a careful check will show that I am not coming in here trying to blow up the issue for political reasons, but it does exist as a matter of concern, and I feel quite strongly that all of the resources of the country have to be taken and put into operation to combat this and to contain it otherwise as has happened in North America and some other countries you will find yourself with a very big problem among teenagers in this country. At the same time not only the discipline from the point of view of people taking drugs, but there are other factors which have been inducing children to behave in a manner in

which they are now behaving, and when we look at all this, we would get some idea of why, maybe for the reasons stated here today, there has been a steady decline in scholarships of children in secondary schools. It may not be the only reason, but there are a number of factors which would encourage this. A very important reason also which we will have to bear in mind is the quality of teachers who may be going into some of the schools. We have to be very concerned about this and I hope that the Hon. Minister will take this matter seriously and set in train the necessary administrative procedures to get fully seized of the problem and take the necessary steps to contain it if not necessarily completely irradicate it from the society.

Another aspect I want to draw to the attention of the Minister which was started by my colleague is the attitude prevailing at some of these approved secondary schools. Now we like to boast in Barbados about racial harmony and we like to create the impression that we do not have any vestiges of racial discrimination or racial breaches existing in this country, but repeatedly you find in many areas that you do get instances persisting or evidence that this thing is recurring. You find it in employment and you will find it in one area of education. There is a school in this country where the headmistress is an English woman, and that school has recently been admitting children of negro descent. Traditionally it was a so-called white school, and some very scathing remarks have been made about negro children in that school recently. That school gets government funds as an approved secondary school. If the Minister wants the name I can give him the name, and I hope that the Ministry or the Government when setting out to give money to these schools to enable in some cases some of them to continue on a worthwhile basis, they will see to it that they employ people who will help to promote racial harmony rather than seek to destroy it and continue with this idea of a white supremacy. We have to push that into the background. I do not think that 1979 or the coming years should be any time for anybody to be wanting to establish or keep up the concept of a super race. Unfortunately when you bring foreigners into Barbados and put them as heads of schools or in any position, because you find the same problem occurring in certain areas in the tourist industry where foreigners had been brought in here and given jobs as managers at certain hotels, they then adopt a very peculiar attitude towards the local people in this country which destroys the concept that this is an island where there is nice racial harmony and there are no problems between black and white. This is a matter for education and I am throwing it out for the Minister because it is a very serious problem in this country where you bring these people into the country for whatever reason and they behave as if they were in their original country and they start making these remarks towards black children in Barbados.

I should like to make it quite clear that I am one of those persons who is very much opposed to this type of behaviour, and I would go all out to oppose it, not only to talk about it here on the floor of the House of Assembly, but to take active steps in the society to oppose it. We do not want that. I hope the Minister will take a very serious look at the behaviour of some of these schools. This problem of bringing people into Barbados to head schools raises another question, that is, what is the immigration policy of the present Government, because certainly one could find Barbadians who are competent, trained and willing to take charge of these schools. Maybe the problem with them is that they cannot be of the right colour and that is all. So we have to look seriously at what is the immigration policies of the present Government.

Another problem pertaining to approved secondary schools lies in the fact that a lot of these schools are now fading out due to the correct policy of Government in taking more children based on the results of the 11-plus examination into the modern secondary schools. With more children going into the modern secondary schools we find that these private secondary schools are having difficulty in getting quality and quantity of students who come in, and I think Government should look very seriously at some of these schools and see if it is not better to remove all the students from some of these schools and get them absorbed in the modern secondary schools and allow these private secondary schools to fold up, because what is going on in these private secondary schools leaves a lot to be desired. You cannot afford to have Government spending millions of dollars when the year comes in education, and every year you find that the amount of money voted for education is going to be increased and the Government is building more and more schools and providing more and better facilities, while at the same time and permitted to exist are schools which tend to create the impression that Government does not know exactly what it is doing. You have schools, I would not say with low standards, with no standards at all which are being permitted to masquerade as secondary schools in this country and at the same time some of them are able to get assistance from Government, and I think Government needs to look very carefully into the policy because if you look carefully at the modern secondary schools and do something about increasing the numbers at these schools, in the very near future there would be very little need for Barbadians to go to some of these private secondary schools where the standards leave much to be desired. I think it would be to the credit of the Government to act on that and get children removed from these schools which turn out to be nothing more than exploitation of the parents of those children. I think at the same time it is unfair also to provide education of a very good quality for one section of your children and allow another set for no reason of their own to go to

these schools and get exploited. This is a matter which I feel the Minister is very capable and confident and may be enthusiastic to deal with, and I hope he will deal with this matter in the very near future.

Hon. L.S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, it is now 2.10 p.m. and I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: 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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L.S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be now suspended until 3.10 p.m.

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
2.10 p.m.

On Resumption --

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Speaker, I want under Standing Order No. 76 of the Standing Orders of this Honourable Chamber to raise a point of Privilege. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Honourable Chamber I spoke on the question of CBC and the report in this morning's *Advocate News*, a copy of which I have and which I intend to make a document of this Honourable Chamber, misrepresented the statement which I made.

Now as I understand the procedure, Mr. Speaker, I have to draw the attention of the Chamber to the offending words. The offending words are these, Mr. Speaker;

> "The complaint that the exerpts of the Press conference by the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday were not carried by CBC-TV were also put down to the decision of the newsroom by Mr. Alleyne."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I take exception to that principally because that was not what I said nor was it a reasonable interpretation of what I said. I have taken the liberty of checking the actual words which were taken down by the Official Reporter and it confirms that the words reported in the Newspaper are not the words which I used in the course of my speech nor could the report in the Newspaper be a reasonable interpretation of the words which I used.

I also want, Mr. Speaker, to draw to the attention of this Honourable Chamber another passage which in my submission constitutes a breach of privilege especially when one is dealing with a matter as sensitive as the reporting of news. The words are these:

> "He said that journalists must understand that some news must be suppressed in the interest of national security."

Now I take objection to the use of the word "suppressed" particularly because I went out of my way to speak generally about the self-imposed limitation of responsible Journalists.

Mr. Speaker, those are the offending passages and without more ado I am making a statement to Your Honour that they constitute a breach in so far as they misrepresent what I said and cannot be a reasonable interpretation of what I said yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have heard the hon. member and I prefer to give a ruling on the matter later in the day's Sitting.

When the Sitting was suspended the House was in Committee of Supply. To that it now reverts.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN: When the Suspension was taken the House was debating Head 15(2).

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I will briefly answer a few points raised by two hon. members. In respect to the hon. member for St. Michael South West, he raised the question of the role of the Private Secondary Schools in the educational system in Barbados. In particular he talked about St. Winifred's and he made some rather scathing comments about that school and he went on to read out what was the school's theme song. It was "Jerusalem". Apart from saying that "Jerusalem" is one of the most memorable pieces of William Blake's poetry, it was one of his famous songs of experience.

These were not his songs of innocence. He wrote songs of innocence and songs of experience and his songs of innocence are related to lands and beauty and flowers and so on. His songs of experience dealt with tigers and fires and that sort of thing. This is one of his songs of experience. Now I say this because "Jerusalem" had its day in Britain at a very important time of its development and I go along very much with the hon.

member for St. Michael South West that "Jerusalem" is irrelevant to modern situation schools in Barbados.

It however puzzles me that the hon. member saw so much wrong with the school but still opted to send his children to that same very school. That is puzzling to me. I am in a different position and I keep saying it. I feel that there is something wrong with certain Private Schools in Barbados and their cultural orientation and their social orientation which just do not meet my philosophy so I send my children to Government Primary Schools but the hon. member sends his children to St. Winifred's as he says, finds everything wrong with St. Winifred's, the social policies, the racial policies, the cultural policies and continues complaining about it although he freely chose to send his children there. Well that is a matter for him.

He went a little further when he said that that school had a whole lot to offer that would enable its graduates to lead useful lives and that the Ministry of Education could learn a lot from this school. Now either the hon. member does not know what he is talking about or having put his foot in his mouth earlier on is now anxious to get it back out. The curriculum in the Government's Primary and Secondary Schools are fairly wider than they are in any Private School in Barbados. There is no dispute about that so for the hon. member to point out that the fine things, as he described them, and I do not know what they are, probably how well you hold a teacup when you are drinking tea: I do not know if that is what he meant but the fine things that the Ministry of Education could learn from St. Winifred's really is an insult not only to the Ministry of Education but to all the people of Barbados.

There is a further point the hon. member made in relation to the question of another Private School, St. Gabriel's and he said that that school was going down in numbers and that it was being forced to close down. I have received communications from the authorities from St. Gabriel's that they will be closing its Secondary section as from the new academic year. We would accept that in the Ministry of Education because it is important that everybody realises that the principle of quality Secondary Education is very expensive. Gone are the days when one could be satisfied with the teaching of a lot of literary subjects and textbooks and an almost total disregard for the teaching of functional and technical subjects and it is these subjects that cause a great amount of capital expenditure.

One can teach Shakespeare or one can teach Nepaul or one can teach Eddie Brathwaite from a textbook, a single book, but it is not possible to teach Commerce, or Accounts, or Metal Work or any of the technical and functional subjects at the minimal cost at which you can teach any of the literary subjects and it is for this reason that a number of approved Private Schools in Barbados are finding it a little bit difficult to remain in business because of the ever increasing cost of Secondary Education. These schools would have to charge a fee structure that would be way beyond the capabilities of the average Barbadian parent.
3.25 p.m.

The hon. member also spoke, and along with him was the member for St. Michael North Central, on what they described as the unapproved private schools, and we understand from the hon. members that they operated a rip-off system in which they were interested primarily in getting money and was giving very little in return. It would be ungracious of me if I did not put into the record that a number of these schools – and one thinks as far back as the Modern High School – schools that were started by educational entrepreneurs that fill a positive need in the educational system in Barbados. These schools sprang up originally when there was an increasing demand for secondary education in Barbados and when Government was not in a position to meet all the secondary needs of the time, and I believe that any hon. member who remembers Lynch's Secondary School, the Modern High School, and these schools would think that it is a little bit unkind to hear hon. members on the other side describing these institutions as rip-off institutions.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member will give way. I am sure that my colleague who spoke after I did joined me in being extremely careful to separate out those schools that are approved, those schools which have given sterling service, and those fly-by-night institutions which seem to grow up for no other purpose than the rip-off, and I think the Hon. Minister would be unkind if he attempts to put what we said in the context of all private secondary schools being in the same vein.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I take the point made by the hon. member, I am not going to dispute that. As a matter of fact, I am very glad that he has now got up and made it clear for all of us, because I really would not expect the hon. member for St. Michael South West of all people to have been making the type of comment that I thought he had made, to which I just made reference.

The hon. member for St. Michael North Central made what I consider a very – I really do not want to put an unkind epithet on the speech made by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central – let us just say that he also perplexes me, because he has made some very strong and serious allegations without stating any data that would help me to correct the very ill he

complained of. He is talking about drugs in secondary schools, and I listened to him and I heard about five different schools he mentioned. He mentioned one in the south, then he mentioned another school somewhere else in town where there is a prevalence of marijuana, and he as a medical practitioner, he said, has had to treat a number of patients who were affected by the use of the drug and so on, but why I am so perplexed is because the hon. member would be failing in his duty and his responsibility if he did not point out to me which schools are involved so that I can carry out the necessary investigation and correct that wrong. Because we in the Ministry of Education certainly have not been receiving reports of any prevalence of drug use or drug pushing to which he referred at the schools in this island. Over the past two and a half year while I have been in the Ministry I believe that I have heard of one single incident where drugs were found by one or two pupils in the school, and that was some time ago. We have taken a look at it and I have not heard of any repetition, so I would not criticise the hon. member for St. Michael North Central in that regard, all I will do is invite him if he is serious about the statement he is making, if he does not want to do it on the floor of this Chamber, to put it to me in writing so that I can have the officers in my Ministry investigate what would be a very undesirable state of affairs.

He also goes on, the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, to raise a number of questions in relation to the nationality of the people who are Head Teachers, and again stating without any evidence that a number of scathing racial attacks were being made on black children in the schools of Barbados by white non-national teachers. I have been trying to find out which white foreign Head Teacher there is in a school in Barbados and I really have not been able to find out which one; I don't know which school that could be, but I think that he has got a duty to tell me who the Head Teacher is and which school she is teaching at so that I can investigate these very serious charges. The hon. member doesn't need to be worried about it, I as Minister of Education will not condone anybody preaching racial inferiority or superiority in any school in Barbados, so again he is pushing an open door. I would like to get the information so I can investigate it.

While I am on this let me say that it is not only this white non-national who the hon. member says is employing these very wicked tactics in the schools, I believe that there are some black Barbadian nationals who are equally awry in their racial attitudes. The hon. member for St. Michael South West talked yesterday about what happened at the Cadet camps when he was going to school, but I do believe an awful lot of that has changed. The type of problem that is being mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael North Central is a problem with which we are all familiar. When I was going to school, I can remember very vividly indeed, when I was in the third form at school the form was divided into two. There was a passage up from the door and all the black boys say down on one side and all the white ones on the other. That happened when I was going to school, what I am saying is that I am not going to condone that type of attitude in the schools as long as I am Minister of Education, and I would wish that hon. members would not only seek to get a little news coverage out of these alarming and alarmist statements but if they want me to do something about it, bring it to my attention.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, if I make some allusion to the Education Act, the Education Act was passed in Parliament in 1975, I think it was, and the previous administration never sought to get the Act proclaimed. I do not know why, I can only assume that it was because they were not so happy with their final product and if that is so then they have a friend, because I am not happy with it either, and this is why I have given an assurance that I will take a very close look at the Act, and before the summer recess I will be coming before Parliament with a number of amendments to that Act to give a more substantial control by the Ministry of Education on a lot of what is happening in the schools in this island. This brings me on, Mr. Chairman, to the Lodge School. The hon. member for St. Michael South West has said, and he really has caught me off guard, because I do not recall either of the two statements he has talked about.

3.35 p.m.

To the best of my knowledge and belief I do not recall ever making a public statement on the Boarding Establishment at the Lodge School, so when the hon. member says that my statement and the Prime Minister's statement are contradictory, I do not know what he is talking about. As a matter of fact, I will invite the hon. member to give me further particulars, because I do not recall making such a statement and I do not recall hearing the Prime Minister make any statement that committed the Government of Barbados on the Lodge School either. What I recall is that at the Lodge School's Speech Day last year the Prime Minister made a statement in relation to the boarding establishment and the gist of what he said was that the matter would be referred to the Cabinet for a decision. That is what I recall about this. Let me go a bit further.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman. When the Prime Minister made that statement, as far as I recall he was responding to something that had happened prior to that and he was in fact dealing with the matter *ex post facto.*

Hon. L. R. TULL: That is a good phrase but it does not mean anything, and I would tell the hon.

member what is *ex post facto:* It wasn't as a result of any statement I had made; I am stating now categorically that I never made a public statement about the boarding establishment and the Lodge School. What has happened is that some time in January last year I had asked the Governing Body of the Lodge School to take a look at the possibility of keeping the boarding establishment open because they were losing money on the boarding establishment and the Governing Body made certain recommendations to me and reference was made in the Headmaster's report at Prize Giving Day last year and the Prime Minister made a statement in relation to that; but I have never made any public statement on the status of the boarding establishment at the Lodge School.

One final point, Mr. Chairman, in respect of the Education Act and what we commonly refer to as the older secondary schools. I am not at all happy about the continuing division in status between the newer secondary schools and the older ones. The older secondary schools were established under various schemes in the 19th century and were given powers in those days that were almost total. The newer secondary schools are directly under the Ministry of Education and why we continue to have the difference between the two is a bit hard to understand. The new Act was brought only in 1975 but did not seek to remove the difference between the newer secondary schools and the older ones, and it is that dichotomy which exists that I will deal with and bring before Parliament before the summer recess. I heard a member making a big song and dance about privileges and about some schools being better than others, and he was a member of the Cabinet at the time they brought a wishy-washy Education Act that did not seek to correct the illnesses in the management of secondary schools in Barbados. As long as that dichotomy exists the standard between the two groups of schools will be different, and I will seek to change that. I must state for the hon. member that I do not hold any brief for Harrison College. I feel a greater and personal obligation to look after the St. George's Secondary School than Harrison College; I feel I have to look after St. Matthias School and St. Leonard's, and I feel a strong obligation to look after the newer secondary schools.

And I want the hon. member to look at the Estimates. The Opposition comes in here apparently ill-prepared for debate on the Estimates. A close examination of the Estimates would show that there is a policy directive that the older secondary schools are to get no increase in their estimates for supplies etc., while the newer secondary schools are to get the benefit of any increases in this area. It is not unknown to me to have a recommendation one day for a covered concrete pathway across the grass at Queens College because nice little girls must not get their feet wet, and within twenty four hours to get a recommendation to deny a newer secondary school a badly needed toilet. I have seen last year a figure in the Estimates to paint a pavilion at Harrison College but a request turned down to have toilets fixed at St. Leonard's. I am not going to condone that. The hon. member had a chance to do something about this and did nothing. So he shouldn't get over there now and try to throw these things out, because there is a different perspective now. In the newer secondary schools the Boards of management literally have no say. They cannot determine expenditure or priorities. But the older secondary schools are almost omnipotent; and as one headmaster tried to make it clear, the Ministry cannot tell him what to do as he was appointed by the Governing Body of the school. I have news for him. This year we will be renegotiating the lease at the Lodge School with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and subject to what legal advice I am given by the Attorney General the scheme of government at the Lodge School will be changed; all the iniquitous clauses in the old agreement, e.g., that only an Anglican can be the headmaster, that certain scholarships can only be given to white boys, will go. During your fifteen years in power the Democratic Labour Party allowed these things to continue.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member just said that the lease is running out this year. I think it is misleading to suggest that the Democratic Labour Party was in power for fifteen years and could have changed things which the hon. member himself is saying he cannot change without legal advice.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member may be trying to throw me off my speech but he will not succeed. The Democratic Labour Party was in power for fifteen years and the former Prime Minister was a member of the governing body of the Lodge School from 1958 up to the present time, a period of twenty-one years, and I see nothing in the record of the hon. member trying to get these iniquitous arrangements out of the Lodge School. And the point the hon. member is making that the lease is going to be negotiated this year has nothing to do with it. The hon. member is up at Cave Hill doing first year law and he can probably find this out but the Government does not have to wait till the lease runs out before it can be renegotiated.
3.45 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Michael South West will know that that will come to an end also. We will no longer have this clause about only members of the Anglican Church can be headmasters of Lodge School. We will end the whole question of scholarships for white boys: and thirdly at the Lodge School the management structure will be changed. With this change, I believe

that there will be fewer letters appearing in the Press about what the schemes of Government are. The problem is that you have a governing body at the Lodge School who have neither the time nor the interest in managing the school. When I have had the lease renegotiated there will be a change before the end of this year.

I heard from a number of sources that Lodge School has a number of intractable problems. I do not believe that they are intractable. I believe that is based mainly on the intransigence of a number of the people involved. I am confident that some time later in the year a number of these problems will be resolved.

The question that Head 15(2) – Schools – (ii) Secondary – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(3) – ERDISTON COLLEGE

Head 15(3) – Erdiston College – for the sum of $256,928 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(3) – Erdiston College – stand part.

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

The question that Head 15(3) – Erdiston College stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(4) – TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL

Head 15(4) – Technical and Vocational – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(4) – Technical and Vocational – for the sum of $583,537 stand part.

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

The question that Head 15(4) – Technical and Vocational stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(5) – COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY

Head 15(5) – Colleges and University – for the sum of $11,808,920 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(5) – Colleges and University – for the Sum of $11,808,920 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, is it Head 15(5)? I am only asking because I am sure that the hon. member did not want to mislead you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I have a very short intervention to make on this. This Head deals with Colleges and University. I do not get up to speak about my favourite College, Sir. I wish to deal with the Community College very briefly. You will note that I have nothing to say about Erdiston; but the point that I want to make on the Community College is that it seems to me that there is something inherently wrong with the system of higher education in which you see a Community College in existence, a Teachers Training College in existence and a number of other institutions which are supposed to provide training and education at the secondary level.

Now, as you know, Sir, all of these institutions were created before we had the University of the West Indies, and more so before we had university education in Barbados. I am excepting Codrington College which provided a limited amount of classical and similar education. It was necessary, therefore, for these institutions like Erdiston College and similar institutions to be created, as it were, that they could become the end point, a cutting off point, a finishing point for education. We have got the UWI to a point, we have been told, where it has a good reputation across the world. How is it then that we are in a position where a person can go into one of these institutions and spend the required two years, and if that person should attempt to go, say, to the UWI to pursue a course in the same field that person has to start from scratch? If for no other reason, it must be a colossal waste of manpower and resources. I have no doubt – I am not approaching this in any partisan manner – but I have no doubt that the Minister and his advisers – he has a large number of advisers – that the Community College must either change its name or do what it is supposed to do. A Community College was created in North America to deal with the whole area of community development. It did not concern itself with certification but with education that the people were concerned with to further their knowledge in that part of the world and to ensure that those people who wanted to go further up the educational ladder would find easier acceptance in the schools and colleges of higher learning in North America.

3.55 p.m.

Now, Sir, I think it is fair to say that when the concept of a Community College came to Barbados that the intention was there that this would become a Community College in the truest sense of the term, and somehow the people in Barbados got involved in an argument about a Sixth Form College and somehow a Sixth Form College got intertwined with the

Community College, and what we ended up with is something that is neither a Sixth Form College nor a Community College despite its name.

Now from what I have been observing over the last four years some attempt is being made to go in this direction. I believe that the coming of the Divisions of Technology, with the coming of the division of Health Sciences that a broadening of the base of the Community College has begun to appear, but we still have as far as I know the original old-fashioned idea which can see a young man or young woman spend two years of his or her life at the Community College and come out with one Advanced Certificate or at the most two, and I am told from time to time a person or two have managed to get three. It would have to be a waste of resources for an individual to go to a Community College and spend two years and end up getting advanced level certificates. In a strange kind of way I make bold to say that the concept of advanced level, if it is not a built-in lever to deal with employment and employment problems is a waste of time. The concept of "A" level I say without fear of contradiction is a waste of time, because most young people who have completed a good secondary education resulting in five or more "O" levels are capable of absorbing college education in the truest sense of the word. Now, Sir, that does not mean that we ought not to have had "A" levels in Barbados. I am not saying that. The system which evolved in this country is what was known then and it is what was acceptable to the British system which is the one from which we evolved. I am saying however that in a developing country far from one having one Community College which provides some kind of advanced level training generally speaking, we are in a situation where we should have a minimum of two Community Colleges where all of the advanced training beyond secondary could be done in these Community Colleges where both those who are coming out of the secondary schools and those who are adults that wish to continue education can meet and mix and eventually you will have all the persons graduating from that Community College with a Community College diploma which in my view should be the equivalent of the Associated Degree in North America at the highest level, which would permit anyone who leaves Barbados and wishes to continue his education to be accepted in a four year college in North America or a three year college in Europe to finish his degree in two years or whatever is the equivalent time, and in that way we would help to remove many of the difficulties which now exist in our educational system thus, Mr. Chairman, the problem which now exists with overlap might cease to be a problem in the sense that a person who was Erdiston trained or Community College trained would be equivalent to a person who had as it were completed half of his university education, and such a person could go on to the University and ought to be allowed to finish his degree in two years or 18 months or whatever is the equivalent time, if not we are wasting a lot of scarce resources in duplication of effort.

The other thing that results from that is we could not possibly have the quality of teaching capability for the kind of excellence that one should see in a country of 250,000 people. If we have to find a lecturer for the Community College and a Lecturer for Erdiston College and a Lecturer for Cave Hill all in a particular subject area, it may very well be that the excellent lecturer is at the Community College, the average lecturer is at Cave Hill and the one somewhere else and perhaps not up to scratch which may very well mean that we are losing out on the teaching capabilities of a number of people.

I know that is always very difficult in the area of education and culture and such areas to have change instituted in such a way as to satisfy the vast majority of people and that that change be radical at the same time. I would not expect the Minister to perform miracles, but I hope that his policies are going in this direction where we will in fact be able eventually in Barbados and not so very long from now to have a co-ordinated approach to our higher education I might have inadvertently left out the Institute of Management and Productivity, but it seems to me that if you pay attention to the quality of course that is offered at BIMAP, if you pay attention to the rigour which is required for graduation from BIMAP, if you look at the quality of the Lecturer at BIMAP, generally speaking there should be no reason why a person who graduates from BIMAP should have to start at scratch if such a person seeks to enter a program of Government for management in the University of the West Indies. There is a serious need for us to co-ordinate our educational policy not only in Barbados but throughout the West Indies, so that we can gain every single ounce from these resources that are available.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of brevity, I believe having made the point that it is necessary to stretch any further I should like to hear the Minister respond to my brief intervention.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, in keeping with your ruling and the Rules of the House, I should like to begin my contribution by declaring an interest in an aspect of this vote, the vote which deals with subscriptions and contributions. Under the note to Item 4 sub-head (1) there is a vote for the Labour College (B.W.U.) to the tune of $20,000.

I want to say that day before yesterday we had a rather long discussion on the Labour College particularly under the head of Training, but I think I would be failing in my duty now that we have reached this Head

if I did not say a few more comments on this particular item because I think that it is of extreme importance that one understands very clearly what is involved here, and I would like to say at the very outset that nothing would stop me, not even the threats from the Prime Minister, from making any points which I want to make relative to policy or relative to objectives of the Labour College. Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is my considered opinion that workers' education is an important consideration and must be an important consideration in national development.
4.05 p.m.

The Barbados Workers' Union Labour College was conceived and established by the Barbados Workers' Union. In 1974 it was opened on the 20th September. During the construction period the Government gave a grant to the College to the tune of $90,000 and agreed on a yearly basis to make a contribution to the tune of $10,000. In 1977 this was increased to $20,000 and I believe that the Minister of Education received a letter from the Union expressing thanks from the Barbados Workers' Union for this.

We feel strongly that the subvention needs to be increased. We advanced a number of reasons for this and I think there are compelling reasons for this and I just want to make it very clear that this is not a question of begging for anything and it is not a question that the Minister thinks that somebody has to come and beg him for money as payment out of his pocket. This is taxpayers' money that we are talking about. My money, your money, all the people who pay tax in this country make up a contribution towards education.

Sir, this is of extreme importance and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that if one looks around the Caribbean, if you take the Labour College in Guyana, the Labour College in Guyana is supported 100% by the Government of Guyana. The Labour College in Trinidad and Tobago is supported 100% by that Government. I just want to make this point very clear. I am not at all making any plea for 100% support but one has to recognise very clearly that in view of the national importance in this particular area of training and in view of the fact that the Government can find it possible, and this goes for both Governments because this criticism, Mr. Chairman, as you would be well aware if anybody checks through the Estimates Debate, you would recognise that this point was made and will continue to be made about the small amount of contribution which has been coming through the Government and I suppose through the taxpayers to the Government towards the training of workers in this country. I think it is important that one recognises this.

Right now the Government has established a Committee to deal with workers' participation. The Government says that it is committed to the concept of workers' participation and we would want to see it available as a quality and as a fact for this society. How on earth are we going to be able to prepare ourselves and face up to the consideration of workers' participation and an appreciation of what is involved and be able to deal effectively with workers participation if we are not going to provide the where-withal for the training of the workers. After all we are reaching out to keep them involved in this whole idea of participation and decision making at their work place. It is important that we recognise these matters.

Take for example the kind of things which we do at the Labour College from time to time in preparing the workers for this Workers' participation feature some very important courses and workshop seminars. We deal with collective bargaining. That is very important for this whole question of preserving and insuring that we have a reasonable industrial relations climate in this country which is very important for any developing country. We deal with family welfare and questions and when we come to discuss Health I certainly have something to say about family planning.

We deal with co-operatives which is a concept which I believe that we need to develop in this country once more. We also have to prepare workers to deal with various aspects of Labour Legislation and do not let the Lawyers deal with all. There are a number of matters which workers have to deal with regarding their rights, especially Holiday with pay, Maternity leave, Shop legislation, Severance Pay, National Insurance, the Salaries Legislation and a whole deal of Labour Legislation.

This has to be explained to people and people have got to understand clearly what is what. Mr. Chairman, we also have to provide participation with some background to the society and particularly with special reference to the Caribbean. I would want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in the last five short years that the Barbados Workers' Union Labour College has been established that it has been able to be reckoned as a model Trade Union Educational Training Institution. Not only in the Caribbean but also in the Western Hemisphere and particularly for developing countries and it should be of interest to the House.

I think that the Hon. Minister of External Affairs is aware of the fact that the Organisation of the American States at its Fourth or Fifth Meeting of Ministers of Labour of that Organisation in Guatemala adopted the model of the Labour College, the way in which it was designed and how it functions as one to be followed by Trade Union Institutions in the Western Hemisphere throughout Latin America and the

Caribbean. This is a fact. *(Cheers.)* This is in the record of the OAS.

We have provided opportunities for participants from other Islands in the Caribbean and I think we recognise our responsibilities in this particular regard. We feel in Barbados that the level of leadership should be stressed. The level of leadership of the Trade Unionists in Barbados is high and probably is amongst the highest in the Caribbean and we feel that we have a lot to offer in terms of training Trade Unions from the other regions in the Caribbean and particularly in the Eastern Caribbean and it is for this reason that we have opened our doors to participants from Unions in the Eastern Caribbean and last year officially I think the record will indicate we had over 140 such Trade Unionists coming here for various courses and I am sure that the Attorney General will also be interested to know that included in those were over 199 women of the people participating in our programme over the last year.

What we are involved in, however, is trying to explain very clearly what is involved and when one says that the College as a right should be getting a higher subvention one makes that statement against a background of the kind of contributions which is being made for widening the views and deepening the insights of people who are participating in the programme from time to time. I think this matter is one which we must go into and I would make that plea and will continue to make it because I know that the time will come and it will not be very long when the subvention will be increased even to more than that.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, before you announce the Head, I just want to answer a few of the questions asked by the hon. member for St. Michael South West in relation to the Barbados Community College. One has got to understand the issue with the Barbados Community College if you want to put in perspective what is happening today.
4.15 p.m.

When in 1969, I think it was, when the then Minister of Education came up with his concept of the Community College, as I had to say yesterday, his head was screwed on the right way but he was not in a position to win over to his cause his colleagues in the Cabinet at that time, and particularly set against him was the then Prime Minister, the hon. member for St. John. I hear from the hon. member for St. Michael South West about what the Community College was designed to be. I know of no record to tell me what it was designed to be, because there was no decision at the time, there was no uniformity of view among the Government precisely what purpose the Community College was to serve, and I believe that the hon. member is using his intimate knowledge of the community college of the United States and is trying to transfer that concept to Barbados and spelling that out as the original concept of the Barbados Community College, but that is not the record.

The then Minister of Education wanted, as I recall, to have an abolition of all the sixth forms in Barbados and that the Community College was to be used as the universal sixth form school in Barbados. He made a statement to that effect, and then out of the blue in that same year, I believe it was at the Speech Day of Harrison College, the then Prime Minister came out and made it quite plain that the Minister did not know what he was talking about and he had no intention of abolishing sixth forms, so when you hear about the contradictory statements between Ministers and Prime Ministers, that was a classic one. So that we took over a Community College that was not charted on any particular course, they had no idea of where they were going, and they admitted it, it is not a question of my just making a criticism, the people at the Community College freely admitted that they were not sure of what direction they were going in and what was the role they were supposed to play in the community, but it is interesting that the hon. member for St. Michael South West should say that the Barbados Community College should be community oriented, it should be interested in community development and community education. It is not an institution, as he said, merely for certification but a college where the public can be taught in fields that were non-traditional. They are very fine words, and they are words that are well suited to the new policy in relation to the Barbados Community College, because since I have take over the Ministry it is precisely in that area that I have been giving the greatest importance in relation to the College.

I have had the Chairman of the College and the Principal come in for discussions with me, and that is precisely what they have been told, that this must be a community oriented college. There are a number of traditional schools and other institutions of learning in Barbados that are already carrying out the sort of role that the Community College was doing by and large up to that point, and it was imperative that the College should adapt the community needs, it should institute short courses, *ad hoc* courses, non-certified courses for the development of the needs of particularly adult people in Barbados. When people no matter what their educational background or achievement feel that there is a pressing need for instruction in a certain special area of interest in Barbados the Community College should step in. The Community College should also take a look at the needs of industry in Barbados, commerce and so on, and see where it can run short *ad hoc* courses for the training of people in these areas.

I have already said that I have had discussions with officials of the IDC about the setting up of short courses for the training of technicians for the electronics industry. We had our discussions on that and one of the perhaps leading electronics industrialists in Barbados managed to come in with us and give us an idea of course content to train technicians for the electronics industry. We have set up at the Community College the type of course that is geared to prepare people in that area, and this is the sort of thing the hon. member and I are totally agreed on, but it is something entirely new, and I believe that if he is going to give credit for it he should not go too far back because this has not been happening for a very long time.

The Ministry of Education has also taken under the wings of the Community College a wider array of training areas. You have heard the Attorney General repeat over and over again our plan to start from the new academic year the training of para-legals to meet a very vital need in the society. Everybody walks around and talks with certain authority about the legal profession, but not many people realise that there is an acute shortage of lawyers in the Public Service of Barbados and in certain sections of the private service in Barbados, and the Attorney General's Chambers is feeling this shortage more than anybody else, so we are setting up the para-legal course from September at the Community College.

We are also bringing the Hotel School under the administrative wing of the Barbados Community College. We have had a report done on the Hotel School, we have taken a very close look at it in conjunction with the Ministry of Tourism and certain recommendations have been made, and from 1st January, 1980 the Hotel School will be brought under the administrative umbrella of the Barbados Community College.

We also expect at some time in the not too distant future to bring under the authority and guidance of the Community College nursing education in Barbados. I do not want to go into the details of that, I believe hon. members have heard me speak on it before, and again this year we are hoping to extend the courses in Accountancy under some technical assistance of the British Government, and we are hoping that we will be able to provide a number of places in that particular course for students from the Eastern Caribbean Countries.

Another interesting and provocative comment made in the contribution of the hon. member for St. Michael South West was about the rationalisation of post secondary institutions of education in Barbados. I myself share his concern, and I have come into the Ministry and found that Erdiston Teachers' Training College, the Community College, the Polytechnic, the School of Education, the University, all post secondary institutions, and there was very little binding them together.

4.25 p.m.

There was very little cooperation, no logical graduation from one institution to another and that was a cause of some concern to me. I am happy to say that in the last year or so some measure of complementarity and cooperation has been brought into the relationship between the Barbados Community College and Erdiston Teachers' Training College, because they are now operating a cooperative programme for the training of teachers of vocational and technical subjects. And the University School of Education is also involved because they will be assisting in the levels of certification. This is the sort of direction in which the Government will be moving to harmonise the diverse interests of these secondary institutions.

And if I may quickly advert to the point raised by the hon. member for St. Lucy, the Government of Barbados is glad to give what assistance it can to the Barbados Labour College. I must remind the hon. member that it was the Barbados Labour Party that was the first political party associated with trade unionism in Barbados, and we would be pleased at any time to consider any request from the College and to offer any help the Government can give. I am happy that Barbados has been spared many of the industrial stresses and strains that are commonplace in a number of Caribbean Territories. The fact that there is a fairly healthy industrial relations climate in Barbados is a testament to the hard work and solid foundation laid by the Barbados Labour Party as the founders of trade unionism in this country. So the hon. member need not worry about the attitude of the Government towards the Labour College. But I have thrown out the suggestion already and do so again: I am firmly of the view that the Workers College is under-utilized, and it would be in the interest of the hon. member to try and sit down with myself or with the Minister of Labour and try to work out a programme to maximize the use of the Labour College, because in a country like ours with scarce resources we cannot afford to have the College at Mangrove under-utilized. I am perfectly willing to listen to him and when the hon. member made a request for an increase of the subvention I was happy to increase the subvention, and when he wants to make a new request I can assure him I will look on it with favour, although the money will have to come from the Minister of Finance.

Now the question was raised by the Labour College about Government's subvention to BIMAP. The difference BIMAP as an employers' institute and the Labour College as a workers institute is that the Government has a direct role in the management and

operation of BIMAP, and I believe the arrangement is that the Government matches BIMAP for any contributions it can raise. The Chairman of the Industrial Development Corporation is also the Executive Trustee of BIMAP. But the Government has no connection whatever at that level with the Labour College.

Mr. GREAVES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I am surprised that the Minister of Education does not know that a representative of the Ministry of Education is on the Advisory Board of the Labour College.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The difference between a lawyer and a non-lawyer is that a lawyer understands what an advisory board is and what a trustee or member of a board of management is. If the hon. member feels that membership of an advisory board is enough, I do not feel so. And I do not want to labour that point; the hon. member can be assured that the Government is willing to lend an attentive ear to the people at the Labour College.

I want to make one final point in relation to the attitude of the University and other institutions of learning. Some time ago in this Chamber I made some statements that were reported in the newspapers and which raised a great deal of consternation in the ivory towers of the University, and I was warned subsequently by someone of considerable influence in Barbados to keep my hands off that University. I have news for the dear lady. As long of the University of the West Indies is going to maintain its ivory tower approach and cut itself off from the essential needs of the Caribbean society, I will continue to make criticisms against it. The University of the West Indies must understand that it is financed by the Governments of these territories and in many cases at a sacrifice in other areas, and they cannot operate as an autonomous, arrogant body cut off from the rest of the community, and we in this Government have been making it clear to the University Council and the University Grants Committee that we expect them to play a more direct role in the national life of this country. I have recently been involved in the salary negotiations for the University teachers, and it amazed me how little research is done and how narrow are the areas they concentrate on. There are a lot of urgent national problems that require attention, but the teachers at the university by and large make a lot of noise about salaries but fail to make a contribution to those areas that require attention. I will not go on to deal with the University at any greater length now but I want to issue a warning that we will continue to keep pressure on the University to change its ways and pay greater attention to the needs of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(6) stand part of the Schedule.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, before you put the question I will like to make a short contribution on this matter. In doing so I will like to declare my interest as an acting staff member at the Barbados Community College.

First of all there was a statement to the effect that there was no clear indication as to the aims of the Barbados Community College. On that point I would like to refer to the laws of Barbados, chapter 38, entitled "Act to provide for the establishment of an educational institution to be known as the Barbados Community College and for matters connected therewith and incidentals thereto". And Clause 3 of that Act states: "There shall be established an educational institution to be called the Barbados Community College. The aim of the College shall be to provide a place of education offering instruction in all or any of the following fields of education, that is to say, Agriculture, Commerce, Fine Arts, Liberal Arts, Science and Technology." So the aims of the Community College are clearly set out and the areas in which the College was expected to operate. And the Act went on further to state "And in such other fields of education as the Minister may from time to time determine." So it was quite clear that this was to be an institution whose aims are enshrined in the laws of this country and in accordance with any directives which may come from the Minister of Education. As far as the levels of education are concerned there was no doubt in my mind that it was meant to provide education at the advanced level, and I see nothing wrong with that, providing education at the advanced level. Education is a matter of steps or levels, and it was certainly a clear intention that the College was not to be restricted to what is called academic steps like the traditional Sixth Forms of our secondary schools, because we inserted such subjects as Agriculture, Commerce, Fine Arts and Technology which by and large did not constitute part of the curriculum of the regular Sixth Forms.
4.35 p.m.

So, this was a pioneering institution embracing not only academic education, but going much further than that. Let me just make one point here. There seems to be some suggestion that it is only now that new developments are taking place in that institution. The Division of Health Sciences was established before I left the Ministry of Education. Instructions in areas such as pharmacy and laboratory technology were given, and the Minister of Health at that time was particularly interested in those areas, and we collaborated in those areas, and as a result that particular Division was established. That is not particularly known in this community; because a distinguished newspaper of this country, the Nation newspaper, which has been severely criticised yesterday by the other side – we are not criticising it – but in one of its editorials it was so

carried away by the propaganda from the Government side, that Health Services was something that were started only yesterday, while that is a division that was started before I left the Ministry of Education.

I must agree with my colleague, the member for St. Michael South Central, who indicated that students should be able to leave the Barbados Community College and then go to other territory level institutions and university level institutions in this region and beyond, and should be able to complete their degree after the normal three or four year programme after spending two years successively at the Barbados Community College.

To this end we believe that the Barbados Community College should be offering associate degrees certifying those students; and I am fortified in this regard, because no less a person than the Deputy Prime Minister in this Government agreed with me that they will be offering an associate degree; but that is what we said in a document entitled "A Design for Living for a Free People".

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will make it a document of this House?

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will willingly make it a document of this House, if it is not there already. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you that the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto is a most important document; and in it we indicated that one of the policies that we have was the awarding of associate degrees to students successfully completing designated courses at the Barbados Community College permitting them to enter institutions of higher learning both in the Caribbean and beyond. We actually negotiated with this university in the USA, and Penn-state University and they agreed to accept some of the students from the Division of Technology to complete their programme after two years. They sent a team down here. That is a matter of record. I do not believe that up to this time we have been able to get the University of the West Indies to move in that regard; but I hope that the Minister of Education now has his views from the University in this regard to negotiate admissions.

We have heard a lot about the programme for school personnel being started, and I would read this document again – "A Design for Living for a Free People"; and part of the programme was to introduce an in-service course. *(Aside)*. The member for St. James is trying to put me off; but I have to get this on the record. The policy was to introduce an in-service course for senior school personnel. We are well aware of the problems in the Ministry of Education.

There are some very outstanding public officers and professional officers in the Ministry of Education, and they know what the problems are – experienced headteachers and so on; but we did have some blue prints for these developments: I do not wish to prolong this much longer. I merely wanted to make those few observations.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member reads out the aims of the Community College as set out in the Education Act; and all that is set out in the Act is that you are to teach the following subjects – 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and all such other subjects as the Minister may determine; but when the hon. member for St. Michael South West was talking about the role of the Community College and the direction in which it should go, and what part it should play in this society, nobody was talking about instruction in Agriculture, Commerce, Finance, Liberal Arts or Science and Technology. That is not what we are talking about at all, and the hon. member knows that. The Act says: "Such other fields of education as may be determined from time to time by the Minister"; and the only one that was determined by the Minister from 1969 to 1976 was the field of Health Sciences.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order. The hon. member must be misleading the House on this particular matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please do not make the suggestion that he is misleading the House.

Hon. L. R. TULL: What did he get up for?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: To make one.

Hon. L. R. TULL: To make one? All right. We will give him an extra from 1969-1976. The second point is that I think that the Hon. member for St. Michael South West made a point with which I agreed that the College has to be community oriented in order to satisfy present needs, and not have *ad hoc* courses from time to time in areas that do not require certification.

4.45 p.m.

I think that is what we were talking about, so when the hon. member gets up and makes that type of statement, he should know that I understand that the Community College was his special baby. But I am always amused to see the hon. member wax warm. I would have thought he would have been with me on this one because he came up with the concept of a Community College and he had a good idea, a good concept, and he allowed his colleagues in the previous Cabinet to wreck the whole thing. I thought he was going to come along with me. The hon. member for St. John destroyed at its very inception what was a good concept by the hon. member, and now that I am trying to give some support to the

concept, he gets up and makes these rather facile criticisms.

One final thing I want to say. The hon. member asked whether we would be getting recognition for the Community College from other institutions; not only that because only now we are getting recognition of the University, we are getting recognition from the University of Guyana, we are getting recognition from the West Indies School of Public Health and the College of Arts, Science and Technology in Jamaica.

Mr. TAITT: Just one question. Would the hon. member explain what he means by recognition? I am not sure I understand what he means.

Hon. L. R. TULL: It is not part of my job to teach elementary English to the hon. member. If he does not understand the meaning of recognition, he should not be in here.

Mr. TAITT: I take it that with these colleges, when they pass up by the new Community College, will recognise it.

The question that the sum of $11,808,920 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (5) Colleges and University, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (6) HOUSECRAFT CENTRE

Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (6) Housecraft Centre – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $76,569 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (6) Housecraft Centre, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 15 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (7) HOTEL SCHOOL

Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (7) Hotel School – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $143,961 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (7) Hotel School, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 15 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (8) SCHOOL MEALS DEPARTMENT

Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (8) School Meals Department – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,659, 366 Under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (8) School Meals Department, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Head 15(8) School Meals Department, if by chance I make some criticism, they are constructive ones, and in addition to my criticisms I intend to give facts which I can substantiate. I never intended to speak on this Head, but only two days ago I left this House very early and it was a coincidence that on my way home I met three school meals department assistants. I say it was a coincidence because some will come to the conclusion that I went out of my way to query these people, but I want it to be known that throughout my political career I have at all times assisted the Transport Board with passengers from my home and from Bridgetown.

Now, Sir, during the time that those people were travelling with me they intimated to me that only one hot meal – I would like the Minister to listen attentively – is served weekly and that during the other days the children are fed on bread and other things. *(Asides)* I will get to your point. But, Sir, what I am aware of, and speaking as a layman, is that those things do not have in the necessary proteins, and therefore I want the Minister to explain to this House if that statement is accurate.

Mr. Chairman, I do not only speak here today as the representative of a constituency, but as a parent. I have a child at a primary school. I have never queried the child about the school meals, but what I did notice in the home, and this has been going on for some time, is that my wife has been preparing meals for that child to take to school when in the past it was not necessary for her to do so. I want to say, Sir, that we have to realise that the children of the artisan, the children of the domestic, the children of the agricultural labourer and in some cases some so-called middle-class people are the children who attend these primary schools. If you were to go to these schools, you would not find certain middle-class people's children there, and you would not find white children there, and therefore you can see that we have to concentrate on that service.

4.55 p.m.

It is the paupers in most cases who send their children there and I too have always pinned my faith in the Primary School because I am not in a position to pay the exhorbitant fees and in many cases, the Teachers at some of these schools are untrained. Therefore all my children have been given Primary School education and in this case I still have one at school who is only 7 years old. Now, Sir, I am saying, Mr. Chairman,...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order in the Gallery, please.

Mr. WEEKES: I am going to be very serious about this point. Only a few days ago I sat in here and heard that we expect to have a reserve of $20 million. Are we having a part of that at the expense of the School Meals Service? I am going to repeat that question. Are we saving money, $20 million we expect as a reserve and yet the school children cannot get proper meals for their lunch? The time has come when we must give this matter serious consideration.

Now my point is this, that if the amount which was allocated to run the School Meals affair had gone, or was about to go, the Government should have come to this House and ask for a Supplement and I can assure you that it would have had the full co-operation and support of this Honourable House. But, Sir, that has worried me, and only recently today I have been checking on the Estimates. All of us are aware that the prices of commodities have gone up and if you have a condition which I have drawn to the attention of this House for 1978/79 in which the children are not getting the regular school lunch which they were accustomed to and in these Estimates today, Sir, what do I see?

The prices of commodities are going up and up. For example Corned Beef has just gone up about 60 cents a tin or more and here it is that last year we voted $3,200,000 to the School Meals Service to feed the children. What do you see in here for 1979/80 the same $3,200,000. Now can you tell me that if these children are at present suffering and the $3,200,000 has not met the demands and instead of coming to this House and at least asking for $1 million more, we have come back here with the big increases in commodities and we are still asking for $3,200,000.

Now if that is the method which is being used to save money for us to have a reserve, I am saying that we are misleading the public. When I say that, Sir, I mean it is a fact. Some people are saying that it is the sick-out with the Teachers which has caused the children to get only one hot meal per week. I do not know if that statement is authentic but what I would say is that if it is a true statement, I can only suggest to the Minister of Education to do everything possible to influence his colleagues to settle the issue amicably with the Teachers so as to avoid the hardships which these children are suffering.

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware every child in this country, if it has the potential, if it has the ability to assimilate to learn regardless of its parents' vocation it has the opportunity to go from the Primary School to a University.

5.05 p.m.

I am saying that hungry children cannot learn, and it is the children of the masses who depend on these meals for the upkeep of their children during the hours they are at school. You would take into consideration, Sir, that I am from a rural area and therefore I am in a position to tell you all about the agricultural sector of the community. You get a poor woman leaving home at half past six to get to work on the plantation, the ten cents which I consider as free school meals, but she depends on those meals for her children during the period she is at work because she will not return home before 5 or 6 o'clock, and therefore you will see that if we have the masses at heart the school meals service is indispensable to the education of these poor children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is known that certain people have not got to think about the school meals because they are in a position to send their children to private schools. Their children have transportation, a motor car to take them there, a motor car to take the lunch, and those are privileges which certain people's children in this country have, but we as the representatives of the people cannot afford to starve the poor children of this country through lack of funds or whatever the Minister may tell us. I am now happy to know that for the first time in the history of this country – I have forgotten how many years it was mentioned – that we are going to have this big service. It is a very good thing. We Barbadians feel very proud about it, but let us consider that it must not be done at the expense of the poor, hungry school children.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Philip South is a very sincere man when he talks about the problems of the poor people of Barbados, and I have no doubt that his contribution here was in that vein. However, I must allay a few of his fears.

Like the hon. member, I too live in a rural area and I too represent an agricultural constituency and I know the importance of the daily meal to the school children in the primary schools of Barbados. We in the Ministry of Education have a number of problems in regard to the school feeding programme. I have used a number of opportunities recently to point out a number of these difficulties and also to spell out certain details of planning for change in some of the directions in which we have been going. It is a bit unfair, however, for the hon. member to suggest that the country has had a surplus on current expenditure.

Mr. WEEKES: On a point of order, Sir, I never said that, I said we expect. I cannot substantiate what the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister has said, I am not saying that we have a surplus, I am just repeating what the Prime Minister has said, so I shall be very grateful if you will not for one moment misquote me.

Hon. L. R. TULL: I do not quite understand that, but what I gather is, to put it his way, the Prime Minister has said there will be a surplus of $21 million and the hon. member is hoping that that surplus will not be at the expense of the school meals for the children, or something like that. I think it is a bit unfair even to insinuate it, because the difficulty in regard to the first problem raised by the hon. member, the fact that in some schools there has only been one hot meal per week recently stems out of the attitude of the Barbados Union of Teachers in relation to their role in the school meals service, and also the sick-out. He is perfectly right when he says it has something to do with the sick-out, but it also has something to do with the role the teachers play in the programme, and I will explain what I mean.

As far as the sick-out goes a number of schools in the island, some days as many as 40 or 50, are affected and children have to be sent home early in the day, and therefore there will be a great deal of wastage if the regular meals are prepared and then there was nobody to take them, and this is what I say is the effect of the rotary sick-out which has been brought by the teachers, but this is a temporary thing, it is not a permanent situation. We have had to give more than the normal packed lunches, but whether the lunch is packed or hot, as stated by the hon. member, the nutritional value of each meal is at an adequate level. You do not need to have a meal that is hot for it to have adequate nutritional content, and we make sure of that.

Also, in respect of the attitude of the Barbados Union of Teachers, all of Barbados knows that the Barbados Union of Teachers said last year that the teachers should have nothing to do with school meals. They said if they are teachers they are teachers and their job is to teach, not to supervise children at lunch and to collect the money for school meals, and I want now to say very clearly to everybody, because there is a lot of misinformation and a few misconceptions about this. Teachers in Barbados are not required and have never been required to dole out food to children. A lot of people in Barbados thought that the teachers had to ladle food out and hand to the children but that has never been the case. What the teachers were required to do, and had been doing from the implementation of the school meals service, back in 1962, was that they would first thing on mornings in their classrooms get the children in each class – each teacher gets the names of the children in his class – who is taking a school meal that day and collecting the ten cents for it, the Head Teacher or Senior Teacher would go around to all the classes and get the total number of children, then call the School Meals Centre and say we need X number of lunches today. At lunchtime the teachers were required to supervise the children, and by supervision I do not mean handing them their meals, it just means a general supervision of what is going on and to make sure that things are going to order, but the teachers have said that that is not their job, that they are not collecting any money for the school meals, that they are not going to telephone the Centre to tell them how many children at their school need meals for that particular day, that they are not going to give a general supervision of the children while they are having lunch, that that is no part of their job, and indeed that they are not prepared to collect ten cents from each child and hand over.

I want the people in this country to understand that that is what the issue is; that is all. The teacher in the time that the taxpayer is paying him to be in a classroom – he is not being asked to do it out of normal hours – in normal teaching hours he is asked to collect the money, count the number of children who want to take school meals, pass on the number to the School Meals Centre, and then at lunchtime make sure that the children don't fight or misbehave and that sort of thing, and they say that is not their job. Yesterday I had to remark that a lot of the things the teachers were doing in Barbados all through the sixties and up to 1976 without complaint, suddenly they are complaining. From 1962 to 1978 the teachers were supervising the school meals service, but suddenly in 1978 with a new Government the Barbados Union of Teachers told all the teachers not to touch it. They were doing it for sixteen years before that when there was the Democratic Labour Party Government, but the moment there has been a change of Government they are told not to touch the school meals, they are teachers and they must teach and let us bring other people in to deal with the school meals.

There are 362 school meals servers in Barbados. These are women who are employed by Government to serve the children their meals, to take up the eating utensils and put them away, and wash them, and this sort of thing. There are 362 of them spread out in the primary schools in Barbados who are paid to do that specific job, and a lot of people in Barbados were under the impression that the teachers had to do that. The teachers said, "hands off." This has contributed to some extent to a falling off in the school meals standard, and I am calling on parents in Barbados and people who are paying these teachers to bring home to them in no uncertain terms that they expect certain duties from them for the money they are being paid. If the teachers were being asked to do menial work I could very well understand their taking objection to it. I have said only yesterday that there are teachers who say that they are not to mark registers of who are present and who are

absent from the classroom because they say that is clerical work and they are teachers so you have to get clerks to do it, they do not have to mark registers. There are teachers in Barbados who say that they will not take prayers on mornings in schools because they are not preachers; get a pastor or a preacher to come into the school and pay him to do that. That is the situation in which we find ourselves now, and I do not believe that I have been hearing enough public reaction against this sort of thing, and I am listening.

I know in a certain part of Barbados to which I am very intimately connected I am trying desperately – not so much now as some months ago – to hold back some parents from assaulting teachers. I am begging them not to do it, because as the hon. member says, we know up in these rural constituencies there are agricultural workers, people who go out into the fields of this island and sweat in the noonday sun and are soaked by the rain and give of everything in them to keep this country going, and they expect that when they go out to work during the day that the teachers will look after the small, little ones that they are slaving for. These are the people who pay the teachers, and I am having extreme difficulty in restraining some people in the agricultural belt in Barbados from assaulting teachers who refuse to assist their children in getting school meals. I do not know what they expect the Government to do, I really don't know what they expect us to do.

There are other considerations. The Union says that we must pay people to come into the schools, go to each class, collect the money, find out which children want lunch, pay over the money and supervise the children during the lunch hour. Now, I will tell you my experience. (ASIDE). It will increase employment as you say, but it will also increase confusion, because if you put one person into a school of 700 to go to each classroom – a stranger, mark you, not a teacher – to collect money from each child, mark down all the names and then get in touch with the School Meals Centre to say deliver 700 lunches, by the time that person is finished it will be 3 o'clock in the afternoon. I go around to schools in Barbados and it is difficult to get little children to talk to me because I am a stranger. They will talk to their teachers, they will tell their teachers what their problems are, and any new person going into that school to collect the money will encounter that same problem, therefore what the teachers are suggesting is entirely unreasonable, and as far as I am concerned I am never going to advise the Government of Barbados to make that concession. I am not going to do it, whatever the consequences.

Now this question about the marginal increase of expenditure on school meals in the coming financial year. Let me just say this. There has been a falling off in the number of children who have been taking school meals for a variety of reasons, but one of the important reasons is that we have been taking off the tops off a number of all age schools and putting them into new secondary places, and as the hon. member well knows, there are no school meals served at the secondary level, so that in fact there are fewer children in the school meals programme now that there were in the past. Let me also say at this stage that the reason why we can have only a marginal increase in the cost of the provision of the school meals programme is not because we are giving them a smaller meal or a less nutritious meal, but because the cost of living, the prices of certain food commodities, have dropped. For instance, the cost of chicken is $1.59 per pound, when this time last year it was well over $2.00 per pound; the cost of corned beef when we took over the Government was $2.62 per pound, and whatever the hon. member may say, it was only $1.60 up to two weeks ago, and now it is in the region of $2.00 and maybe over that. The cost of potatoes, both local sweet and imported English potatoes has gone down, the cost of onions has gone down, the cost of flour has gone down, the cost of vegetables has gone down and the cost of beef clod has gone down, and that explains why we do not need as much money, as the hon. member has suggested.

Now I have only given you eight area of foodstuff where the cost has gone down in the last year, and I would like the hon. member to ponder that. It is not a question of not having enough money, as the member has said, and coming for a supplementary, we have got enough money to feed all the primary school children adequately for the whole financial year, but we also had another problem last year which in a way was responsible for a heavy preponderance of these box lunches, and that is that for most of the past financial year it was impossible to get lamb in Barbados, so the supplier to the school meals department was not supplying any. We could not get pork for a substantial period of that time and at one time we even had a problem with chicken, but only for a short period, so that when the hon. member is swinging his swath far and wide he must take these things into consideration, because as I said when I started, I know that he is genuinely concerned about the lot of these little children, but he must not feel that it is in his breast alone to feel for the little children.

He made the point very strongly that he has one child in a Government primary school, therefore he must be concerned. But let me tell the hon. member that I have two in the Government primary schools, because like him I cannot afford to send my children to fee paying schools, I just cannot afford it, so I am concerned in a very direct way with what happens in the school meals service in Barbados.

Just let me say finally, Mr. Chairman.

5.25 p.m.

The Democratic Labour Party Opposition has got it in their hands to a very large extent to improve the School Meals Service in Barbados. The bulk of the people who work in the School Meals Programme were hand picked by the Democratic Labour Party. I am not quarrelling with that. All that I am saying is that there are a number of people in the School Meals Service who still say or feel that Sandiford or Sleepy Smith is Minister of Education; and they are prepared to do a whole lot to embarrass the present administration. They make no bones about it. I think that it is in the hands of the members of the opposite side to tell them that their own responsibility is to the children of Barbados.

The question that Head 15(8) – School Meals Department – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(9) – AUDIO VISUAL EDUCATION

Head 15(9) – Audio Visual Education – for the sum of $108,536 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(9) stand part.

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

The question that Head 15(9) – Audio Visual Education stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(10) – INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS

Head 15(10) – Industrial Schools – for the sum of $164,886 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(10) stand part.

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

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get the Minister's reaction to a number of reports or statements coming out in a section of the Press not long ago about the state of affairs in one of these Government Industrial Schools. Up to now there has been no comment by the Ministry to that particular article, and it leads people to believe that whatever was stated in that article was true. The article reported a breakdown of discipline up there, bad behaviour and assaults on teachers and inmates at one of the institutions. It was also reported that there were cases of homosexuality. Nothing had been said about it by the Ministry; and I would like to hear from the Minister whether this is a cause of concern to the Government Industrial School; and if it is so, what is the Ministry of Education doing to correct that situation? Certainly the people of the country cannot feel happy about this state of affairs. I am not saying that it is true, but I would like to hear the Minister's reaction to that statement in the Press.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I myself read the report in the newspaper some weeks ago. The Nation newspaper is the most irresponsible newspaper that has ever been published in this country. *(Aside:* I thought that you had an interest. You should declare it.) Do not worry about my interest. I thought that you were talking about the Government Information Service. The report that appeared in the Nation newspaper was not a report based on fact. I asked the Board of Visitors of the Industrial School to have a look and report into what we saw in the newspaper. The Board of Governors along with the Board of Visitors, acting on the advice of the Principal, reported that there had been no evidence of homosexuality at the Government Industrial School for many years.

We have also been told that whatever indiscipline has been evidenced at the Government Industrial Schools is no more or less than is associated with reform schools, and that things had not been so critical as to warrant the type of report that we saw in the newspaper. One of the problems that has been stated is that of absconding. Apparently, over the last few months there has been an increase in the number of boys who have been absconding from the school; and that is the only real area of worry. Again we have to make up our minds whether we are going to run a reform school as an open institution or as a prison with walls and padlocks and that kind of thing. My views on reformatories, especially for people at that age, would not lead me to tighten up on the security in that place to the extent to which you would need tall walls and padlocks. If a few children abscond from time to time in such an open policy of reformation, we will have to live with that; but it is not true to believe 90% of what we read in that report in the Nation newspaper.

The question that Head 15(10) – Government Industrial Schools – stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(11) – LIBRARIES

Head 15(11) – Libraries – for the sum of $231,485 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 15(11) – Libraries – stand part.

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

The question that Head 15(11) – Libraries stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 15(12) – CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Head 15(12) – Cultural Affairs – for the sum of $253,952 was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, under Head 15(12) – Cultural Affairs – I would like to state that CARIFESTA, 1979 is being hosted by the Government of Cuba in the month of July this year; and the Government of Barbados will be sending a contingent to participate in CARIFESTA this year.
5.35 p.m.

I want also to add that Crop Over 1979 is now at an advanced stage of planning and we are looking forward to a bigger and better Crop Over Festival, 1979.

I beg to move that the sum of $253,952 under Head 15 – Ministry of Education and Culture (12) Cultural Affairs, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 115 – MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE

Head 115 – Ministry of Education and Culture – was called.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, under this Head I should like to draw hon. member's attention to Item 13 – School Uniforms. In the International Year of the Child, says Cameron Tudor, the Minister of Education should demonstrate his faith in the young people of this country by giving them free school uniform. Included in the Capital Estimates for 1979–80 is the figure of $400,000 for the initial outlay and implementation of the policy of the Barbados Labour Party as enunciated in its election manifesto of 1976.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $18,637,852 under Head 115 – Ministry of Education and Culture, as amended stand part of the Schedule.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I want to second this and to talk about it. Sir, I think it is about time in this country that people clearly understand it takes Government to have proper planning; it must build a proper economic base, correct infelicities in Government.... If the hon. member for St. Michael South West cannot take his licks, let him get up and go out.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, it is not the licks I cannot take, it is the hon. member I can't take.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not surprised. I would not want him to take me; he has the wrong sex. Sir, the hon. member must be careful today.

The reason why I begin on this is that, as the Minister said in introducing this particular Head, the provision under Item 13 makes provision for implementing part of the manifesto's promise of the Barbados Labour Party, and I myself have listened to several meetings of the Democratic Labour Party and I have read the other foolishness that Mr. Cameron Tudor writes in the newspaper, pure propaganda, trying to convince the people of this country that the Barbados Labour Party will make promises in its manifesto and not set out to honour those promises, but the promises must be honoured in the context of an economy that can withstand the cost, and unless it can withstand the cost, it would be a reckless Government that misleads a country into going ahead with schemes merely because they are going to get a few votes in 1981 and put back in power. I hope that the electorate of Barbados are very sensible. I have never seen in a country so many meetings held after an election as have been held during our period without any fear of freedom of speech and freedom of the Press as we have heard a lot about. I am not surprised the Opposition does not want to talk on these Capital Estimates for the Ministry of Education. They are anxious now to hurry us off this Head because they have seen in the Head the Government's clear intention to carry out the full promises on education that were set out in one of the most outstanding documents for social and economic development in this country. *(Asides.)*

Sir, I am going to cite the Standing Orders for the benefit of the hon. member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I know the Standing Orders. You do not have to cite them for me.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The implementation of the scheme for school uniform is an important part of our pledge to the people, and I congratulate the Minister again. They should be big enough to congratulate him. They would not do it so I will do it for bringing forward this scheme in the International Year of the Child and getting this going. Mr. Cameron Tudor got some fancy figures and said it is going to cost the country $20 million. He cannot even understand the figure and the Minister should be well commended. I hope he gets the scheme well organised and that it will begin in the first place to benefit all the people right down the line who cannot afford particularly to bear the cost of school uniforms.

I want to talk on some other items too. I want to commend the Minister for Item 19 – Language Lab. For several years now the OAS has been anxious to assist the Government of Barbados with a language laboratory at the Community College. Ambassador McComie when he was our representative to Washington and the OAS took steps about it, but nothing was done. This Minister has scored again. He is on the right track and that is why he can withstand almost single-handedly for four days now everything the Opposition has got to say. That is going to be an important contribution to the economic development, not only the educational development of Barbados, because it is about time that we in this country become not only bi-lingual but tri-lingual particularly having regard to the area in which we live. French and Spanish are vital languages not only for people who are going to Harrison College and Queens College but at the primary level for the transaction of business for instance, and in the business of every day living particularly, and I hope the Minister will move on after he has got his language laboratory going and has managed to train enough teachers to teach the languages themselves and to get many more facilities into the primary schools, to the position where he can make at the primary level and at the secondary level five years of Spanish and five years of French compulsory. I think it is a must. I know he has had talks with foreign representatives who could assist us in this field and I hope he will accomplish it during the time that he is at the Ministry.

I want to make a further comment on the National Auditorium and Cultural Centre. We are tending to move across now. I am glad to see that he has a token vote in this year's Estimates, and I know that the plan which the Government has for the establishment of an auditorium is part of the overall Bridgetown development in the area of the Cathedral Square, and therefore this token vote will enable that Ministry to get on with the planning so that in the whole of the area of the Cathedral Square and Spry Street he will have not only a Central Bank building, but a proper national auditorium and cultural centre which has been promised for so long and which has been very long in coming.

I want also to refer again to Item 1 – Primary Schools, and here I am going to be a bit more parochial. I am glad to see this in the Estimates, because with the officials listening I want some repairs done to the St. Matthias Schools. This is most important and I have already written the Minister in this issue and I believe in the new financial year if he has money that I will see the St. Matthias Schools being adequately repaired and the toilet facilities being fixed. I am prepared to wait for some time before we can get a new primary school for that area, although I believe it is necessary to have in St. Matthias or somewhere near there a combined primary school and give back the church their quarters.

5.45 p.m.

We are very much squashed in that area and I would hope that the Ministry in their long-term planning for the next five years development would see that adequate arrangements are being made for this.

Finally I want to talk about Item 10, Library Services. Under Library Services I am glad to see that the Minister intends to up-date the Library facility in Oistins because in my view the Library facilities were part of the overall Oistins Development Scheme and indeed the Minister of Health and myself have been co-ordinating our Ministries' work in this respect and we can very easily work in conjunction with this Minister to co-ordinate the whole development of that particular project there.

I am appealing also for people who use Library facilities in this country for all their lives to recognise that we have a duty to give to the Government, some of us when we die, others in our lifetime, part of our books which unfortunately nowadays people tend either to ignore or to sell or to get exported from the country and I hope that I will find many more people in Barbados who are anxious of leaving their Libraries for a National Library Service in Barbados.

People cannot expect the Government to merely provide these services. I myself from time to time have made various gifts and donations to the University of the West Indies, particularly the Faculty of Law with legal publications and I have a collection of the manuscripts and the First Editions, particular in History and Sociology, books of the Caribbean in general and I have managed to collect some of these and I will trust that one of these days myself, if the Library wants some of the things I have collected, to make a donation in this regard but it is an area in which the public could be asked to at least show their appreciation of what the Government itself is doing for Libraries in this area for making a substantial contribution and I would not have wanted this occasion to pass without commenting on this particular point.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I do not intend to be long so members need not despair. I would only like on behalf of the mothers of St. Michael West *(Cheers.)* to thank the Minister of Education and Culture for the introduction of one of the major pledges of the Barbados Labour Party's Manifesto programme for 1976. I have been reminded, Sir, that as Chairman of the Party I am perfectly at liberty to make parochial points *(Cheers.)* and, Sir.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The member must be heard in silence.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you, Sir. I would also like, getting a little more serious now, to reflect upon the fact that working class parents in Barbados for a number of

years have had restrictions imposed upon them by the increasing cost in keeping children in school even though the educational system is fundamentally free. There are some things that do cause parents a great deal of anxiety and one of those is the question of having their children properly clothed. This is a very humane part of the Labour Party's programme which demonstrates, I am sure, that this Party is a Party that has a heart and recognises the problems of those persons who are fighting to go up from down the ladder and through the path of upward mobility achieve something of merit for their children.

Speaking under this Head 15 I would also like to make another parochial point and this is to ask the Hon. Minister to bear in mind when he is allocating money for the renovations of school properties that there are two schools in my constituency that I regard as urgently being in need of restoration.

The Deacon's Primary School which was built not terribly long ago continues to pose very serious problems and it is a very uncomfortable school during the wet weather and even though the roof does not leak the design of the school is such that it accommodates almost all of the rain coming in from the East and the Teachers and children have frequently to abandon their classrooms because of flooding in the classrooms. This is a phenomena which is not common in Barbados but it is particularly disquieting at the Deacon's Primary School in St. Michael West. The yard of that school is also in a very bad state of disrepair and I would also like to see some of this vote being used to create a more pleasant environment for the children of St. Michael West.

The next school I have in mind, Sir, is the Eagle Hall Infants School which has been there for a long time and which is now in need of extension and I am hoping that this vote here for Primary Schools will be used to improve the facilities so that both the Teachers and the children will have a more pleasing learning environment.

These are the only two points I want to make under this Head and I would close by once again thanking the Hon. Minister, a looking forward purposeful Minister, for introducing a programme which we promised in the Manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party.

5.55 p.m.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I am indeed proud this afternoon to hear the Minister announce that this financial year will see the introduction of free school uniforms. I am indeed happy because I was one of those persons who sat on a Committee to examine and recommend a policy on education and this is part of the policy that was recommended for the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto. For the people of Barbados, especially parents, this day should be a happy one when they learn that this Party, which has so often been accused of making promises, has fulfilled one of its promises today. Night after night the public of Barbados has been subjected to hearing accusations and hearing people criticizing the promises made by this Government. I am sure that today those people will be disappointed in those people who night after night gave the impression that this Government was only a Government of promises.

I do not want to be parochial in my address, but I must say as a representative of the people of St. Michael South-East that I am particularly happy on this occasion. First I must thank the Minister of Education for the work he has done in my constituency. When I came to this Chamber I asked the Minister to consider fixing the lights in the Parkinson School. I also drew to his attention that the canteen was in an unhealthy state. I can report today that both these problems have been fully solved. The lights are now restored at the Parkinson School for the first time since 1975, and there is a completely new canteen at the Parkinson School. This must show that the Government is doing its job for the children. I must go a bit further on this when I realize that over the past couple of months so much effort has been concentrated in St. Michael South-East to get me de-popularized, and people will realize that why some other people are after the member for St. Michael South-East is because of the wonderful work I have been doing. But I can assure you Mr. Chairman, that more and more of the good work will be shown over the next couple of years and the people of St. Michael South-East will gladly return me in the next election.

We have a situation of which I must be proud on this occasion. The Hon. Minister has included in his programme a new primary school in St. Michael South-East. The people of Clapham, the Pine, Parkinson Field and the surrounding areas who have called upon me time and time again to do something about a primary school will now see their appeals come through and I must thank the Minister for so graciously granting me such a favour for the people of St. Michael South-East; and I must also say that when the extension to the Parkinson School which will provide more spacious classrooms and improve the playing facilities of that school and the whole area is completed, the people of the constituency will indeed be very happy. And with the siting of the Samuel Jackman Prescod Polytechnic which will also be situated in St. Michael South-East there is surely a hub of activity in the constituency. I am indeed happy to know that there are lots of activity in St. Michael South East which will redound to the benefit of the children and parents in that constituency.

Dr. CADDLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the Minister that we on this side have taken note of Item 13 and would like to compliment him for getting so far in having this Item included in the Estimates. However, there is a long way between having an Item included in

the Estimates and getting the scheme off the ground, and people in this country will be anxiously awaiting the time when they will be in a position to get the actual school uniforms. I think it would be in the interest of the Minister to spell out in detail how this scheme will be operated. Some years ago under the Local Government Scheme in Bridgetown there used to be a system of providing certain children with school uniforms, and we all know how that scheme operated and the problems and difficulties which parents had with degradation of their personality in going to avail themselves of help under that scheme. I hope when this scheme gets off the ground people will not have problems reminiscent of that time.

I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to Item 1 in the sum of $800,000 for the repair of primary schools. I can only hope that this amount is sufficient, because as I go around I see a lot of work needed to be done to bring these schools back to a proper condition. If you look at the St. Giles Boys' School, there is a lot of work to be done there, from the roof to the yard. Similar work needs to be done at the St. Giles Girls' School. And if you listen to any of the representatives in here they can all tell you of schools in their constituency very much in need of repair. So it is open to serious question whether this amount of money is sufficient for the repairs that need to be done. Some of these schools have been without repairs for a very long time and parents would like to know that something is going to be done to get these schools in a proper condition.

While talking about school buildings I would like to point out that the yards in many of these schools need repair and that children have a rough time in walking in these yards and that something needs to be done to reinstate these yards.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the Housecraft Centre to be a very important institution in this country, and I believe the time has come to take another look at it as regards expanding it or setting up other centres in other parts of the Island. I am a bit disappointed to see only $25,000 provided for the Housecraft Centre.

On the question of a language laboratory I would like to commend the Minister for the progress made so far and I look forward to seeing this project get off the ground also, for I recognize that in this area where a lot of Spanish is spoken, and French to a lesser extent, Barbadians should get into the act of learning more than one language, and the best time for people to learn a new language is when they are young; so I am glad to hear the Minister says he plans to have French and Spanish taught compulsorily in schools.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that, unlike my colleagues on the back bench and my distinguished friend on the other side, I am not congratulating the Minister on any school uniforms. The country gave us a mandate to provide school uniforms and the Minister is doing that. As far as the other side is concerned they will have to be congratulating us a lot of times as our Manifesto takes off. I heard at your public meetings the hon. member for St. Michael North Central talking about bringing in the Mottley system. I do not know what he is talking about, if the handing out of old khaki pants and such like; but that is the other side's mentality. You are now searching for something to say on the public platform. But when the Minister made the announcement he had the Opposition off-balance; they did not know where they were going. I have heard all your announcements polluting the air night after night about the grand old man of your party who said he dislike public meetings because he did not see why people should be kept up night after night. Now when the nights come he is all about in St. Michael North-East talking about children this and children that. We have a Manifesto. We have corrected the country's economic position and from here on you will have to keep your mouth closed. But your people are going to be well housed; I am the Minister of Housing and I am going to house you well. As a matter of fact I have invited the hon. member for St. Michael South to send in any Dems he has in his constituency. There is a Tenants Committee at the National Housing Corporation and you can send 200 of them to me and I will ask the Tenants Committee to help the hon. member for St. Michael South. I don't interfere with the operations of the Housing Corporation but I will ask the Corporation to help them as much as possible. And when I provide the houses, you will be butting about Bay Street and Broad Street not knowing where to canvass. But you have refused the offer. There are a number of people in the Bay Land who would like houses and you told me they are Dems and I am prepared to ask the Tenants Committee to use their influence and give at least 200 people in the Bay Land some houses.

Mr. SANDIFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I can well understand the generosity of the Minister. Unfortunately on this occasion it must be a case of the Greeks bringing gifts. I do not want his help on this occasion because he is trying to help me down and out.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I would like to assure the hon. member I would not help down, but I would not help him out either. But if he is now refusing to help these people in the Bay Land who come to me very often I am going to make it very clear to them that the hon. member for St. Michael South has said not to give them a house.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: We don't want to be facetious in this matter.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Facetious? What is facetious about that? I believe Sir, you would like to be out of the Chair for a few minutes and I am going to move that you report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting for ten minutes.
6.15 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. Earlier in the day the hon. member for St. Michael North West drew the attention of this Hon. House to two items appearing in today's Advocate-News. I have listened to his complaint, and *prima facie,* there is a breach of privilege committed; and I think that it was his motion that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges of this Hon. House, and I do so rule.

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

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

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Chairman, before I move finally that this Head stand part, I want to draw to the attention of members a number of factors in these Capital Estimates, and especially to the fact that the Government is spending over $17 million in capital expenditure on the Ministry of Education in this year, which by all accounts is the highest capital expenditure by this Ministry ever.

There are certain other aspects that I would like to mention. Among them is the provision of a new secondary school at Wotton in Christ Church which we hope to start to construct during this coming financial year. I know that I have been saying over the past 24 hours that our primary thrust will be in the area of primary education; but we are not turning our backs on secondary education. In the two years and a bit since we have been in Government, we have completed the Roebuck Secondary School, and at the beginning of the next school year, towards September, we will have completed the secondary school at Trents in St. James with the capacity for 1,200 children. Sometime before the end of this financial year we will start construction of the school at Wotton, which we expect will also have a capacity of 1,200. We hope to do extensions to existing secondary schools, thereby providing an additional 1,500 to 1,600 new secondary places.

Another point I should mention – and I am sorry that the hon. member for St. Philip is not here, because he was a little bit concerned about expenditure on the School Meals Service. In the Capital Estimates there is a figure of $300,000 mainly for the St. Lucy Secondary School and we will complete Phase 4, and a number of older secondary schools.

The other point that I will raise is that in place of the figure $300,000 for the School Meals Service, if hon. members will take a look at the amendment which has been circulated, they will find that the figure of $1,500,000 has been inserted in place of the figure $300,000, under Capital for the School Meals Service; and we are hoping during the time to start construction of a new school meals centre to replace the one at Gun Hill, and build a new centre somewhere in St. George.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 115 with amendments stand part.

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

The question that Head 115 – Ministry of Education and Culture (Capital Expenditure) stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General – Direction and Policy Formulation – in the sum of $1,458,422 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that this Head stand part, I want to ask for an amendment to the explanatory notes on the page opposite Page 46 under Item 15 and including at the end thereof the words which have been circulated – "and to provide printing, editing and incidental costs for law reporting projects."

Mr. Chairman, this Head should not detain hon. members for a long time; but I should wish to say that perhaps of all the Ministries of Government, the Ministry of the Attorney General is the most technical of all the Ministries in that the Attorney General has a special constitutional role to play, and as such, sometimes his role as Attorney General is not particularly understood in the community. Perhaps it might be timely to remind the House that part of his role is to the legal adviser to the House, on both sides, and to the Senate as well.

But the main trust of the Ministry's work is being the principal legal adviser to the Government; and I think

that I would be failing in my duty if I did not comment to the House the fact that within the past few years the gulf between private remuneration at the Bar and public remuneration for those persons who serve in the Attorney General's office has widened considerably. It is not unusual for us to have from time to time resignations from those people who are going into the private sector to practise on their own, or who may go into the quasi public sector; and in the past year in my Ministry there has been no exception to a regular pattern that has gone on since the year 1960.

The Solicitor General has prepared for me a list of the names and posts of officers in the Legal Department through the years 1960 to 1977; and I am satisfied that my Ministry, as the principal Law Office of the Crown has been the most unfortunate department in suffering the loss during these years of the sort that we have suffered. While we can see in some cases that some of these officers have gone to the Bench or become DPPs, they have resigned from the Service; and it seems to me a great tragedy that we cannot retain in the Government Service qualified Legal Advisers with years of practice and experience built up by some of them.

For example, during the year, two of our officers have gone to Statutory Corporations to do exactly the work that they were doing with us, at a higher level of remuneration than they got in our department. It seems to me that if they are competent to go to these Statutory Corporations at a higher remuneration, the principle of keeping them in the Attorney General's Office at a lower level of remuneration must be in considerable doubt. We have had three officers going into private practice. One returned to Dominica, and two to the Private Bar. So this year so far, we have had five people leaving the department; and as I said, it seems to be something that has been occurring from time to time.

6.35 p.m.

In 1976 for instance before I became Minister there were four people who left the Department between the months of May and July, and in 1971 there were five people who left the Department including outstanding legal draughtsmen like Mr. Neville Nicholls and Mr. Fred Waterman. I will be submitting to the Ministries of Establishment and Finance and hopefully to this House during the year ways of rectifying this sort of drift. One of the ways we are examining is to give the people in the department some remuneration in lieu of private practice. I want to comment that perhaps this is the only professional part of the Civil Service in which private practice is disallowed and yet there is no compensating remuneration paid to the people who have to forego practice. Surveyors are allowed outside practice, some doctors are allowed outside practice, architects are allowed outside practice, but when it comes to the lawyers they are denied outside practice and yet their remuneration does not reflect the sort of denial which has been meted out to them. The comments which I made on this part of the Ministry's business go also in relation to the Judiciary, particularly the magistracy. Although we have a separate item on magistracy, it is not often remembered that magistrates carry the bulk of cases adjudicated in this country between the citizen and the Crown and between citizen and citizen and have a rather heavy work-load, and yet today they too are not in my view adequately remunerated.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that this is particularly because they have been set up in an administrative civil service grading which has gone on for years and it seems difficult to get through that they have to break out of this. I say as a result as the Minister responsible that unless serious consideration is given to remunerating lawyers in the public sector much better than they are remunerated today, we will end up with a situation where the Government who is after all the biggest employer and has the most legal business in this community, will find itself with a rather young service, lacking in experience and maybe people who are not themselves Barbadian. Let me say that in view, having come from the private bar, I am in a position to comment on this. I know the level of remuneration in the private bar particularly among barristers as such. I have seen the level of taxation of costs that is now becoming accepted in Barbados, and I believe that if the level of taxation of costs now accepted in Barbados continues and the remuneration in the private bar continues at that level, there will continue to be a drift from the public service legal side into the private service legal side, and I do not believe for one moment that by and large the people at the private bar are better qualified than the people in my Chambers. In fact I myself when I came to be Attorney General recognised that there were several areas of the law that one never saw outside at the private bar that even the most junior people in the Attorney General's Chambers would be exposed to, and one could possibly go through a whole practice here for several years without having the sort of exposure that one gets in the Attorney General's Chambers.

Sir, this raises the whole question of the legal profession. You will realise that we have to be responsible under the Legal Profession Act for the regulation of the profession, and only a couple of weeks ago when I attended a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council of Legal Education, which is the professional body responsible for the Law Schools and the legal profession in the Caribbean, I expressed my regret at the fact that Barbados for the sort of money that it is paying for legal education both at the Faculty of Law at the Cave Hill Campus and the other campuses, and also for the money it is paying for the professional law schools was not getting reasonable returns. We have been allotted five places at the Cave Hill Campus. This year we have

got a few more. For the last two years we have got something in the region of ten because other countries were not taking up their full quota, but the quota of five which has been extended to ten is not satisfactory at present, and I have already said to this House on another occasion that I have referred to the Minister of Education under whose portfolio the Faculty of Law comes letters from people who have been denied admission to the Law School when much more senior people who have already got first exams or have been qualified in some way have had an opportunity to go, and when in any event other countries in the Caribbean have got more places, because if there are Barbadians available we will want to see that they are given an opportunity particularly when we are now cutting off the possibility of Barbadians becoming qualified outside the region without going through some form of legal training at the Law Schools.

In the Law Schools we have been producing on an average about five to six people a year, and many of them have not come back into the public service, and hence the problem is increasing, and not only myself but other Attorneys-General have asked that this subject of the restructuring of the legal education and the course for legal education should be referred to the meeting of Ministers of Justice or Ministers of Legal Affairs or Attorneys-General which we trust will meet shortly in May in Jamaica or Antigua. Mr. Chairman, although I have made these remarks in relation to Barbados and in relation to our problem, I have to say to the House that it is a problem for the whole region. For instance, in the sister Republic of Trinidad and Tobago they have something like 27 vacancies in the Ministry of the Attorney General alone, and indeed recent advertisements here have gone unnoticed even by people whom we have practising in Barbados. Likewise only today I was speaking to the Minister of Legal Affairs, who was sitting in this House, for Antigua, and he was asking if there was any way in which Barbados could help him with legal officers. We have had approaches from Belize and the Bahamas for officers to serve in the judiciary.

There is a shortage of legal personnel in the region and hence I think for all these reasons we will have to pay more regard to the training of the profession, of possibly restructuring the course and reducing it from being three years to the first degree plus two years at professional law school which seems to be a continuation in some respect of the degree course, and the two years in Trinidad have been proving very expensive for some of our people. We should try to reduce it to three years plus one in Trinidad plus one year practical which people could serve in legal chambers in their country or otherwise and those we certify in some way going towards their final degree courses. I am hoping that this matter, as I said, will be raised very quickly, that is, the problem about the establishment. Despite this, I think that during this year we hope to be able to achieve a few more things. For instance, as hon. members will know we have managed to update the Laws to the 31st December, 1976, and the blue volumes now reflect this, but we have already prepared the second supplement which would update our Laws to the 31st December, 1978, and the proofs have already gone off to be printed, and I trust that later this year hon. members and people in the profession and the public can buy an edition of the Laws of Barbados showing the laws as at 31st December, 1978. They would then have to just take the volumes as they come off the press.

6.45 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the subsidiary legislation this is still a problem. There is no where at present in Barbados, not even in my Chambers that you can find a complete set of Rules and Regulations of what is called the Subsidiary Legislation in Barbados and indeed not even at the Cave Hill Campus at the Faculty of Law. In 1974 the then Cabinet took a decision to ask Mr. Wilfred Fergusson and Mr. Erskine Ward to bring the legislation up to date to the 31st December, 1974 and the understanding was that the project would have been complete in two years. Well it has not been completed, Sir.

I am hoping this year, Sir, that Mr. Fergusson who is now working alone on the project will be able to complete the actual project. He has given me an outside date of the 30th September, this year and I hope that we will have the subsidiary legislation brought up-to-date to the 31st December, 1978 and that it will be available for the country and thereafter we will seek to get the Laws up-dated on an annual basis. This is the subsidiary Legislation.

One of the areas of the law in which we have been a little deficient in in this country is in the Law Reports. I do not know how many hon. members have taken the opportunity to find out what are the Law Reports of Barbados going back to the 1840's when we had our first Supreme Court set up. You will find it almost impossible to say what decisions have gone out of our Courts since the 19th Century other than the Sir Herbert Gray's Report and a few other Reports here and there. There is no composite set of Law Reports in Barbados.

In these Estimates under Head 15 members will note that we are making a start on doing a Law Reporting Project and I have been able to engage the services of Mrs. Betty Bourne-Holland, a former Magistrate of this Island and a former Judge of the Supreme Court of Trinidad and Tobago, born of Barbadian parentage in St. Lucia, now retired, to start in Barbados on the Law Reports. We are beginning with the years 1976 – 1978 but we will be hoping for her to go back to 1956 for which reasonably accurate reports are available and we are looking for international funding to get research into the

case determined by the Courts having Jurisdiction under Barbados from the year 1840 to the year 1956. That is a much longer-termed project.

The aim will be that as Judgments are given by the Courts that we will publish these on an annual basis and probably print them and reproduce them in our Official Gazettes and steps are being readily taken to achieve these objectives within minimal time as possible.

Now in the field of Law Reform, Mr. Chairman, I believe that we have had some achievement despite our limited resources. Hon. members will be aware that we have already brought composite legislation down to this Honourable House which has been passed by both Houses of Parliament reforming the whole area of Land Law and I do not want to go over the debate on this matter.

We have started the reform of the whole area of Criminal Law as well. We now have an Expert working with us under the British Bilateral Technical Assistance Scheme. He commenced work at the beginning of the year and it is expected that within two years we will have the legislation coming into Parliament remodelling the whole of our Criminal Law, including the area of fines, penalties and also all the penal legislation.

We are making a start at Administrative Law as well. Hon. members complain from time to time, both in this House and in the Senate, for instance, that the Government brings down or has brought down legislation which seems to go too far and impinges on the rights of the people and indeed under our Manifesto we made reference to the need to study this trend. We have secured the services of Professor H. W. R. Wade, an authority on Administrative Law, and he will be coming to Barbados in a few days' time in order to look over the areas that are needed and the provisions that we hope will be completed by December, 1979 when the necessary legislation will be ready and we hope to bring this to parliament next year.

This will include a new and up-dated Commissions of Enquiries Act. Quite a bit of discussion arose on the powers of Commissions of Enquiries and the rights, duties and protection given to people whose conduct may come into question. There is no doubt that our Act is out-dated and that it does not reflect modern thinking or natural justice and I am taking steps to have Professor Wade's terms of reference include the area of Commissions of Enquiries.

Now in the field of Family Law, Sir, I said a few days ago in a public address that we have already completed in our Chambers the law abolishing the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate children and that will be in April. I trust also in April or May once it has gone through the Civil Service consultation that we should be in a position to bring by then the Law on Domicile of which you spoke, Sir. I know you cannot speak now but you spoke about this last year and that is ready as well. We are now circulating that and we are a far way along the road to completing our draft legislation on Divorce, and Nullity of Marriage, Maintenance and Family Property and to give implementation to the recommendations of the National Commission on the Status of Women.

I have with me here, Sir, the draft Defamation Act along with the Briefing Book. The Defamation Act will be before Cabinet shortly and will be in this House within a couple of months as well. We have also looked at the areas of law passed by the British Parliament and which still are applicable to Barbados and which should be re-located here. I have an Expert from Canada who is supposed to be the second leading authority on drafting. He is with us for two years.

So far, we have done a new Bill on Extradition, a new Bill on Official Secrets which modernises the Official Secrets Act and cuts out some of the restrictive provisions on Information which are contained in the United Kingdom 1911 Act which applies to us. We have done a new Bill on Information; access to Public Information, which is going through the rounds of consultation and we have already brought the Marine Insurance Act before Parliament as one of the reform measures.

Sir, in the field of International Law, we have also made a start here. We are starting to review the International Legal Conventions which may have affected Barbados from the time it became a settled Colony to date and I believe that we have got up to the year 1887 in that review and shortly I hope, by the end of next year, we will have completed the whole review of all of the Treaties which affect Barbados. We have indicated our position on them to certain States who may have benefits and obligations under those Treaties and be in a position to publish for the public of Barbados a complete set of the Treaty Obligations of Barbados.

In short, Sir, the Ministry of the Attorney General has a thrust in the area of Law reform and I think I have only outlined some of these. Members must bear in mind that we are also working in the field of Consumer Legislation. Our only handicap here is that we are waiting for some policy directions as well from the Ministry.

We have looked at Road Traffic and that Bill is out with the Ministry. We are looking at the field of Labour Law. I know the hon. member for St. Lucy is interested in this. The first one is the Factories Act which has been with the Ministry of Labour for some

time and there is some other legislation, the first draft of which we have circulated to the Union.
6.55 p.m.

I do not believe the Severance Payments Bill has gone out, but at least the first draft on reforming the Severance Payments Bill has also been done. The Ministries have given us their legislative programme for this year, it is a very heavy legislative programme. For instance, Sir, the Defence Bill which we have drafted is a substantial Bill of about 70 pages, and the Financial Institutions Bill is in about its second draft, so despite our depleted staff position our officers have been working manfully and have been sticking to the task, and I should certainly like to compliment them and the Solicitor General who leads them on the administrative side for the support they have given me during the year. We have a heavy load ahead of us for the next two years, of course, and I hope to achieve in that time a lot of social legislation and social reform, as well as the reform of lawyers' law.

Talking about lawyers' law, Sir, there is one comment I should like to make for the benefit of the profession, and it is this, Sir. The profession has talked about the absence of rules, and quite rightly they talk about the absence of a proper set of rules. For instance, the rules in admiralty go back to the year 1887 and have never been revised. Well, once again we are doing a complete review of the Supreme Court Rules and the Magistrates Court Rules and the Supreme Court Act, and I trust that before the end of the year I will be in a position to bring this revision to the House. If you don't get it this year certainly it will be early in the new year, but we have again secured the services of an expert in this field.

Legal training I touched on so far as the profession *per se* is concerned, but we are also taking steps to provide para-legal training, and in this regard I will mention that I have the full support of the Ministry of Education and the Community College, and within a few weeks Professor Williams of Cathelano College in Canada will be coming as an expert to sit down with our people to plan the introduction of the para-legal course at the Community College. Unless we have adequately trained para-legals, both for the public sector and the private sector, we may find ourselves at a disadvantage for the future without the possibility of improving the delivery of legal services.

Sir, in this section of my address I have not adverted to some of the other problems because there are sub-Heads and I hope to deal with some of these matters under sub-Heads like Police, Fire Services and under Capital. I have laid more stress in this instance on law reform, law reporting and when I come on to Judiciary I will talk a little more about our legal aid programme, but I have laid stress on these areas because I think they are crucial, and I believe that in this respect we have a developmental role to perform.

I move that the Head as amended stand part.

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

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

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HEAD 10(2) – REGISTRATION DEPARTMENT

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $230,326 under Head 10(2) – Registration Department, stand part of the Schedule.

There is only one complaint I have about the Registration Department, Sir, which is the lack of space, and there is very little we can do about that at the moment. We are building a new Supreme Court to which I will advert later on under the Capital Estimates, and at that time I hope that I can get rid of the problems occurring in this Department.

I beg to move that this Head stand part.

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

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

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HEAD 10(3) – CROWN SOLICITOR'S DEPARTMENT

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $26,494 under Head 10(3) – Crown Solicitor's Department, stand part of the Schedule.

Let me just inform hon. members that the Crown Solicitor's Department is now at Marine House and is being fully integrated as a Department of the Ministry of the Attorney General. There is one regret which we have which I believe again is a staffing regret, that Mr. Carol Fields for whom I am thankful for his services, is not a well man any longer and I do not know how long he will be with us; we have lost Mr. Edmund King who has gone to the Barbados National Bank, and we now have the position where we have a young qualified attorney-at-law who has joined us, but again there are very few people who are coming into the legal service and learning the solicitor's aspect of practice, and the Government unless we are prepared to provide the funds

will find itself that it has to refer its conveyancing and its land acquisition to outside people, and the cost will be more than having the Government's own legal advisers. I am repeating this, Sir, because I want it as a matter of record that I have foreseen the danger, I have spoken of the danger, and it is a danger. This department saves the Government thousands of dollars.

Let me give you an instance where we saved the Government money, Sir. Myself and the Acting Crown Solicitor negotiated the Orion Bank loan, for which this House has already passed a guarantee, and we know that if we had been working as private lawyers the fees we would have got for those negotiations would have exceeded the salary of the Attorney General for a year, so I am making the point very strongly that with one set of negotiations I believe that I earned at least half of the salary paid by the Government, and the Crown Solicitor would have earned his salary. We negotiated with the contractors at the Port on half million U.S. dollars, and you should know the scale that private lawyers would have been allowed, and that would have paid the salary of an Attorney General for probably two and a half years. I am not only a Minister as such, I am a technical Minister, and I want to make it quite clear that I feel that my officers save the Government money, and the Government does not always recognise this, and successive Governments have failed to recognise this, but if we were being allowed to sell our services to the Government like private lawyers, then I think they would soon understand that they are remunerating lawyers properly in the Public Service.

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

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

MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
HEAD 10(4) – PROBATION DEPARTMENT

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Sir, in moving the sum of $24,482 under Head 10(4) – Probation Department, stand part of the Schedule, I would like on this occasion with your permission to pay tribute to the lady who has headed this Department for so long. She is now retiring in a couple of days' time when she goes on pre-retirement leave from the Service. With your permission I will call her name. Miss Hildergarde Weekes has given outstanding service in the Probation Department.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to give notice, because you are not reflecting on her in an adverse way.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: As you please, Sir. She has given outstanding service to this country and she underscores all the points that I have been making about women, of their outstanding capability and leadership quality where they are as good as men are.
7.05 p.m.

This department is run on very little money but it carries out its duties seriously, and I think we have made some indentation in modern methods of penal reform and treatment.

I beg to move that Head 10(4) stand part.

The question that the sum of $24,482 under Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (4) Probation Department – stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (5) – PRISONS

Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (5) Prisons – was called.

Hon. H deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $419,260 under Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (5) Prisons – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (6) FIRE SERVICE

Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (6) – Fire Service – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $287,160 under Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (6) Fire Service – stand part of the Schedule. Unless hon. members want any details on the Fire Service I do not propose to make a speech.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to second the motion.

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

HEAD 10 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (7) POLICE

Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (7) Police – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that Head 10(7) stand part, I should like to compliment the Royal Barbados Police Force on a very successful year

in fighting crime in this country. The statistics for 1978 show that the number of reported crimes in 1978 fell below the 1975 figure by 16% and by 9.1% below the 1977 figures. The reason why I have taken the year 1975 is that it was the first year in which the Police Force had to work reduced hours because of the introduction of the 40-hour week and therefore a good point for comparison. However, we must admit that during the year certain crimes hit the headlines on a number of occasions and regretfully some of the persons speaking about the commission of crimes gave the impression that there was a great upsurge of serious crimes in Barbados. This really is not so. The police have done a commendable job, as the figures will show, and we have had a considerable reduction in some areas of crime both reported and detected and understandably the Commissioner of Police and his men can feel proud about this performance, particularly when we bear in mind that since 1969 there has been no increase in the establishment of the Police Force other than the transfer of the 52 positions of writ servers at the beginning of this year to full police duties. What has been happening then is that with the same complement of men between 1969 and 1978 the police have been called upon to fight crime in circumstances where there have been increases in a number of households in the country and in circumstances where the number of visitors to the Island has increased. We have done so in difficult circumstances for the Police, but despite the impression sometimes given I should like the Press to give the Police and the public their full support. What we admit freely from the Police point of view is that some serious crimes in Barbados can have the potential to create total disorder in vital areas of the lives of our citizens. For instance, some crimes committed during the year were accompanied by acts of violence and in some instances were directed against the person and property of visitors. Now in that area we have been most concerned to enlist the support of various sectors of the public and we have set up a crime prevention panel under the chairmanship of the Commissioner of Police, and one of the areas to which we have directed our attention is crime in the tourist industry. We admit that some of it is committed outside of the tourist plant or hotel premises, but the figures we have show that the majority of crimes against visitors are committed on the hotel property or in the precincts of the hotels, and we will be discussing with the Hotel Association and with hoteliers and the Barbados Board of Tourism the way in which we can assist them in policing their premises better and in improving security and training security personnel to deal with this type of crime. There is no way that the public can afford to pay for the number of policemen which would be necessary to be placed at every hotel in this country if they are relying on the police solely to give this protection, and I have made this clear to the hoteliers and I believe that they understand it. But we will continue to fight crime in this area and will continue to ask Barbadians to help us in doing so because this country has a good reputation for welcoming and looking after visitors to our Island. I was particularly pleased to see that despite two incidents involving Canadians the Canadian Press was very kind to us and treated them as isolated cases. But we cannot always rely on this show of appreciation and therefore we have counselled our people to recognize that we are selling a service. Visitors are not going to do us the good by coming to Barbados unless you treat them properly, and therefore the public at large has a duty to perform in this field. The Police Force has also been satisfied with the actual reduction and levelling off in the commission of certain crimes, the commission of which we highlighted in 1977 as being capable of adversely affecting the economy of the country and the general well being of the people and crime which can have potential danger. If I may give some examples in 1977 there were 80 cases of reported robbery, but this dropped to 54 in 1978; larceny from the person, 161 in 1977 dropped to 129 in 1978. Larceny in dwelling house, 527 in 1977 dropping to 516 in 1978; housebreaking, 544 in 1977 to 505 in 1978; and rape remained at 55 in both years 1977 and 1978.

I regret very much the increase in the number of road accidents. These rose somewhat over the 1977 figure. The 1978 figure was 3,693 compared with 3,594 in 1977. Fatal accidents increased from 28 in 1977 to 35 in 1978; serious injury dropped from 201 to 190. I make an appeal to the public to treat our roads not as race tracks and not to be negligent on the roads because it can involve the lives of persons. During this year the Police will be introducing the radar widely; we will be increasing the number of radar units and will step up action to detect people who are breaking the traffic laws and we will be making an all out effort to deal with the increasing problem of people riding bicycles without adequate lights.

Mr. Chairman, I would be failing in my duty if I did not advert to one case which has casued a great deal of discussion in this country.
7.15 p.m.

I do so to make a few points clear, not to be controversial. I want to be very particular about this case. If hon. members will bear with me – although I know that the hon. member for St. Michael South West sometimes in a teasing manner says that I am lecturing. I do not intend to lecture but I really on this part of the case have to explain the role of the Police, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Attorney General – and I trust that the Press as well as the public will take note of it.

I have a duty to the Police Force of this country. Now, Sir, from time to time in Barbados we have had cases of murder to have gone unsolved. Last year was not exceptional in that regard; and I want to highlight and remind the public of a few cases. In 1970 a young man

called Jefferson Lloyd was shot in the Ivy at St. Giles Boys' School. He was supposed to be with a woman who was supposed to be his lover, and she was at the same time married to somebody else. That was in 1970. There were only two people who were there together, Lloyd and this woman. The story that she gave to the police varied from time to time. At one stage it was one thing and at another stage it was another thing. The Police have never been able to identify sufficiently the person who committed that alleged act of murder to bring them before the courts of this island. However, Sir, they did hold an inquest. The Police did as well as they could.

On the 18th October, 1970, George Aimey, an employee of the Advocate Newspaper was killed, was murdered, near the Children's Goodwill League. He was struck on his head with a piece of wood; and again he was just with a young woman. There were only two people who came forward with any evidence of value and again in this case the stories differed. What was said by the young lady at one time and what was said by the lady at another time varied. Now George Aimey's death remains one of the unsolved murder crimes in this country. It may have been forgotten, no doubt, by a few people; but it is still very much in the mind of the Royal Barbados Police Force and should be very much current in the mind of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The third case is the case of a young man who lived in my constituency called Anthony Harris, 21 years old. His mother is Miss Joyce Harris of Rockley, Christ Church. He was murdered on Harrison College pasture near Weymouth Pasture on the 10th June at about 8.15 p.m. Again he was with a young woman with whom he had gone to the cinema. They had been engaging in a sexual relationship at the time, and apparently somebody walked across; and when he left he was supposed to have been murdered. The stories again varied as to the identity of the murderer. These are three cases.

Now, Sir, last year 1978, there occurred in this island one case involving the alleged murder of Victor Pele Parris. That case has become a *cause celebre,* and you, Mr. Chairman, and I will be restricted in talking about any matters before the Courts connected with this. I want, however, to say a few words as to the role of the Police. Now, Sir, people must clearly understand that in the investigation of crime and the prosecution of crime, the principal parties concerned must be the Police and the Director of Public Prosecutions. Under the constitution of this island, unless it is one of those cases coming under Section 79(a) – and murder is not one of those – the Attorney General of the country has no responsibility for the investigation of crime or for its prosecution. That has to be made absolutely clear, very clear.

The Constitution gives the Director of Public Prosecutions a secured position and although if in here an issue arises on him I can speak, I do not accept ministerial responsibility for the Director of Public Prosecutions in so far as the judge under our Constitution has an independent role to play. That is the correct legal position. It is not the Attorney General's duty to issue instructions to the Police as to how they should investigate a case or deal with a case. That is the position, and as long as I am Attorney General, that will remain the position as far as I am concerned. I want to say that this does not seem to be very clearly understood by some people in this community, including the Press.

Now, Sir, the Police as a matter of course, if they wish outside help, all that is necessary is to come to their Minister for the provision of funds. It is significant that in the Pele Case in which he was supposed to be murdered in 1978, the Commissioner of Police came to me and asked for the provision of funds to send an expert to London to the forensic laboratory in connection with the alleged murder of a lady in Belleville. I cannot go into that because the case is still *sub judice* before the Courts.

The notes of the Commissioner of Police will confirm, and the notes of this file will confirm, that I told the Commissioner of Police that if he wished funds for any outstanding Murder case, including the Pele case which was being investigated, and the alleged disappearance of Mr. Mark Stokes, I, as Attorney General, would ensure that those funds were made available. I would go further. *(Aside).* That was in June. Just a moment. The matter having reached the political proportions it had reached. I told him that it was his duty to investigate all cases properly.

The Commissioner of Police said to me then that he did not need any consultations other than to send someone to the forensic laboratory. His investigations were proceeding, and he was consulting fully with the Director of Public Prosecutions who was giving him all the advice that he was entitled to. Now, Sir the next time the matter came before me was after the coroner's inquest; and my note of the 18th October, 1978, my Permanent Secretary's note – and I believe that he writes shorthand – his shorthand record showed that I said to the Commissioner of Police that I had read the report in the Press where the Coroner had made comments on the conduct of the Police, that they had fallen to a new low. 7.25 p.m.

I therefore felt it my duty as Attorney General to take the statement seriously. If the statement proved to be well founded I had a duty to do something about it. On the other hand, if the statement proved to be unfounded, I also had a duty to bring the true facts to the attention of the Coroner and the public. I said that some people were suggesting that authorities were apathetic in this case because of political blockage. I

said that I had never interfered with the police and certainly not with the police in the Pele case, and I wish however for justice not only to be done but to be seen to be done. I reminded him of my relationship with the Director of Public Prosecutions under the Constitution and I said that I could not give directions to the Director except in very limited circumstances. I said that on the Pele case I may be moved to make a ministerial statement, but I would not wish to do so if in any way it would affect the independent action of any kind which might have to be taken arising out of the coroner's inquest or that might affect the outcome of any case which results from the investigation. I wondered whether the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Commissioner, again I asked the question, would wish funds to be provided to have the investigations made from outside the Caribbean area into the alleged murder of Victor Parris. This, I said, was a matter for the Commissioner of Police. If the Commissioner was happy with the progress being made in the case, he should so report to me, but if on the other hand the Commissioner felt that his hands would be strengthened by using outside investigators and the Director of Public Prosecutions agreed with him, then I would be willing to provide the money to have this done. I told the Commissioner I wished him to understand that the matter was entirely in his hands. I as Attorney General was not prepared to substitute my judgement on matters of this kind or on day to day administration of the Police Force for the judgement of the Commissioner of Police and the Director of Public Prosecutions. The Commissioner said that he had asked for funds in the George Street murder case and funds had been provided. As far as the Pele case was concerned, he would welcome the advice of the Director of Public Prosecutions and he thought that the Director of Public Prosecutions was the appropriate person to advise on the question of bringing in an outside expert. He had submitted the file to the DPP before sending it to the coroner, but he thought the Director of Public Prosecutions should see the file again with the proceedings of the coroner's court. The Commissioner said he himself did not see the need at this stage for bringing in any expert to assist with practical investigation, but he would await the coroner's report on the proceedings.

I referred to that of the 19th October as I have referred to my conversations with the Commissioner in June 1978 before this case became a political football. Now, Sir, I want to make a few things clear for people in this country. If they want an Attorney General for whom they set up a commission as was done with Mr. Gairy and then make allegations that he was interfering with the police in the execution of their duty, they have got to get one other than, and you will forgive me, Henry Forde. That is clear. It is as clear as this is night. There is no way in bowing to any pressure for political or any other reasons that I am going to prostitute my understanding of the role of an Attorney General in this country and be forced by any political pressure from any source whatsoever to interfere in these positions. *(Asides)* If the Opposition would keep quiet for a little while I should be happy, because you see, there are some areas of our life that should be moved from the political football that it has become.

The area of justice in this sensitive role is one. What I want to hear from the Opposition is that they will counsel the people that they praise; that is what I want to hear from them, and I got some speeches when they spoke on the case too. I want them to recognise the true role in this country of an Attorney General, to realise that you have met up one who is strong and who understands his role for a start, and to understand as well and tell your supporters to understand because I have told the people in Christ Church West that in 1981 they can pass on my judgement on this particular issue, and I accept their judgement on politics, but when it comes to the judgement on how I act constitutionally and correctly, I have to rely finally on my honesty.

Now for the benefit of the House I have consulted about this position leading people in the Caribbean; the former Mr. Justice Aubrey Fraser. I have consulted Mr. Guya L. B. Persaud the Director of the Council for Legal Education on the role and whether I am correct, and if I err I prefer to err with them than to err with other people on this. Let me go on a little further. I will leave some of the things for my reply because I know some people will jump flat-footed.

Now, Sir, very few people have studied in this country or even read about the position of a Director of Public Prosecutions. I have had the benefit of having the view that I take on this matter confirmed by recent evidence given to the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure in England by the Director of Public Prosecutions in England and his document which I have here with me has been made available to me confidentially. I cannot disclose its contents because the Royal Commission is still sitting, but I feel very convinced about the role and I support the Royal Barbados Police Force on this issue. If you want to call for my resignation, call for it. I have had the advice of the Solicitor General on the basis of his reading the inquest proceedings. I have never myself looked at the inquest proceedings; I asked the Solicitor General to do it. I have never myself looked at the file on this matter because I am a political Attorney General; I kept far off, but this became an issue. I have had the advice of my Solicitor General and I respect his advice and he advises me that in this instance, given a study of the evidence, there was very little else that a policeman or the police in this case could have done, and I respect his opinion, and

therefore he confirms the view of the Commissioner of Police on the matter that the police have done all they can.

Now I want to throw a bombshell for them. I said that the police can, as a normal matter of routine from day to day if they want to, consult with other Forces. Before the inquest proceedings were finished, a Scotland Yard expert was in Barbados passing through on some other business. The Commissioner of Police himself had discussions with him about the case in general. Subsequent to that the Commissioner himself saw two Inspectors from Scotland Yard who were then attached to St. Lucia investigating a similar case that they could do nothing about. They read his files and told him they could not see what else they could do in the matter; so the Commissioner remains convinced that if this matter had not been made a political football and if people had not been accused in all sorts of ways for political purposes and partisan political purposes, this issue would never have received the sort of treatment that it is getting in Barbados. It has been made nothing else than a nasty political game; that is what it has become, and instead of people running down the Commissioner of Police and his men on the one hand and trying to soft-soap them on the other, they had better have a little bit of respect in this country for the independence of the Police Force in this respect. Do you know why? Today, Sir, it is for you and tomorrow it is for me. The area of justice is too important a one for people to begin to make political capital out of it even although it might win them elections or may cause people seats. I deprecate the sort of conduct that has arisen out of this case, and all of the people who are responsible for it either directly by speaking or encouraging people by their silence actively or otherwise are unworthy in this country of even offering themselves or coming forward for public office in Barbados.

7.35 p.m.

All of the people who are responsible for it either directly by speaking or encouraging people by their silence or otherwise, are unworthy of this country to even offer themselves or come forward in public office in Barbados. Not one of them, Sir. I said I have come into public life and I have not got anything out of it other than a little position if that means something. I have not got any money out of it. I have come into public life to serve and I will serve as long as the people want me.

I have told the people and I have repeated it and I can say it on the platform a million times that I will never serve if it means prosecuting principles in order to gain power. I do not intend to do it. Anytime they want to get up and call for my resignation they can do that, Sir. Anytime they want to they can do it but I will never do it and I repeat to this House that at this stage the Police have done the best they can. No member of my staff has in any way done anything in this case that is improper. No member of the Cabinet or indeed of the Government has done anything improper in this case and it is a filthy, nasty, vicious campaign conducted for short-term political gain and by misguided dirty people that has brought this matter to the stage that it is at now and it is about time that somebody tell them.

People think that I am a soft Minister but on principle I am a very hard man. I have warned them to respect the law of Barbados, respect the Police in this country, respect the Judiciary, respect it because in these days the monster with the hydro-head, is that it? The many-headed monster will come and gobble the very people who think that they are benefitting from their vapourings on the platforms in this country. You have got to believe it. You had better believe it and I am sounding a warning to the good people of Barbados that finally they should have a little common sense. Do not have their reputations destroyed because of nasty, short-sighted people in Barbados.

The Police of Barbados have nothing to be afraid of. The Commissioner of Police has the file open. They are going to do their duty. As their Minister they have my full support on this and I will resign from this country and go into public life before I let them down on this issue because I know that they have done the best that they can and I know that they are only nasty-minded, dirty-minded people who could for political reasons do this and I want to finish up on this point, Sir.

Mr. Sleepy Smith, a former member of the Democratic Labour Party told me here outside the House two days ago that he represented the Pele family and that he could not say, and that there is not a stroke of evidence associating the hon. member for St. Michael South East, Mr. Bradshaw, in the case. He said so to me out there and that was not the first time that he said it, Sir, and I will go further because the time has come for fair play in this country.

Mr. Vernon Smith, Sleepy Smith's brother, came home to my house while the case was going on and said to me that he would go and advise his brother that when he is resting his case to make Mr. Bradshaw's position clear that it is just a nasty short-term political thing that they are doing to the young man in this country. What am I to do under circumstances such as this? I asked the Democratic Labour Party; they support the Barbados Police, they like an independent Attorney General, they like a Director of Public Prosecutions that is strict, I challenge them and they have just praised Eric Sealy, I challenge them if they have the guts to get up on a platform and condemn him for the nastiness he has done in respect of this case. I challenge them if they have guts. Let the hon. member for St. Michael North Central who

has been praising him, let the hon. member for St. Michael South Central all get up if they have guts to do so and clear the name of the hon. member for St. Michael South East, do that, if you have some guts in this country. I challenge you.

When you get outside on the platforms it will be me and you on this issue, if you think the time has not come for me to speak up. My records are there. I told you when I leave this Ministry whenever it will be in due course, anyone of you can come in after us and find in any documents or in any file written by my officers, that at least there is one man in this country who does not get down in this sort of thing. You must stop it, if you are backers, if you are supporters, if you are financiers, if you have to have guts, all of you. In here you are silent, since your big maguffy is absent. Perhaps one of these days the good Lord will let this final case come out for the benefit of everybody. Political power is a dangerous thing. It leads good men, sometimes short-sightedly, who are too anxious to get into it, it leads to their final down-fall. I hope it does not happen to any hon. member of this House.

I beg to move that the sum of $2,547,124 under Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (7) Police, stand part of the Schedule.

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

The question that the sum of $2,547,124 under Head 10 – Ministry of the Attorney General (7) Police, stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move that you do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that you do now suspend this Sitting until 8.30 p.m.

Mr. SISNETT: I beg to second that.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
7.45 p.m.

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed. When the suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply; to that it now reverts.

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 110 – MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, in moving that the sum of $1,954,744 under Head 110 – Ministry of the Attorney General, stand part of the Schedule, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the amendments which are necessary:

Under the column Estimates 1979-80 the figure '227,000' – Item 5 – vehicles should be deleted, and '242,800 should be inserted.

After Item 12 insert item 13 Code No. 160,844 Prisons.

Under the column Estimates 1979-80 opposite Item 13 insert the figure 35,640, delete the total figure 1,903,304 under the column Estimates 1979-80 and insert the figure 1,954,744.

Under the heading Explanatory Notes include note 13 to read as fellows: "Provides for repairs and renovations to the kitchen at Glendairy Prisons.

Under object classification delete the figure 757,000 for Purchase of Vehicles and insert the figure 772,800.

Delete the figure 908,864 for Construction and Improvements to Property and insert 944,504.

Delete the figure 1,903,304 under Analysis of Expenditure and insert 1,954,744.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to talk on a couple of the items which will be in the Ministry's Capital budget for the coming year, and I trust that we can achieve spending just under $2 million which has been allocated to this Ministry's Capital budget.

Under Police Stations, we intend during the year to complete, as far as we can, the redevelopment at District A Police Station. We will be concentrating on the training block, the administration block and building a substation

for the electrical equipment, as well as finishing and repairing the construction of the wall. We will then have further areas to construct; for instance, we will have to do the mess hall as well. You see, Sir, we have included $328,364 but I expect that once work continues apace we will have to come for a further supplementary under this Head before the end of the financial year.

The reason why we cannot give a particular figure at this time is that revision of some of the plans is taking place and we have to wait on confirmed estimates from the Ministry of Communications and Works. The project at District A must be proceeded with despite the escalating cost that occurred there, because the conditions at District A happen to be really substandard. I have said enough in the Press about that and I really do not want to expatiate on the development at District A. We are hoping during the year to begin the Oistins Police Station, and we are combining this Police Station with a Magistrates Court, and we hope to transfer the headquarters of the Southern Division from Boarded Hall to Oistins. This is part and parcel of the overall Oistins development, Sir, and together with the Architect who is redesigning the polyclinic for the Ministry of Health – in fact, we have been working with him and he is the Architect for the project – so that we will get total development of that area. It is only a token provision for the Oistins development, but part of the funding for this station will probably come from the EDF funding. It is not expected that the plans will be completed before September or October during this year, and obviously any work will be limited to the latter part of this year or the earlier part of next year.

At Crab Hill Police Station we are reviewing our position there. Crab Hill is now a family station, there are only two officers there and it seems to me – that it is my own view – to be quite inadequate and I can only say it is a tribute to the people of St. Lucy that there is such a limited amount of policing necessary for that parish. It is sometimes helped by police who come from Speightstown, but I have asked the Commissioner to look at the necessity to upgrade the station somewhat, and after this regrading takes place it will be necessary for us to have some more money in the Capital Estimates.

At the Grantley Adams Airport, the police who do the immigration service there are in very bad quarters, and I am surprised that when the airport project was planned that nobody took into account that it would be necessary to provide the police with a proper station, far less proper living quarters, and the airport project plans proceeded without any consideration being given to the needs of the police.

I want to make the point again that it is surprising when I hear one or two of the policemen saying how much the Democratic Labour Party has done for them, and when I look at the record I cannot see the signs of it. The last police station of any significance in this country was built in 1955, the Hastings Police Station. Under the Barbados Labour Party with pretty up-graded accommodation. After that I have found myself landed with a situation in which the physical plant for the policemen has been totally run down, in some instances absolutely substandard, and it is going to take a period of years to get it back to any respectable living conditions for the Police Force, and I am saying it now because I want it on the record. All I found in my Ministry was a file where everytime they were going to do a development plan they wasted the Police's time to say what they want and nothing was done for them. This is the full file with it here, Sir, which gives the whole history of it, which I keep in the office for anybody who wants to see it; but actually putting their words into deeds, that was never done for the Police Force in this country and that is why it hurts me now sometimes when I hear the foolishness on public platforms, and their appealing to the sentiment of a few policemen, and when you examine their track record it is not there.

I hope at Oistins to provide a model police station to show them proper living conditions for people who have to live a full barrack life and to be responsible for civil law and order in this country, and to leave it not as a monument to me but as a guide to people for the future, that they must treat the police as men and women. They are away from their homes for a long time, I don't want some of the sentiment going around now – I am not accusing any hon. member – trying quietly to subvert the Police Force with a lot of foolishness and not recognising that when it comes to performance it just is not there.

I am doing a tour of all the stations, I have almost completed it, and of all the stations the two most outstanding are the Hastings Police Station and the Worthing Police Station, outstanding in terms of accommodation, and even those are not adequate.

I will revert to Grantley Adams Airport. An airport development plan, we are going to be told, was started by the last Government, and nobody remembered that they needed police. The police have been living up there for years in substandard conditions, there were representations made about them all the time and like in most aspects of the Government of this country nothing has been done for them.

8.45 p.m.

I am actively discussing and had hoped that I could have persuaded my friend at the IDC to give me what was the former ISL building, but I am told by the Chairman of the IDC that the building has been leased out already, so the search goes on. I believe they will make a piece of land available to us or we may get

some space at the existing airport. So that we can start planning we have put in a token vote. The reason why there is a token position for the Port is that we are planning to close down the Bay Street Police Station and move the Police into the Port proper and we will have to provide facilities there. We are having some arguments with the Port Department as to whether it should be the responsibility of the Port Authority to provide adequate accommodation or whether the cost should be met from public funds. Meanwhile they have suggested to us a building which the Commissioner of Police does not consider adequate. At some stage later when we have made progress with our plans I may have to come back to this House to ask for funds in order to get on with the building if it becomes necessary. I think that our programme for police stations for this year is realistic but I do not believe that is all we have to do to offer adequate physical provisions for the Police Force over the next ten years. The Police Station at District D is totally unsatisfactory. We propose building a new station at Welchman Hall as part of the development of that area. At Speightstown we have an overall development plan. Preliminary views of the architects Robertson Ward is that we will maintain the Speightstown Police Station where it is but will have to build considerably to update the facilities there. At Holetown the argument has gone on from 1969 about upgrading the conditions at Holetown; the argument has been between two Ministries, the Ministry of Housing and the Ministry of Home Affairs, as to whether you should build going towards the sea on finding a new location. At one stage it was suggested that there should be a new location, but no definite decision was made. My Ministry is meeting with the Ministry of Housing in a week or so and if we reach a decision the architects will be asked to have plans ready for the capital Estimates next year.

As regards District B, the plan will be that we will remove the Police Station from District B, place a Fire Station there and place the Police Station and a Magistrate's Court in the sub-town which the Government is creating in St George. Our plans are far advanced for this sub-town on the Glebe Land and surrounding areas, but we cannot go on with the Police Station or the Courthouse until the new school in St. George is built because we are taking over the Girls School section for the Police Station, with some adjoining lands for the Magistrate's court.

In St. Philip our proposal is eventually to remove the Police Station to Six Cross Road and use the existing Police Station as a Fire Station. That final decision has not yet been taken, but why I ask for a token vote is to enable the planning to get ahead and by next year's Estimates you will see an increased vote for the construction of the fire station in this area. We are trying to upgrade police tele-communication equipment so that each station will have easy means of communicating. We need this from the point of view of internal security and we have been lucky to get an offer from Cable and Wireless for equipment they have, hence the $98,440.

I regret to say that little progress has been made in the construction of public mortuary or forensic laboratory. If you look back through the Estimates to the 1960s you will see that this Item has appeared in every Estimates that have been put up. The Minister of Health and myself have now identified an area of land we think suitable and have asked the Ministry of Housing and Lands to see if this land can be acquired for construction of a public mortuary and forensic laboratory, and if it is we will try to plan for this. I doubt that during the course of this year we can do more than identify the land, acquire it and begin to put designs on the drawing board.

As regards Police vehicles: I believe the hon. member for St. John made a point during the second reading of the Appropriation Bill proper as distinct from the Estimates that during his time he had to be continually cutting down police requests for vehicles, and it appears from that as though the Police was gobbling up public funds to spend on vehicles and in his careful way he had to be cutting down their requests. I had the matter researched, and if that was his view it was a misguided one. The ideal number of vehicles which the police would want is 127 if we are to adequately serve the demands on the Police, not only for protocol purposes, not only for driving public officials, but for doing police duties, particularly in circumstances where the Police are under-established, where there are not enough policemen. At the moment we have 97 vehicles in the Police Force – that is 30 short. As a matter of fact their cars have been retired when they reach about 100,000 miles; that is the average number of miles before the vehicles go up on survey to be retired. Again this is an area where the police have been denied proper equipment, and I believe they will now understand why they were denied the equipment, just as they were denied their duty allowance by the then Minister of Finance – then he gets around here posing how he is a good friend of the Police, yet he never paid due regard to their needs. I have, however, asked the Police to have a look at the possibility of denying having the Japanese get our money and make no return in kind. I think the Minister of Trade shares this view. Although I drive a Japanese car myself, the next time I buy a car it won't be a Japanese car unless the Japanese understand that they must change their selfish ways towards these countries. We must begin to buy from other countries which make funds available to us either multi-laterally or otherwise, and therefore I have asked the Police in their purchase of vehicles in the future to have a look at other

countries. The same goes for the Germans too, although they are not quite as bad. But the Japanese must be the most selfish people on the international scene.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Attorney General seems to be making the point that the Police have Japanese vehicles. I would like to bring him back to the Head under consideration.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am under the Head; I am showing that even when it comes to vehicles there is an international relations exercise and people must see where domestic policy and international policy can mesh.
8.55 p.m.

I want to say that we will be looking during the year to see whether we can get vehicles even from the USA which will be more suitable for the police duties in this country. We are also trying to upgrade a radio pocket phone and we are also trying to get another crash tender for the airport. Those that were purchased before have been run down. Under Fire Stations, I am glad to inform the people of Worthing that we will be bringing some Fire Women up at Worthing Fire Station, and we hope that there will be sufficient accommodation so that we can have Fire Women in the Fire Service in Christ Church West before the end of the next year. That is why I hope that the acting Chief Fire Officer is here listening to me, and that he would not be fire proof to fire ladies entering the Service.

I do not think that there is any other point that I will stress at this moment – oh, yes, the Courts, perhaps. I said that I would say something about the Law Courts and the Registration Office, and I will finish on that. There is no doubt that the accommodation at the Registry is very unsatisfactory. It is bursting at the seams. The complaints of the lawyers and the public are correct on this point. In fact officers who work there and Attorneys-at-Law have no proper area of accommodation. Some of our deeds lying about there in conditions that are unsatisfactory; but there is no way, given the limitations and the physical size, in which we can remedy those particular complaints.

We have set out to construct a new Hall of Justice in the areas bounded by James Street, Coleridge Street and Synagogue Lane; and in the whole of that area we hope to build a seven story building in which the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeal and the various Courts will be sited, along with the Registration Office as well as the Ministry of the Attorney General; and the Director of Public Prosecutions will have a separate office as well as adequate provision for supporting services.

We are at the stage where steps are being taken to acquire the land; and preliminary drawings are being prepared by the Ministry of Communications and Works; and the Cabinet has agreed that one of the architects at the Ministry of Communications and Works should be seconded full time on this project. I am told by the experts who are advising me that providing the project office can be set up by April, construction should be able to be commenced in September or October; and we will spend every bit of the $½ million issue which has been provided under Item 10 of the Capital Estimates.

The project is estimated at this stage – and these are very preliminary estimates – to cost us $12.4 million and to start in 1979-80 and continue into 1981–82. I believe that this is necessary if we are to house properly the various courts. We will use the existing Supreme Court building for upgrading the Magistrates Court and transfer the District A Court to that building; and the existing Registry we will use for police expansion at Central Station which will limit the amount of new building we will then have to do at the Central Station. Those are the plans to which I want to draw your attention, Sir. Perhaps I need not discuss the Regional Police Training Centre at this time because during the year I will have to come back to the House and speak on my proposals for the Regional Police Training College.

I beg to move that this Head as amended stand part.

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

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I had one or two comments to make on this Head. *(Asides).*

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I hear voices other than yours on the Government benches. The Rule clearly says that a member must be heard in silence.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you. I am saying that I want to comment particularly under this Head, Item 4, on the need for a forensic laboratory service on which unfortunately there is no note in Part 2. The forensic laboratory – I would expect the hon. member for St. Lucy to be dwelling in those quarters, but I did say "laboratory". The forensic laboratory, Sir, becomes increasingly urgent in the face of the more sophisticated crimes being committed in Barbados today.

I am not altogether quieted by the Attorney General's statement that crime has very much held constant in Barbados, because we are living in what I observe to be an increasingly lawless society; and one can only reasonably expect that unless you provide the tools, unless you provide the police with the proper tools, the job they have to do will become increasingly complex, and we will begin to see the crime statistics crawling forward.

Now, I have been reliably informed – by one of my colleagues for example – that there is only one ballistics

expert in Barbados. I do not know if that is 100% true; but if it is true, Sir, I would tend to feel that that is an atrocious state of affairs because we are observing in Barbados an increasing tendency to commit crime by the use of firearms; and unless, Sir, we have people trained in the art of detection of crime associated with the use of firearms, we will be in a very bad state. I would like to feel that we are looking at this situation. *(Asides).* I believe that my career as a U.S. Army soldier *(Cheers)* is by now known to everybody in Barbados. I would be grateful if you would protect me from the member for St. James; because he is heckling about my career in the U.S. Army.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have a little more order. Let the hon. member be heard; and let us keep to the point so that we can get it into the records of this House indelibly.

Mr. JOHNSON: Thank you Sir. I would sincerely feel that the Police in Barbados have to work under conditions that are not always the best; and for that reason, therefore, we have to provide them with the necessary training if they are to perform a job as effectively as they are expected to. The two arms that create a complete police officer, in my view, are (1) training in the technical aspect of policing and (2) training in the more humane aspects of policing.
9.05 p.m.

During the last several months we have witnessed a situation in which the Police of Barbados have figured very prominently. The Attorney General was careful to point out that the situation where crimes of violence have gone undetected; the actual offender has not been established. It is not something which has begun to happen only recently, but the records seem to indicate that we have had these kinds of situations over a period of years. It would be a matter of great concern to me if these crimes related to crimes against buildings or institutions, but the crimes which we refer to in this case have been crimes against the person, and in each of the cases cited by the Attorney General that crime resulted in the death of some individual in Barbados. The police have been unable to solve these crimes. I would not be as concerned as I am if all these crimes happened to individuals who did not have relatives and friends and others who cared, but, Sir, in each case, and this is where I do not rely on the assurance given to me by people trained in legal disciplines, I prefer to bring to bear on these crimes my own training in the area of sociology, because.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please let us have some order.

Mr. JOHNSON: In the Chair as well, Sir?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has three minutes to wind up.

Mr. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if I have to sit down now I am going to get back up under another Head. I have something of great importance to say because I believe that in recent times we have witnessed a situation where in Barbados people who have absolutely nothing to lose in terms of reputation have gone abroad and made the task of the police infinitely more difficult. I am not really concerned about that. I am concerned that over the last several months one of my colleagues has got his reputation tarnished, and if we are not careful tarnished beyond redemption almost by persons who have absolutely nothing to lose, and the police unfortunately, actors on the scene, have been drawn into the situation. I, unlike the Attorney General, will not stand up in this Honourable Chamber and pretend that every man who wears a uniform in this society is a paragon of virtue. I will say without reserve that by and large the men who wear police uniforms in our country are men whom I feel have the highest integrity, and I am prepared on any occasion and on all occasions when I have the opportunity to stand up even in public or private forum and defend that uniform and the men who wear it, because they work in a difficult field under difficult circumstances and they need the respect and admiration of the public, but I am saying there are some rotten eggs in that uniform, rotten to the core, and they do no credit to themselves or to their other fellow officers when they allow themselves to walk around in this society and either inadvertently or otherwise lend credence to that same heinous, wicked, contemptible crime that has been committed by one particular person in our society, aided and abetted by others in high office. They have walked around and said themselves in some cases – it has been alleged to me, I have not heard them with my own ears but people who claimed that they have heard them have said repeatedly to me that certain members of the Royal Barbados Police Force have been heard to say it – that the crime we were speaking about was committed by one of my colleagues. You can whistle if you want to. I do not have to play to the police for votes. There are policemen in my constituency whom I respect, and I am not going to back off this. I was not born with a seat in Barbados and I have said before and I am prepared to say that my colleague for the last year or more has had to go through this country, and I am satisfied that not a single member on that side or even on this side can know the private sufferings to which he has been put, the mental torture, the psychological trauma that he has passed through. I am surprised at the lack of sensitivity on these benches as well.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there are times when we have to stand up and let our voices be heard, and I am saying that while we are in politics, and it is reputed to be a reckless wicked game, even verging on war, I am satisfied that no hon. member has any business to have to suffer as my colleague suffered over the last several months for political reasons, and our society has to watch

itself because we as politicians are looked up to in this society, but unfortunately we have men in here who are not prepared to stand up for what is right and decent, who are prepared for short term political advantage to crucify anybody that they have to crucify, and it is unfortunate not that this crime has not been solved because there are others that have not been solved, but what makes it particularly galling is that night after night people go to sleep; the parents, friends, relatives of Pele have suffered because of his death, but like so many things the Good Lord that made us provided the spiritual, psychic healing so that we are able to deal with that.
9.15 p.m.

Sir, the hon. member on this side, night after night as long as there is this cloud, he goes to sleep alone and he has to face and live with that burden. I do not know anything about the law but approaching the law from the position of the social scientist I feel that every law that has ever been passed has been passed for man, for this society. Whatever the society operates in and when a crime of the nature we are talking about is committed, somebody in this society in the interest of public quiet must be able to get up and say something.

The Attorney General says that the Law and the Constitution of Barbados is so set up that he is powerless to act. Well, Sir, I still believe in moral persuasion and even though it is improper for the Attorney General to give instructions to anybody I am satisfied in my mind that in the public interest the Attorney General must certainly have the power in the public interest to use a little persuasion upon those who have the constitutional right so that they can act to find a solution that is fair and reasonable to all concerned.

I am not suggesting that he interferes with the course of Justice. I am saying that he can talk to somebody, the Director of Public Prosecutions, and say look, this situation is such that I believe that it is in the public interest that you do something, whatever that something is, and if in this case the public wants to see some External Agency come in, I feel from a purely political angle, and I am Chairman of the Barbados Labour Party, from a purely political angle, I feel that the public wants to have an answer. Did my colleague or did he not commit that Crime?

The Attorney General, in my view, has the authority to use moral persuasion upon whom he can use it to let some External Agency come in and let the people realise that the Police in Barbados are not hiding anything. An External Agency who has absolutely no interest in the political situation in Barbados can come in and say in our view having looked over the files of the Police, we are satisfied that the evidence is such and such and nobody can indict anybody on that and I think that if we had done that, a lot of the acrimony, a lot of the suffering to which some of us have been exposed and if any of us still have any measure of sensitivity left we would have suffered with our colleague. When you heard people out there in Belmont Road saying if the Attorney General killed him, bring him to justice. If it is the Governor General bring him to justice and if it was Bradshaw bring him to justice and everybody went away that night knowing full well what the inference was.

It is our duty as politicians not to interfere but we have as leaders to give direction so that justice can be done so that unnecessary suffering does not come to people who do not deserve to suffer. *(Cheers.)*

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that after hearing my colleagues on the backbench I must confess that if ever there has been a time in my life that I have ever seen true mettle in a man was on this occasion. He was subjected to one of the best organised helpers on the frontbench that I have ever seen. He weathered that storm. *(Asides.)* Yes, I organised it. He weathered that storm and ended up with a speech that almost brought tears to my eyes.

I never intended getting into this debate but I am going to say something in here tonight that I believe I am going to be challenged to say it outside and I am prepared to go outside when I leave here tonight and say it in front the member for St. Michael South Central. That is what I am going to deal with. Now, Sir, I have heard the law and the pronouncement by the Attorney General whom I believe is fully qualified to be the principal adviser in legal affairs in the Government of Barbados. As a Cabinet Minister I have also listened to my colleagues in Cabinet and I have come to my own conclusions.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman knowing the Attorney General as well as I do over a number of years which I have worked with him, from 1966, I think it was, Sir, I have found him to be a man of high morals in spite of what people might say about him, a man of conviction and courage and if he feels as legal advisor to the Government that he is powerless to bring people to justice by seeking outside help, I cannot challenge that. What is very remarkable is that I listened this afternoon to hear a number of unsolved crimes in this country mention, and quite recently, in this very Chamber, the member for St. Michael South West brought a Resolution in here about one Mr. Butts of Seafoods. He brought a Resolution in here asking Government to go into the unfortunate death of Mr. Butts. Mr. Butts was working on a vessel, a shrimp boat of Seafoods. Listen for the political input. I am going to say it. I may have to withdraw it but I am going to say it.

A Resolution came in here and the Government was taken to task about a Mr. Butts because Seafoods was

involved. It was a political football. I heard about Mr. Butts family and Mr. Butts' children. The Minister of Trade and the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General put the facts as they were, but it was Seafoods involved.

Mr. George "Racketeer" Clarke died quite recently in one of the other territories and according to the press the death or murder of him nobody knows about it. Well Mr. Clarke's body came down.
9.25 p.m.

He was a political activist and my colleague and good friend since 1950, not like the other scamp who used to be my doctor one time. I am talking about a political scamp in this country who used to be my doctor once. I saw my colleague and old time friend heading the cortege to pay his last respects to Mr. Charles "Racketeer" Clarke. I have not seen a Resolution yet, Sir, I am waiting on two Resolutions, one about Mr. Clarke, and I am waiting on the one about Helen now. The Attorney General read out a number of unsolved murders in this country from 1970, I think it was, and not one of those unsolved crimes was taken to the public platforms except for the one about the young man who unfortunately died either by the gun, or the knife, or some form that was responsible for his death. I could never understand in my 15 years in public life how people could sit down and fabricate a story like members of the Opposition. I charge you, members of the Opposition, let me tell you why I charge them, Sir.

I went on a farm labour programme inspection visit to Canada. I am subject to correction, but I think it was in the month of September. The member for St. Michael South Central, Dr. Haynes, he is known as Dr. Haynes, the member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please don't call his name.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am sorry, Sir, I didn't know you would recognise his name. He met me at Toronto airport in the presence of a Mr. George Broome, Mr. Frank Goodridge and Mr. George Brancker, my wife, her daughter and her son-in-law who were on their honeymoon, and I saw a parliamentary colleague of mine at Toronto Airport and after greeting the member for St. Michael South Central, his behaviour to my mind, Sir, was innocuous on that occasion, and I said to the hon. member: "I believe you were drinking; were you drinking?" Do you know what was his reply to me? "Do you see that bird over there? She looks good, doesn't she?" And the next thing he said to me was, "Man, Craiggie, man, how Bradshaw could kill Pele?" That is what the member for St. Michael South Central asked me, and I asked him what he was talking about, and I said to him: "I had respect for you for a number of years." You are nodding your head, I am going to say it on a public platform about you, and something else too, about the amount of dope you bring into Barbados, you, the amount of ganja and marijuana that you trade in Barbados, the political scamp you are.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Whatever may be the motivation of the hon. member, to accuse an hon. member in this Chamber, pointing his finger and making a number of remarks, and included among them are ganja, marijuana, dope.....(Hon. L. S. CRAIG: But you smoke ganja, you said that in here already).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: If one member is on a point of order the other member must take his seat.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I have never said that in here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have to ask the Hon. Leader of the House to withdraw the allegation about smoking marijuana, because you are imputing a criminal offence to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. You will have to withdraw that.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I never said the hon. member for St. Michael South Central brought ganja and marijuana in here, I pointed my finger as I am gesticulating when I am speaking. I have always done that, this has been my way of speaking publicly. This is how I have been always speaking, with my finger like that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have asked the hon. member to withdraw the remark; you cannot quarrel with the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What remark do I have to withdraw, Mr. Chairman? You tell me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: An allegation about an hon. member on that side bringing marijuana into the island. That is my ruling.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I will withdraw the remark, Sir. I hope the record will prove that I did not refer to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You will now proceed without quarrelling with the Chair either.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I would suggest to you not to raise your voice at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is only one person in charge here tonight, and that is I.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I have only made a simple request, Sir, not to raise your voice at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: And I have made one of you, you will not quarrel with the Chair.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am not quarrelling with the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Well, accept my ruling and continue with your speech or discontinue it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I accepted your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I said I was going to withdraw, I am simply asking you not to shout at me.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please get back to the debate on Head 110.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Now, Mr. Chairman, the member for St. Michael South Central told me at the airport in Toronto – as a matter of fact, asked me – how could Bradshaw kill Pele. It was like a dagger that went through me. I was the most amazed person when I came back to this country and heard a political campaign carried on against one of my colleagues, something that I could never imagine that responsible people could sit down and fabricate such a story for selfish greed. I could never imagine that, Sir, and I have not heard one single member on the Opposition bench on any occasion get up and dissociate himself from the members of the public who have been making such allegations. I can only conclude they are involved in some of these allegations, because the same way they complimented the Minister of Education for bringing the reforms today, they could have got up manfully in here and say they do not associate themselves with the remarks made by people on the public platforms and a number of them in here and John Public should be made aware of this.

It is regrettable that people can sink to such low levels for political power, and I am going to support the Attorney General, whether he decides to resign or to remain in public life, for the courage of his convictions and his integrity in public life. It is a vicious thing to say. I heard my colleagues talk about the mental torture and what psychological effects it had on my colleague; this is what I would say. Politics is a strange, strange thing, a strange business. I would never have envisaged members on that side, and maybe on this side, sitting arm in arm on occasions. It is a very strange business, for that selfish greed for power that you can go out on the public platform night after night and make allegations about one of your colleagues in here. He is a parliamentary colleague. He may be on one side or on the other, but he is a parliamentary colleague whom you are making such remarks about. I have seen the white people in this country when they were in power fighting each other tooth and nail, but I have never heard them making such charges against each other. It is regrettable to see that now all of us are in here occupying these seats in this high office that such charges should be made about black people like yourselves.

I think I heard on the outside that police have told other people that it is so. Where are we going? I faced three elections, I failed to be part of the Government in two of them, but I took my defeat. I cried with Bernard St. John, Sir, the Deputy Prime Minister, in 1971. I think some of my colleagues here will remember when he lost his seat I sat down at the conference table and tears ran out of my eyes because he went down because of the vicious things they said on the public platforms about him. In this country if you are to win an election by rumour and vicious scandal, if that is going to win an election, the Prime Minister will know from me and the people of St. James. I am finished with that if that is going to be so. I believe that a victory for the Opposition im my colleague's constituency is a victory for scandal and rumour; that is how I feel, Sir. A victory against my colleague is a victory for scandal and rumour in this country.

9.35 p.m.

I drive out at night, I stand in the crowd and tape their meetings, and I see people whom you would consider intelligent and hear them cheering about who killed Pele, a man in the prime of his years who died at the hands of some wicked person. This is my firm belief: If the Attorney General is powerless, Government is supreme. There must be a way. There must be a way to clear a name once and for all of a wicked scandal. I do not care what it cost the Government, and as my grandmother would say two heads are better than one, and so in spite of what the Attorney General says I think we should seek whatever help is necessary to clear the fair name of Barbados. I can appreciate the Attorney General's position acting within the Constitution and keeping to the legal methods at his disposal. In the meantime John Citizen is being told something over and over again, and the methods used to defuse that problem are not defusing the problem; so one must come to the conclusion that something is wrong. There is nothing wrong in reconsidering something. The Attorney General's integrity, his scholastic career, his parliamentary life, his private life, these are not in question; but how many people on the whole are saying that the Attorney General had something to do with this? And no matter what passionate speeches he makes on the floor of this House, the fair name of my colleague and my party and the Parliamentarians of Barbados should be cleared once and for all.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: Mr. Chairman, I have been an early exponent of the view which has been articulated by the hon. member for St. Michael South West, and that is that some external agency ought to have been brought in in relation to this matter. I do want to say that in my view it is most unfortunate that the hon. member for St.

Michael South East has had to suffer what is nothing less than an agonizing crisis, not of his own creation, over the past year. It is a crisis which continues and no one knows what will be the final chapter in that unfortunate story. I have spoken with the Attorney General privately with regards to his Constitutional position and have listened with great interest to that position as he represented it here tonight, both in respect of his role in relation to the Police as an investigative agency and his role in relation to the Director of Public Prosecutions as the person armed with the responsibility, according to the Constitution, for initiating prosecutions in this country. But in my view this is not a text book case; this is a case with a difference, and the difference in my view is significant and so substantial as to provide a Constitutional moral, commonsense and political basis on which the Attorney General should have acted in calling in external help.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have explained what is the Constitutional position. The test of any Attorney General in any part of the world is when his own family or his own political party is at stake, whether he is a weakling or whether he has the courage of his convictions. This Attorney General has his and I am not under any circumstances going to change that position. As far as I am concerned that is my final word on this part of the matter. And I want to make my position clear. A lot of problems are probably caused in this country because the Attorney General is also Minister of Home Affairs. But our Constitutional position is different from England.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I can allow you to elucidate but I cannot allow you to make a second speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: I am not making a second speech but the hon. member has given way.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Given way, but for how long? I cannot allow you to make a second speech.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: When I make the second speech I will explain to members what is being done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think then you had better let the hon. member continue.

Dr. CHELTENHAM: I am grateful to my friend but I said to him privately and I say it publicly that we are in agreement 90% but there is a 10% area where honest men may disagree with each other, and I think I am entitled to my point of view just as he is entitled to his. The position as I see it is this: There are several unsolved murders in this country that have taken place in circumstances similar to that of Pele. These unsolved murders have caused no difficulty, but in this particular case we have two strange elements that constitute a difference – we have a strong and persistent rumour on one hand that a colleague of mine, an hon. member of this House has been responsible for that murder, so that you have some sections of the public saying that they do not expect that anyone would be brought to justice because there has been interference in order to protect the hon. member. On the other hand you have an equally strong rumour, though apparently less persistent, that a member of the Royal Barbados Police Force has been responsible for that murder, and as a result there will be no solutions to the murder because the police themselves have vested interest to protect one of their own members. Now I do not believe that there is a shred of truth in either view point. But the point is not whether I believe it or not: the reality of the situation is that there are two schools of thought as far as the rumour-mongering goes. The matter has reached a point of public unease and disquiet which we have never seen in relation to such matters in this country. It is on wax – "who killed Pele?" One newspaper has conducted a crusade, as it were, in relation to the matter. The matter is talked about everywhere in the community. This then is my question to the Attorney General whom I regard as the custodian of law and order; it is his responsibility ultimately.

9.45 p.m.

Because of the twin factors to which I have referred, the rumour that a member of the Police Force was responsible, and the rumour that a member of his own Party was responsible, and the high public disquiet that this matter has realised, what in these circumstances should be the role of the Attorney General? In my view this is not a textbook case. The text books are silent on this sort of situation; and there is that area in which he can say quite legitimately that because of the special circumstances of this matter, and in order to persuade and convince the public that neither the Police Force which is the particular law enforcement agency in this country nor a member of my Party is involved, I think that I have a responsibility to advise that an external agency be brought in; not because we expect any results, not that I feel that we will achieve anything in bringing anyone to justice, but at least we will put an end to the suspicion that someone somewhere is standing in the way of justice. It is not so much as a result of bringing someone to justice that I am concerned about. We should be concerned about what should be done in the circumstances.

That is the basis on which I say that this is a case with a difference. It is not a text book case. There are circumstances in existence which would demand the intervention of the Attorney General, notwithstanding the constitutional position that he is holding out. I want to make one further point before I sit. It has got to do with the Royal Barbados Police Force as structured and the way it responds to matters of this sort. As I understand

it, the sergeant who was in charge or the superintendent or whoever that has the responsibility of a particular jurisdiction – whether it is A, B, C, or D – to initiate investigations in relation to matters that take place in a jurisdiction – we all know that quite often a man in the evening of his days is made a sergeant. He is put in charge of a station, but he has nothing to offer to policing at all; but it is part of the humanity of the system that sometimes before a man goes home you help him to earn an enhanced gratuity and an enhanced pension by giving him a little promotion. Quite often we find a man in charge of a station who cannot even spell the word "investigation". He does not know how to make the first step on the path of setting out on any serious investigation.

As I understand it, outside help, or a person from outside that jurisdiction cannot come in until the members inside that jurisdiction say they want help. In my view that is wrong. As soon as a crime is committed of that nature, whether help is asked for or not, there should be a small team of specialist investigators working side by side with the members of that particular jurisdiction from the outset; because quite often by the time that the ace detectives are called in, the passage of time has erased many of the clues that normally would have been pleasant for the skilled eye if they had been called in from the very outset; and perhaps in this particular case that is the reason for the police not being able to put their hands on anyone; but I do not want to go any further in this matter.

I just want to say, notwithstanding the very forceful arguments that the Attorney General has made, and which I appreciate, there is a small area which makes this case a very powerful case for the intervention of the Attorney General and the seeking of assistance from some external agency.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have practised law in this country from 1964. I have come up against the Police on many occasions, many. Tonight, I heard the Hon. Attorney General read from his files about unsolved murders in this country from 1970 up to today. I have heard him read a note of the meeting that he held with the Commissioner of Police, and from these notes he has offered in practically every paragraph to seek the necessary finance if the Commissioner of Police wanted to bring in outside help in the investigation of a crime. They asked for assistance in connection with a crime in Belleville, and according to the notes, the Commissioner of Police said that he did not think that he wanted financial assistance in connection with the Pele murder.

The Attorney General has spelt out the legal and constitutional position of an Attorney General in this country. I have often said, and I will say again, that when we went into Independence in 1966 we accepted a bastard position in this country whereby we accepted a Constitution based on the British system to be implemented in a country where you have certain functions based upon the American system. So you had a dual position. Do not shake your head and say no.

You have a Civil Service. You have heads of the Police Force that are supposed to be entrenched and cannot be moved, but who are entitled to belong to the political parties of their choice. In the USA the head of the Police Force would have gone when a new political party came into power. It is a bastard position whether you like it or not, and whether the so called constitutional lawyer like it or not, I call it a bastard position because it goes right through the Civil Service in this country. The existing position is that there are permanent Secretaries in Government who are card bearing members, executive members of the political parties and having to work with another political party that forms the Government. Is that not a bastard position?

Mr. Chairman, the Police must understand that they have a very important role in communities like ours. I have said since I came back to this country in 1964 that there are certain policemen who wear their uniform and that is all. They have never appreciated their position in relation to the community. Never. I have seen them in Baxters Road stand up and curse Prime Ministers – not the present one, the former one. I have heard them abuse in the worst way in the presence of their superiors.
9.55 p.m.

Only last week you had a magistrate in the District "A" Court chastising policemen about how they should conduct themselves and come into his court. Now I think the police should stop and appreciate the situation which has developed over this particular crime. I have passed political meetings and I have seen policemen at the political meetings and hearing accusations pouring forth from the platform. I have seen policemen cheer when it was said that a member of the Barbados Labour Party and a member of Parliament knew something or had something to do with this crime.

Now it has been said that there has been interference with justice by the Government in power. Now any policeman from the Commissioner back down should look at his own integrity when such a statement is made, because it makes him look small if he with the constitutional position allows a politician to interfere in his department, and that should be the very first reason why they should have accepted the offer of the Attorney General. The Attorney General has said that he asked the Solicitor General to read the file. Now I am making a plea to the Commissioner of Police

tonight, for Christ in Heaven's sake accept the offer of the Attorney General.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I cannot take that language.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Don't tell me you cannot take that language.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is not the words only but the manner of delivery of the words.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I have heard those words from the time I have.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am asking you to withdraw "for Christ in Heaven's sake."

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I know how hon. members feel.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am ruling. Why is everybody getting so hot under the collar? I think hon. members are getting tired and becoming frayed. I will just ask the Minister to withdraw the words.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I withdraw the words. I am appealing tonight to the Commissioner of Police to accept the offer thrown out to him by the Attorney General, seek the assistance of outside help and remove the rumours once and for all. That is what I am appealing for, and you know why I am appealing. I remember from the time I came back here when the hon. member was practising he defended the police come thick or thin waters. When three policemen were charged one with murder and two with manslaughter and all the other lawyers in Bridgetown ran and hid, he dragged me out of the courts and we worked through Friday, Friday night, Saturday, Saturday night, and Sunday without sleep to appear before the court to rescue the three policemen, and tonight I am saying to be grateful to those who have helped you before. That is what I am saying tonight to the Commissioner of Police and to the other policemen. Even today in his speech he praised police right down the line. The police must now understand that it is the Attorney General who will be on the mark, who is on the line, because let me tell you something, politics is a funny thing. He is saying that he could not care less, but politics is a funny thing, and I think the police should understand that they are supposed to be the custodians of law and order, to prevent breaches of the peace, and if it continues who knows what is likely to happen between the families involved in this dispute? Can the family of the dead man feel good that everybody is pointing a finger; and that poor man, could he feel safe that a friend of the deceased might not try to take revenge against him? Where will the police be at the time? How do they take it? They say, Mr. Chairman, that lawyers cling together; they say doctors cling together. The Attorney General has defended the police for a long time, and I want to see how they will swing with him now. It does not appear as if they are swinging with him because from his notes which he read here tonight he has literally begged them on more than one occasion to come to him for assistance. I understand the Attorney General's position. If his constitutional position says he cannot dictate to the police, he cannot interfere. It is now for the police and the Director of Public Prosecutions to understand that public feelings have gone so high that it is for them to show that they have done everything that is possible to allay public fears. I do not care who is brought to justice, but all I want to know is that the police recognise that they have hurt the feelings of people who want to have the whole thing cleared up.

Mr. Chairman, the Government has a duty to make sure that everything appears to be fair and right in this country. Fortunately the Attorney General says he is not going to break his constitutional position. I have no quarrel with him on that at all. As the hon. member for Christ Church East has said, I heard the rumours that it was a policeman too. I heard other rumours too, but Mr. Chairman the rumour-mongering must come to an end some day. Mr. friend reminded me it was said that the hon. member for Bridgetown had shot me, as if the hon. member can shoot me, but that does not worry me; but the rumours keep coming out. I passed through the bus stand the other night and I saw motor cars from St. Lucy, Christ Church, St. Andrew at a political meeting and do you know what I heard? "Oh, we have come to hear what more there is about who killed Pele!" Well, if the Commissioner of Police is so insensitive to the situation.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I am going to have to ask the hon. member to withdraw. You may not reflect on people in their official capacity.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I withdraw it. I will say that if those who are in authority and have the right in their hands to ask for help fail to do so, then I myself do not know what the situation will lead to. I am appealing for the last time for the good of this country, I am appealing for peace and tranquility that those in authority accept the offer made by the Attorney General to bring in whoever you want, being in people who are impartial, let them have the file, let them do the investigation, and I as a Cabinet member will vote for every cent that is necessary to carry out the investigation even if at the end of the day nobody is brought to justice. I am sure if it is done and the files are opened, then this Government cannot be blamed for shielding anybody from any sort of justice which should come to him. Mr. Chairman, that is my contribution to this debate.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I would like, if possible, to wind up this debate in which obviously hon. members have very strong feelings. I will not be long, Sir. The position is that I think it is in crises such as this that when emotions are high and people's reputations are challenged and political fortunes are at stake that one has to keep a very cool head.
10.05 p.m.

One has in spite of the challenges and in spite of all the difficulties to try to come to the correct decisions and maybe I am in the minds of some people perhaps strong-headed, pig-headed, or maybe to stand with or without a head. The stand which I have taken on this matter is taken after a very mature consideration as I said with the best advice I could get and it is taken I believe in the long run in the interest of Barbados and in the interest of the Court of Justice in this Island and short of resigning, if there was an impasse, and I do not think that there is an impasse between my colleagues and myself, I have nowhere else to go in the matter. That is my position on it.

As far as I am concerned, and I have said it before and I repeat it for the benefit of all Barbadians and it can be repeated on the platform, I do not believe that politics and political power is the Supreme above all Supremes in life or the Supreme in any life and it is because I am so devoid of the lust for power that I feel confident about the stand I have taken on this matter and I will not be deterred from it.

Sir, as early as December 1978 I gave a speech in which I gave vent to some of the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for St. Michael West. I gave that speech to Amnesty and significantly enough the only person in the Press who took any cognisant of the speech was Mr. Gladstone Holder and the *Nation* Newspaper carried his article. We are up in this case against a lot of things. One thing we are up against, as I said before, is a whole orchestrated political campaign which originated unfortunately at the time and at the height of a by-election in which there were all sorts of things involved and it was obvious to me that in that political contest anything that could be used to undermine the position of the political party to which I belong would be used and it was used.

My colleague for St. Michael South East got caught in the cross-fire to the extent that it affected his family life and he has suffered more grievously than any of us could possibly have suffered. I was very conscious about that as well. We got into the position, Sir, where because we have freedom of speech in this country and because frankly we have got to the stage where for one reason or another the sort of prosecutions which can be brought in this country, and I do not want to criticise any officer unless it is a substantial motion, are not brought in the manner in which they should be brought and I have no control over that. We have got to the position where people feel they could get to the stage in this country to incite people to violence, kill their reputation and get away with it. If that is not democracy at work in Barbados I do not know how much more democratic they want the Barbados Labour Party to be but that is a fact.

I have never ever once given directions to the Commissioner of Police that he should prevent people from speaking on public platforms in Barbados. I have, as I am entitled to do, whenever I get reports of Meetings, draw them to the attention of the Director of Public Prosecutions, instructions of which I think there have been breaches of the Law and I have acted in this way under the advice of the Solicitor General and I have been told that some of these cases have become Statute barriers because the Director of Public Prosecutions says that they do not have time to look at them. That is the position I have followed. You see you have a constitutional position and yet you are criticising it. If one is putting a case against you the Police must act. You must also put a case and give facts for the Police.

I have also been in the situation, where as I said, I do not believe it would be right for me to substitute my judgment and give a direction to the Police in a matter involving murder because it would be over-stepping the correct bounds of the Constitutional propriety and I am repeating that and I will tell you why in a minute, Sir. I will tell you what is the role of the Attorney General and what role I am thought to perform in this.

You know why I cannot intervene, Sir? The hon. member for Christ Church East argues about a 10% variance. He is saying that the whole crux of his case is that the Police might have advised you, and quite readily, that they have nothing to benefit from bringing an outside Agency. I have already disclosed to the House that the Commissioner of Police has himself spoken with Scotland Yard Officers and they said that it was pointless wasting their time, that in their view the Police have done all that they could possibly do. That is what the Commissioner had told me.

What is the point of my picking up funds in those circumstances and wasting them in bringing Scotland Yard here under circumstances where they have to work with the very Police whom their superior officers have told that there is no more to be done that has not been done so far. In my view, the hon. member bases it on two grounds. One, he says that it will convince the public, well my view is that if the public of Barbados, and I say it without making any apologies, happen to have so little judgment that they cannot analyse the Pele case properly then they deserve to get the sort of Eric Sealy's who are on the public platforms in Barbados. They do not

deserve, in those circumstances, to have anybody with any position or principle and uprightness and I want the Journalists to mention this because a lot of the blame in this case is also inflamed by the role which the Press is playing in it, a role in which the Press believe that they have a crusade, but a one-sided crusade because I have gone at length to give particularly to the *Nation* Paper a position on the role of the Attorney General and I have set out the position clear and I have never seen them set out to do research on it. They would accept any hand-outs from other people who may be putting up a case against the Government but the Government has to recognise that they should stand firm.

The hon. member for St. Michael West raised a position and he said that they are certain things I can do. Again, I want to, for the purposes of the records in particular, read from a note written on the 2nd February, 1979 by me to my Permanent Secretary.

> "Your Minute of the 29th is noted. The comments of the Director of Public Prosecutions at (25) should be drawn promptly to the attention of the Commissioner of Police. In the light of these comments I should wish the Commissioner to advert subsequently to the following matters:
>
> (1) The Ministry and the Government stand ready to make the necessary funds available immediately for any outside assistance which he may recommend as necessary. This point was made clear to the Police several months ago and well prior to the commencement of the inquest proceedings. Now the Commissioner will recall that at the time of his making a request for funds to send an Officer to England in connection with the George Street murder case, I pointed out my willingness to make funds available to assist in the investigation of all outstanding murder cases, including the Pele murder case.
>
> (2) There is obviously public disquiet concerning the investigation of the case and that factor must weigh heavily in the Commissioner's decision. He must advert, as I am sure he will do, to the need to allay the public's fear that the Police may well not be able to undertake their task efficiently or effectively and may well be withholding information. Whilst I am satisfied that the Police is not so doing, I still consider it important for the Police to do everything they can to ensure that Justice is not only done, but is also seen to be done.

10.15 p.m.

> (3) It is not in the interest of either the police or the public that any further delay should even appear to occur since quick investigation will no doubt assist in the matter.
>
> (4) The Magistrate's strictures on the police investigation must be seriously considered, and it is in the police's own interest to show that they are not afraid of having their own methods of investigation subject to outside scrutiny, especially since the police are satisfied that they have done all they can in the circumstances.
>
> I will again draw your attention and the attention of the Commissioner of Police to the remarks attributed to me at (5) of this file. I would wish the Commissioner to make any recommendation he wishes with the greatest speed. In the light of that recommendation I will propose to make a statement to Parliament."

Sir, I believe that that note reflects the total concern of hon. members, and they may rest assured that this Minister tries his best with the limited mental resources which he has to look at all the strands in a case. I believe that the Government can be proud – I want to say this – the Government can be proud of its conduct in this matter, and I believe in fact that my colleagues, no matter how strongly and emotional they feel, ought to be proud of an Attorney General, as the hon. member for St. James said, who has this sort of courage and who has this sort of – I am sorry to say it for myself – integrity to be prepared, as the hon. member for St. Joseph said that I am on the line, if he is prepared to put himself on the line, I put myself on the line on the matter, Sir, I put myself on the line firmly. I put myself on the line to the vultures who want to go and muddy the waters of justice in this country; I put myself on the line as well, so far as my future reputation is concerned, that I believe we have taken the right course in this matter; I put myself on the line in the third case. If they want to, they can contest the seat in Christ Church West, and if that happens let it go, that is all right with me. Members cannot understand that.

But there are other methods as well to deal with this case, and there are cases before the court and I am not going to comment on those because it would be improper for me to comment on them. I go back again to the whole history of this matter. The Pele case occurred at the time of a bye-election, you have all sorts of strands. I heard there were two rumours, but as far as I am concerned I heard three rumours. I heard a rumour involving the family, I heard a rumour involving the police, and I heard a rumour involving an hon. member of this House. In fact, I heard four rumours, because I heard a rumour involving a boyfriend of the principal witness in this case. I heard those four rumours, but as Attorney

General I cannot deal in rumours. I have had no complaints other than the Magistrate's open statement, not one complaint has been written to me on hard evidence other than hearsay about a particular policeman saying something.

I spoke to the Commissioner of Police and told him I had heard that there were a few members of the Police Force going around giving currency to the rumour. He investigated that and he told me he didn't find that this was so. Well, I don't know what more I can do, and I want to make the final position about these rumours.

One must be very careful in a society like ours which is easily given to gossip and rumour; how you act when you are in a public position of responsibility. I can react to a rumour because I have only a limited way to get it. I am appealing again to members of the Democratic Labour Party who have obvious influence with the people who have been worse offenders in this instance to exercise their influence properly. I know what I am talking about, and I am going to wind up finally on this point, Sir. I have stated my position on the matter and as far as I am concerned I am not issuing any direction in any murder case or any case outside of my jurisdiction to the police as to how they should do their duty. I don't believe I have that power and I am not doing it. I really cannot, I would really have to give up the Ministry first. When I took the Oath of Office, I took the Oath of Office as I understand it to carry out my duty properly, and I am going to do it as best as I understand it. I cannot do it any other way. *(ASIDE).* It is not a question of pride, Sir, I am being told it is a question of pride, but with me it is not a question of pride. I am not a normal Minister of Government, you know, I have a constitutional role, and people must understand that, and therefore I say that regardless of what is the public's position on it – I have heard tonight it would be a waste of time – they don't believe that bringing in Scotland Yard would help, why should I waste public funds on that? I am just not doing that. If the Commissioner of Police finds any new evidence that he wants the position, he can do so and I would make the money available to him. If the Director of Public Prosecutions who has direct responsibility for this sort of thing feels that he can give the police a direction on the matter, then he must act and do so, but I am not in a position to give that direction and I will not be giving the direction. If members of the House do not like that, easy, they must move a vote on the Attorney General in his office. It is as easy as that, and I rest my position there, Sir. I believe that the police have tried their best in this case in which there were several strands.

Sir, if you give me one more minute, there is another point I want to raise, because there are lots of strands.

10.25 p.m.

The Commissioner of Police took the strictures of the Coroner on the police seriously, and in fairness to the Commissioner I want to make his position clear. It is not unusual for judges, magistrates and even Crown Law Officers to comment on the conduct of police investigations. Usually they do so in writing; and where this is not done the Commissioner usually likes to find out what is wrong so that he can take disciplinary action. In this case the Commissioner was advised by the Solicitor General and he mentioned to me he intended contacting the Coroner. I told him to take advice from the Solicitor General on the form of letter to send to the Coroner. The Commissioner of Police wrote the letter – I saw it for the first time this evening – and it was vetted by Mr. Oliver Browne, the Solicitor General. I understand that letter was taken by the Coroner to Mr. F. G. Smith or shown to him. It was then shown to members of the Democratic Labour Party. And the allegation is being made that we are interfering with Coroners! I do not know how far we must go. I do not know whether it is not proper for a Commissioner of Police having had a serious complaint made about his police to ask the man who made the complaint what are his specific allegations so that he could have the particular policeman disciplined and the matter looked into. If the Coroner wants to take letters to Mr. Smith and show them to the Democratic Labour Party and make the whole matter political he is free to do so. And if we are going to get ourselves into a position with the Police that no matter how hard they try they find themselves in these political positions, what is to happen? Sure enough there are members of the Police Force who are strong supporters of the Democratic Labour Party and who do not conduct themselves in a non-partisan manner. Probably there are others on our side who will do the same thing. But as I told the Police in an address to them, they are being manipulated from public platforms and are being egged on to be disloyal to the Government because some people want to overthrow the Government and assume political power. All I can say is that we are all watchdogs of the public interest. I have a limited role as watchdog, the Government has a role, the Opposition has a role, the Press has a role; and I find that in the Pele incident we did not have the support of either the Opposition or the Press in order to sort out the trees from the woods, to sort out justice from political chicanery and skulduggery, and that is what has happened in that case. And if I have to stand up for what I consider to be right I will stand up and there is only one person who can tell me that I am wrong, and that is the Lord Almighty.

10.30 p.m.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to what has been said about the Pele affair. I have my own views and I will take my own actions.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: And the Prime Minister will be told that if he does not agree with what I am saying, he will have my resignation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: There is a very small matter, Mr. Chairman, relating to the Police that I would like to deal with. I do not believe that this point has been canvassed in this debate. It is the matter of the Police Band. I would just like to say that an extremely mischievous rumour relating to the disbandment of the Police Band has been put into circulation by Mr. Cameron Tudor, that high architect of rumour. *(Asides).* Why don't you all behave yourselves? In the end it is not going to be in the hands of any of you what happens to Scotland Yard or the Pele matter either. Just let us be quiet in here. Who wants to quarrel can quarrel, and who wants to resign can resign; but the public has a view, and sometimes the voice of the public has to be listened to. It may be the FBI that we have to call in to deal with the young lady in the USA and find out what contacts she has in the USA etc.

Mr. Chairman, let me get back to the Police Band and the mischievous rumour which is in circulation relating to the disbandment of the Police Band. There is absolutely no truth in this rumour. When the question of the organisation of the Police Force was being examined, one of the comments that was made was that Bands are usually attached to military rather than to Police Forces. I raised it with the Commissioner of Police, and he told me that the Police Band were excellent public relations for the Police, and that obviously they would not play any differently whether they were playing for the Regiment or playing for the Police Band. Obviously, if they changed their uniforms they would still be excellent musicians.

The Commissioner of Police made his point in his polite but forceful way. He made it clear that the Police would prefer to have a Band rather than have the Band transferred somewhere else. There has never been any question of disbandment. I really would like to get this clear. So I hope that we do not have any more such comments in the Press or in the article columns. The Government is extremely proud of the Police Band and has never had any intention of disbanding it. We envisaged it as no other than a Band in being and to be continued in being. Thank you, Sir. I am sorry that I interrupted the debate.

The question that Head 110 – Ministry of the Attorney General (Capital) as amended in the sum of $1,954,744 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

DEFENCE AND SECURITY DIVISION

HEAD 6(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 6(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation (Defence and Security Division) – in the sum of $1,085,461 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 6(1) in the sum of $1,085,461 stand part.

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

The question that Head 6(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation (Defence and Security Division) in the sum of $1,085,461 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 6(2) – BARBADOS DEFENCE FORCE

Head 6(2) – Barbados Defence Force – in the sum of $2,296,873 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 6(2) – in the sum of $2,296,873 stand part.

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

The question that Head 6(2) – Barbados Defence Force – in the sum of $2,296,873 stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 106 – DEFENCE AND SECURITY

Head 106 – Defence and Security (Capital) – in the sum of $1,750,000 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 106 – Defence and Security (Capital) in the sum of $1,750,000 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I must confess that at 10.30 p.m. bearing in mind that the Reporters have been going since 12 o'clock noon, and having been given certain assurances that after certain things had happened we would be going home, I must confess that I did not expect to find myself having to deal with this Head at this time. I must tell you, Sir, that I intend to be expansive on this Head. *(Asides).*

Mr. Chairman, this is Defence and Security. When I looked into my copy of the Estimates I did not believe my eyes. I really literally could not believe that I had seen this. Barbados is going to have a Defence Force with airplanes, battle ships, and mortars and bazookas and the works. I am sure that the Prime Minister is going to get up and tell me that it is a toy battle ship. We are going to talk about airplanes and a battle ship. Mr. Chairman, our experience with ships so far has not been particularly good.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Bearing in mind the type of Press that we have, I think it is only fair that it should be made clear that the words "mortar" and "bazooka" and "battle ship" – none of these words appear in the Estimates. None.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your point of order is well taken.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, all the defence forces and armies that I have ever heard of in my life have had airplanes and ships; and they also had bazookas and carookas and all the other paraphernalia connected with large defence forces.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. The present Government owns ships. It owns Carib West and Caribbean Airways; and I do not know of any bazookas or anything like that. He is just wasting time. He has all that sympathy for the Reporters? Let him talk.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member might as well get accustomed to the idea that at 10.30 in the night he tries to sneak through Defence and Security.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. The hon. member should know me well enough. I tell the Prime Minister how I feel I do not sneak. I am not like the member. I go out in the light. Does he think that I am like him and Barrow who can push him about? You better know your place.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, however he puts it, I am saying for the record that the hon. member tried to sneak through Defence and Security; as a member of this House, I have to start to wonder why.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order. If the member for St. Michael South Central has gone to call the member for St. John, has gone to wake up that old man out of his bed at this time of the night, I hope he does not get a stroke.

Mr. TAITT: If the acting Leader of the House had to send for his Leader and bring him down here to get some kind of order into his ranks, even if I had to send for my old gentleman, there is nothing wrong with that. But a wise old gentleman he is. Wise, wise, wise. Mr. Chairman, we are on Defence and Security. I find it impossible to understand how a country like Barbados – I see that we are going to have a hospital in the Defence Force. The note says: "Commencement of construction of a Hospital and Women's Quarters." I believe that they mean a sick bay. *(Aside)*. Mr. Chairman, am I going to be permitted to make my point?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would rather that hon. members on the Government benches kept their voices to lower tones.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I wish to get some details from the Prime Minister on the number of motor cycles that we are going to be having, and the kind of motor cycles that we are going to be having, whether they are going to be military motor cycles or domestic motor cycles or whether they are going to be motor cycles used by people in the desert. *(Asides)*. Mr. Chairman, I see we will have trailers. My understanding of the kind of trailers that are used in military operations are trailers similar to the ones – the last time I saw trailers was in the movie "Back to Bataan". 10.40 p.m.

I think we will need an ambulance, but I see here armoured security vehicle. It looks to me as if we are going to have the kind of defence force in which the hon. and gallant member for St. Michael West served at another time and another place. It seems to me that far from that honourable gentleman spending his time in here that he may very well be able to bring some of his expert knowledge to bear in what will in fact become the show piece of the Caribbean, the new Barbados Defence Force.

Now the aeroplanes and the ships are put down here as tokens, but when Idi Amin started his estimates in Uganda, he also had a token in his estimates for aeroplanes, and the next thing we had.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, will the hon. member lay the Uganda Estimates to which he has referred and make a document of the House? It is Idi Amin they are dealing with, not Idi Errol. This is a different Kampala you are talking about.

Mr. TAITT: While I have read wide and far, I do not think that it would be necessary to give the Hon. Prime Minister an exact look at Estimates for Uganda. The Hon. Prime Minister has been able to adopt a number of techniques of the Hon. Prime Minister of Uganda without having to look at any documents, and I

have no quarrel with the sterling way in which he has carried out that kind of technique. But seriously though I would really like the Prime Minister to give us a rundown on these aeroplanes. There was a serious newspaper article which appeared in a London newspaper. Now you know that London newspapers are all persuasive authority with the Government, and this newspaper, the Daily Telegraph, stated categorically that the British Prime Minister had said, and I do not wish to misquote the paper but I think the date was 16th February, 1979..... if the matters which I am about to discuss are too sensitive and the Prime Minister feels as a matter of security I should not raise the question, I would be happy not to raise the question; but I saw it in a newspaper and it suggested that the Government of St. Lucia and the Government of Barbados have been in discussion with the British Government to bring a fleet to ward off some attack or some impending excursion by the Cuban Government into the Caribbean.

Now when I read that I dismissed it as I tend to dismiss most reports which emanate from British newspapers about the Caribbean because they have a certain view about politics in the Caribbean; but when I received my copy of the Estimates and I saw that included in the Estimates was a provision for aeroplanes and ships, I became concerned, indeed alarmed that whereas we had been given an assurance by the Rt. Hon. gentleman that there was nothing in that rumour that had been put out about Cuba, here was an article, and so that you will know that it was not hauled out of the air, here is an article from the Sunday Telegraph of 14th January. I believe I said 16th February when I was speaking. It has a headline which says "Patrol Boats for Barbados by Our Diplomatic Correspondent". I think you will agree that the Sunday Telegraph is not a paper you will dismiss in quite the way we have heard the newspapers in Barbados.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is out of order if he attempts to read from that newspaper.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, let me have my say for a minute. Some time ago I remember appearing in a case before the Learned Chief Justice when a certain lawyer pulled a cigarette box from his pocket to quote law from it. The hon. member must know he is out of order when he brings that document.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I anticipated the Hon. Minister and I rule it is out of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: That piece of paper pulled from out of his pocket.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: There is no need to carry on. I anticipated your point and I ruled on it long before you were finished.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, firstly I did not read anything at all from the note, and secondly I must say I resent the imputation by the hon. member that I would have taken something out of my pocket and tried to mislead this House. I am saying as a fact ..... *(Asides)* I have all the time in the world. I am not doing like the father of an hon. and learned member of this House who appeared before the Supreme Court and who on reading a particular page from a document was asked by the Learned Judge if he would please pass the document because the copy which he had did not carry the same words. I am not prepared to do that. If you wish us to get into that kind of discussion, I can handle that kind of discussion. When it comes to pure politics, I love that, Mr. Chairman. If we are going to play that for the rest of the night, subject to your directions, I am ready. As I recall, Sir,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Don't worry to read it; don't worry to hide it behind the page and play you are reading from the page. I am up to all the old tricks already.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order, the real difficulty in this matter is that the hon. member has already said that the Daily Telegraph contained a report that Mr. Callaghan and I had discussions with the Government of St. Lucia on the bringing of a fleet here to defend this country against a Cuban threat. Now that is already on the record and it would place us in a very awkward position if that goes into the record where it is not true, because I do not believe there is any reference to bringing a fleet to defend us against any Cuban invasion in the Sunday Telegraph.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order, but I will rule this way, that Standing Order No. 28(1) precludes any hon. member from reading from a newspaper, and that is less than a newspaper. That is a piece of something that looks like that it could be from a newspaper, so I cannot allow that as the basis for any debate in here. I think the Hon. Prime Minister will have to reply orally and state his belief or disbelief of the truth of what is being said.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir. That particular newspaper said that among the items discussed by Mr. Callaghan and the Prime Minister of Barbados on his recent visit was the provision of boats by Mr. Callaghan's government to assist in security against an incursion into the Caribbean by Cuba. I did not get that out of my head because when it was raised the Hon. Prime Minister said there was nothing to that, and I believe both Prime Ministers, because they are honourable men. But then I read it in the newspaper and I came to the conclusion that the newspaper would have to be wrong because my Prime Minister would not lie on a matter

like that nor would Mr. Callaghan; but it was in the newspaper, and given that the Prime Minister of Barbados has been known to use newspapers as a persuasive source of information, I took it for granted that a British newspaper would have checked the facts before publishing such a matter. I specifically asked the Prime Minister if he thought I was going into an area which was so sensitive I should not, and I am prepared in the interest of this country not to discuss this matter if the Prime Minister says to me that he would rather I didn't. I have not heard him say so and therefore I believe it is proper for me as a member of Parliament to raise the question as to whether (a) it is true that we are going to get any kind of arrangement with the Government of St. Lucia and/or the Government of Britain to bring into this country boats for purposes of defence and security against Cuba or any other country, and (b) in these Estimates we have a token vote for ships and a token vote for aeroplanes. I should like the Prime Minister in so far as it is possible for him to do so without interfering with the security of this country to indicate what is his present intention – and note the words I use – with regard to such ships and such aeroplanes. It may very well be that he is getting a three-seater plane. It may very well be that he is getting something like the Stavronikita, although if he should get a similar boat I hope that he will be much more careful with that than they were with the Stavronikita which has now disappeared, I am told. *(Asides)* If you had the North Point now, Mr. Chairman, the North Point would be in a position to assist you in your difficult task of making money. I am serious and will not be diverted by this chatter about the North Point and the Stavronikita. I am more concerned with large matters because I believe that a country like Barbados which has for all these years prided itself as being a peaceable place to live and not withstanding the few coast guard cutters if you can call them cutters.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member has precisely one minute to conclude.

Mr. TAITT: At this point I think therefore that I had better wait and hear from the Hon. Prime Minister in the preliminary skirmish to find out if it would be necessary to delve any further into these matters.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make my position absolutely clear on this whole question of a defence force for Barbados.

10.50 p.m.

This can have very important implications in regard to the political life and the quality both internal and external of this country for the future. I am convinced that where we have stable institutions, where we have Governments respecting the freedoms not only those freedoms such as freedom of speech, freedom of religious associations, freedom of political associations and such positive freedoms, as the freedom to work, the absence of victimisation and the absence of all factors which can lead to divisiveness within a society and lead a wholesome productive society that developing countries that follow those precepts would have absolutely no need for any Defence Force of this kind.

There is a kind of philosophy which obtain in many countries that you should not vest your total law enforcement agencies into the hands of one person or one group of people and so you find the contention that you must have a Navy, you must have an Army and you must have a Police Force.

The destruction of the democratic process in many developing countries, particularly within the last 20 years, has been due to the creation of Defence Forces and I believe that we had an experience not very far from here within the Caribbean where a Government was almost overthrown by a Defence Force. I am convinced, and I feel very strongly about this that we should be drawing our efforts towards strengthening the Royal Barbados Police Force and if necessary, a special branch of that Force should be set up to deal with matters of Defence and Security and I say this for this reason.

I believe in the heat of newly independent Commonwealth countries I do not know of a single place where the Police Force has been actively involved in planning a coup or overthrowing any particular Government. I cannot think of anyone off-hand. However, the fact is that the Royal Barbados Police Force has a tradition of discipline; a tradition of uprightness, of constitutionality and a tradition of work, a tradition of work that is usefully directed towards the apprehension of law and order.

On the other hand, all of us invariably where you have an Army, although you might be creating artificial work for them, the fact remains that those people are geared particularly to one purpose. They are geared towards shooting and killing people and defending particular situations. You can put them to build roads. You can get them involved in all sorts of social projects but the fact is that there is that primary objective that is always there and I would warn any Government of Barbados that it is a very serious step that they are taking.

There is another aspect of this entire matter. We are starting off with $1,750,000 this year. I do not know how much was voted last year. I cannot say off-hand. Anyhow $1,750.000 is in this Vote. These expenses particularly in relation to military units or para-military units have a way of escalating and they are many developing countries where you find that the

major charge on their current revenue will be service of debt, debt of repayment and then either before or after that the maintenance of an Army. I am not convinced.

I do not see the case for the establishment of any Army in Barbados and I would like to enter a plea at this stage and certainly make my position absolutely clear. I want it to go on the record of this House that I think it is a serious error of judgment to be going into this business of setting up a Defence Force and that operation should come under the control of the Royal Barbados Police Force and if necessary you set up a special branch of the Police Force where the totality of the discipline inherited down the years and which will be brought to bear on each and every member of that Force and then I would sleep more securely in this country. I would be a very worried man and when it comes to this business of a para-military force in countries like this almost ineffably the first people that get shoot, the people against whom they draw their bullets in the first instance, is the local population because invariably they cannot face up to any significant external Force and it is a word of caution and I sincerely hope that this whole matter will be kept under very, very close scrutiny and under control in relation to expenditure and in a very effective disciplined situation.

It must be a matter for concern and there is no point dismissing what we say here on the Opposition Bench because many people might live to regret this kind of decision that is being taken here, and I cannot ignore it, or when you say token votes for ships, airplanes and those kind of things, these are things that are significant pointers and I can only hope and call upon the Government to try and contain this aspect of any security operation that they be very careful whether or not the Royal Barbados Police Force would not have been the more suitable agency to establish security in this country.

11 p.m.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, any debate on Defence and Security will raise a number of problems and a number of questions, and tonight provides us an opportunity to raise a number of questions again on this question of defence and security.

I recall the occasion, Mr. Chairman, when the Prime Minister came to this Hon. Chamber with the White Paper on Defence and Security, and I was under the impression at that time that the Prime Minister had indicated that he did not foresee the expenditure on Defence and Security rising in any significant manner, that is, rising significantly above what was already being spent on Defence and Security. Now we have a situation where if you look at the amount of money which this country is spending in this particular area of Defence and Security – and I think that one has to bear in mind in the totality of the situation that we have already approved large sums of money for the Police Force – but dealing with Defence and Security, from my calculation it would seem as if this year, 1979–80, that we are being called upon to vote $4,306,282 for Defence and Security. I have totalled the amount which we are being asked to provide under the Capital Expenditure and the amount which has just been passed under Head 6(2) – Defence and Security, and I think that we have got to ask ourselves a number of questions.

Looking through the areas in which it is proposed to expend money, one finds a number of things. There are a number of revelations which come to light here. From what I have been able to sift out of what has been presented before us, Mr. Chairman, it would appear as if we would be spending almost $1 million to purchase weapons, and I think we have got to ask ourselves why, why this expenditure on arms and weapons.

I believe that the Prime Minister who has the responsibility for Defence and Security should let us know very clearly what is going to be involved in this large scale purchase of arms for this Department, because remember I said at the outset that when the Prime Minister brought the White Paper some time last year there was some indication that the expenditure would not escalate. I had a quick look at some of the previous Estimates to get some idea as to what the spending was on Defence and Security, and in 1978–79 the actual expenditure was $2,296,873, so what is happening now is that this amount is going to be almost doubled and, as I said, this is a very serious matter and one for which we are demanding explanations on the provision, as my colleague has indicated, for aeroplanes even although it might be a token vote and a token mention of aeroplanes, but we must know something about these aeroplanes. We must know about the ships, whether as my colleague has pointed out, these ships are going to be battle ships, or moses, or fishing boats. I think this is very important; armoured security vehicles, trailers, land rovers, all of these are things which we have to get some explanation on, because one of the very serious problems which developing countries face – and this is a serious problem, because it would seem as if there is an over-concern on this question of security. If you look around the African continent, at Latin America, you will find that these countries rather than attempting in most instances to solve the real crucial problems which confront them, they are more concerned with spending huge sums of money on military and para-military equipment, spending large sums of money on weapons, as we are learning here tonight.

We have a situation where, as I said, the budget on Defence and Security has escalated from over $2 million to over $4 million, almost double, and I would not like to think that we have become so suddenly threatened, this society has become so lawless that the Prime Minister who is in charge of Defence and Security finds it necessary to impose this very serious burden, a burden of over $4 million, on this country, and I believe that the Prime Minister owes it as a duty to let us know something about this. I have already expressed my reservations, when the White Paper came down, on a Defence and on the presence of a Defence Force in Barbados. As my colleague for St. Michael South Central has indicated, the experience of a number of small countries which have overstocked themselves with weapons and which have gone the way of establishing Defence Forces has not been a very fortunate one, and where you have a situation where you are building up an army or Defence Force and providing it with all sorts of weapons, you are creating additional problems within the society, and certainly if the people who are going to be involved in the Defence Force do not have much to do they are going to be thinking of all sorts of machinations and could cause a whole set of problems within the society, so that I believe that we have got to be very careful in this matter and I hope that the Prime Minister will not think that is a hollow plea which is coming from the Opposition.

We are concerned about this sudden jump – I almost said in the Defence budget – but in the amount of money which we are setting aside for this area of defence and security. I am sure that this money could be much more usefully and effectively spent. We are talking in terms of over $4 million.
11.10 p.m.

Could not some consideration be given to alternative ways in which this money could be spent, for example in providing useful and productive jobs for people within the society and providing opportunities for developing more creativity among the people of this country. These are matters of concern to us and approaches which will assist in bringing down the cost of living which is already too high in this country. People in this country are crying out for the high level of taxation and we are burdening the country with more expense which would enable us to spend this kind of money on Defence and Security. Why I believe this is a very crucial point and one on which the Prime Minister must give a clear indication is because I am sure lots of people are concerned about what appears to be this huge bit of the taxpayers' money going in this direction.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: What are you going to talk on? Because if you attempt to speak I am going to apply the appropriate Standing Order.

Mr. TAITT: You can apply what you like.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 106 stand part.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I take it that I am permitted to continue speaking.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the question be now put.

Mr. TAITT: I have not concluded Sir. These ships will cost us $40 million...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for St. Michael South West must take his seat. I have a motion to put the question and I am going to put the question.

The question that the sum of $1,750,000 under Head 106 – Defence and Security stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative, the House dividing as follows:

Ayes: Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS, Hon. L. S. CRAIG, Hon. H. deB. FORDE, Hon. B. A. MILLER, Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE, Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. BRADSHAW, Mr. JOHNSON, Dr. CHELTENHAM, Mr. SISNETT and Mr. ALLEYNE – 11.

Noes: Mr. TAITT, Mr. GREAVES and Dr. HAYNES – 3.

On the motion of Hon. L. S. CRAIG, seconded by Hon. C. L. BOLDEN, Mr. CHAIRMAN reported progress and asked for leave to sit again and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this House now stand suspended until 11 o'clock tomorrow, 23rd March, 1979.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Speaker, before we go into Committee of Supply, I believe hon. members are somewhat worried as to the length of time remaining for the debate on the Estimates, and I was wondering if you would enquire from the Clerk of the House the position at which we have reached.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already enquired into the matter and we have seven hours debating time.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in moving Head 17(1), I should like to make a few very general statements. The first observation I would want to make is that of all the matters which will be coming before this Honourable House during the course of these Estimates debate, none will cost in the end more than health. The truth is that in this Island we spend more on health than we spend on anything else. It is true that the Estimates figures will show that the Ministry of Education spends some $68 million on current account and $17 million on capital account, and that health is estimated to spend some $51 million on current account and $18 million on capital account, but the fact is that we have an educational system in our Island which at the primary, secondary and tertiary levels accounts for the amount of spending which was debated under Education yesterday. The fact is that in health, although we are spending $51 million on current account and $18 million in capital the public sector, in the private sector we have good reason to believe that we may well be spending perhaps even more than that, because in the public sector we have corresponding categories of delivery of health care as we have in education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

The Ministry of Health Estimates will show that almost 50% of its budget is estimated to be spent on tertiary care which the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was designed to deliver. It will also show too for those who have eyes to see it that we are not spending correspondingly enough on primary care, and this is the theme I would like to pursue. The Ministry of Education pursued in education yesterday the dearth of expenditure and other investment in the delivery of primary education in this Island, and I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the dearth of expenditure and other investment in the delivery of primary care.

If I may use the illustration in Education, Mr. Chairman, one pays one's taxes and one's child is afforded primary, secondary and tertiary education, school meals are provided at heavily subsidised cost; the Ministry of Education tells us that school uniforms are now going to be provided. Beyond that the average man and woman in the street in Barbados spends little more on education than what he spends via his taxes. In health on the other hand we have a current situation where we are spending the kind of money which you see estimated here today by way of taxes which you pay, and over and above that the average man and woman in the streets of Barbados, John Public and Jane Public has to go to his or her pocket over and beyond the amount of money we are spending. When they go to the general practitioner or the family doctor, they have got to go to their pockets in excess of what they are paying by way of taxes. When that doctor gives us a prescription we have got to go to the drugstore or the pharmacy and go back to our pockets a second time well over and above what we are already paying in taxes. Again in excess of that there are many people, more than we would care to admit, who go to their pockets yet again to pay for the various types of health and hospitalisation. So that when we look at the over-all in Barbados, if you try to aggregate public and private sector spending, it turns out we are spending more than we are spending in education, more than we are spending on trade, defence or any other item, and it is my view, Mr. Chairman, that in spite of all this we are not getting enough value for the money we are spending, and it is for this and many other reasons that this Government is about to embark on a capital investment on a national health service.

When I say that we are not getting enough value for money, I would want hon. members' attention to be drawn to the fact that despite all the money I said just now, there is still inequitable cover and this inequitable access of health services that do exist. The main thrust of the National Health Service, Mr. Chairman, will be to correct this inequitable access and this inequitable cover particularly in the delivery of primary care. This Government has talked at length about national health services; it has been long in its conception and for that I make no apology; it has been careful and astute in its

planning. I have tried to get the best possible advice and the best possible consultation, and I am happy to report, Mr. Chairman, that the first discussed paper for the proposed national health service of the Island of Barbados is now ready. It is something which is coming; it is something which I now hold in my hand.
11.13 a.m.

This outlines the National Health Service as we hope to begin to implement it before the end of this calendar year. This document, Mr. Chairman, is going to be made available for discussion purposes to every Doctor of this Island, to the Barbados Registered Nurses' Association, the Pharmaceutical Society and to all the other interest groups such as the Labour Union, the Chamber of Commerce, the Employers' Confederation, the Manufacturers and all the others, who I describe as interest groups, whose comments, recommendations and dialogue I am interested to entertain.

I hope to begin distribution of this document on Monday next, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that over the course of perhaps the next six weeks to two months that the dialogue which will flow between interest groups and the Steering Committee of the National Health Service will be constructive and useful and that in the end by the time the study group whose input in the preparation of this document should be of great value to us, that the study group can analyse and evaluate the public discussion. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that by the month of June and no later that discussion will be prompt and by the end of June we will have a final paper and that thereafter the first stages of implementation can proceed.

The discussion document which lies on the Table here, Mr. Chairman, Sir, will not be the first avenue for discussion between the Steering Committee of the National Health Service and the interest groups. The fact is that representatives of the Association of Medical Practitioners, of the Registered Nurses' Association, the Pharmaceutical Society and other interest groups have in fact been in dialogue and consultation with the Steering Committee of the National Health Service and this document is designed for discussion and dialogue with the wider general body of public information.

Now if I may pass on, Mr. Chairman, certainly, I believe, unfounded comments and loose talk was bounding about at the beginning of the discussion of these Estimates. There was talk about a decrease and reduction in social services on account of a decrease in the reduction of spending in those sectors. Health is considered generally to be a social service and I am anxious to refute the statement that decreases in spending represent decreases in the services delivered.

The increase in Health this year represents something over $6 million and that broadly speaking represents the salary increases and other personal emolument increases during the financial year, Mr. Chairman, so that most generally speaking, there has not been financial increases in respect of the actual cost of the delivery of health care. That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a falling off or a reduction in the service which the Ministry of Health delivered to the public of this country. What it does represent, Mr. Chairman, is a greater efficiency and a greater organisation rather than a decrease in many areas.

Mr. Chairman, as the Chief Medical Officer's Report of 1977 will show and as the Yellow pages of the coming new format of the Estimates will show for those who have the interest to look at them, there has rather been an increase in the attendance and quantity and quality of the services that the Ministry of Health has been offering during the past year.

We have added, Mr. Chairman, two new Polyclinics. We have absorbed, as you know, Mr. Chairman, the whole function of the Health Committee and integrated it into the polyclinics with the Health Centres which yet remain, Mr. Chairman, without any reduction in service.

Figures will show increased attendances at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for instance over 1977 and 1978. I see the hon. member for St. Michael South Central holding the Chief Medical Officer's Annual Report for 1977. That Report will show him attendances at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – this is a document of this Honourable House having been laid some months ago – I believe at page 29 it will show that the overall attendance at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the year 1977 numbered somewhere in the region of 168,000. The Yellow Pages perhaps will show you for easier reference for all hon. members at page 105(1) the note reading sub-head (1) Queen Elizabeth Hospital. No, I am afraid that does not show the attendance, Sir.

Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, Sir, the fact is that in the year 1978 those attendances have risen to 175,000.

The Chief Medical Officer's Report for 1977 will also show that at the Public Clinics, ante-natal Care and attendances have risen, and the infant care attendances have risen. It will show that post-natal care attendances have dropped, not significantly, but generally speaking, have risen throughout. It can be very easily demonstrated that services have increased rather than decreased. The services delivered from the Polyclinics, Mr. Chairman, are increasing.
11.23 a.m.

Hon. members may well have heard on the wireless in recent days and recent weeks notices that general practice clinics are now beginning on an experimental basis at the clinic at Warrens and the Maurice Byer Clinic at Speightstown.

Under this Head, Direction and Policy Formulation, at note 11 we see that provision is being made for expenses in the running of the Pan American Health Organisation. Again, this is an area where expanded services can clearly be identified. Barbados has been named as the English speaking co-ordinating office for the Pan American Health Organisation in the Caribbean, we are in the process of refurbishing the building known as Abergeldie at Dayrells Road which will house the Pan American Health Organisation. We have every reason to believe, our experience shows us, that Barbados being the headquarters for the co-ordinating, English speaking offices will bring quite a number of specialist personnel to our doorstep, and with that inevitably will come the expanded services.

The Barbados Family Planning Association mentioned at note 16 has got an increased subvention this year. That largely again, Mr. Chairman, represents increases in personal emoluments. We no longer see the Child Health Committee at note 16 because that is now fully absorbed and integrated into the community health service which we offer. The Barbados Family Planning Association itself has expanded its service, during the last financial year it has initiated its voluntary sterilisation programme, it is preparing even now a programme for education anticipating the abortion legislation which we hope to bring before this Hon. House during the course of the coming financial year.

Services have improved too and have been expanded by way of the upgrading of the District Hospitals. This is an on-going exercise. Each District Hospital consists mostly of very ancient plant, the maintenance costs are high, and little by little, progressively we hope to replace some of these very antiquated buildings and to upgrade and refurbish those which can bear it. I am very happy that the general re-organisation of the District Hospitals has shown very pleasing results, we no longer have a situation existing where you can go into a district hospital and find an old lady, perhaps of 86, crippled by arthritis in one bed lying next to perhaps a young girl of 18 who may be mentally defective, and she may be perhaps lying next to some physically handicapped person of possibly 30 or 40 years old. That situation was unacceptable, Mr. Chairman, now we have what we think is the foundation of a full fledged geriatric hospital at what used to be St. Michael District Hospital, and those nurses who have specific training in that area can now work exclusively with people who are geriatrics rather than finding themselves running up and down the wards attending all types and conditions of persons, so that their specialist training is not wasted. The same goes for doctors and the same goes for other allied para-medical personnel such as occupational physiotherapists who work within that hospital.

Administration is made more efficient and perhaps a little easier by the fact of this kind of re-organisation. Even mundane and simple things like the management of laundry, at a geriatric hospital you would expect a greater quantity of what is described as wet laundry, you are dealing with geriatrics who are perhaps more incompetent than non-geriatrics, and rather than have little packets of wet laundry spread over six district hospitals you will now have it all concentrated for better management at one institution. You now have the older physically and mentally handicapped persons housed at the St. Philip District Hospital and at St. Thomas. We are hoping in this coming financial year to re-organise the service delivered at the St. Andrew District Hospital.

We have a situation in your constituency, Mr. Chairman, where at the St. Philip District Hospital where the Evalina Smith Ward which caters to serious mental defectives has become intolerable. You have youngsters who are of a very young age – 5, 6, 7, 10, 12 – going right up now to 18, 19, adolescent, and it is difficult to manage these young people in one small building, one location, and the time has come for a separation so that better management and more efficient nursing care can be offered, and we are hoping that the elder of those youngsters of Evalina Smith Ward will go down to the St. Andrew Hospital, so that the severe overcrowding which now obtains at St. Philip will be relieved.

I am also happy to report, Mr. Chairman, that at the Lazaretto, also known as Hansen's Home, significant and substantial refurbishing has taken place. We had a situation at the Lazaretto where buildings which were certainly older than you and I are were falling apart, patients were being asked to walk around holes in the floor, there were certain areas which were restricted to patients on account of the fear that the ceiling may fall in here or the floor might give way there. The conditions were more than dilapidated. At the same time we had a situation where there was a fairly substantial stone building in the Lazaretto compound which housed the one private patient. In the course of the financial year we have virtually rebuilt that stone building so that the eight patients at Hansen's Home are now more comfortably accommodated and more safely accommodated.

11.33 a.m.

All of this upgrading at what is described as other hospitals – that is, hospitals other than the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – is an on-going exercise and is showing pleasing results, not only to staff but to patients. At the Psychiatric Hospital, the out-patients service there is showing good results; it is proved and statistics have shown that it is less costly and

constitutes better medical and psychiatric practice. The Black Rock Polyclinic situated within the precincts of the Psychiatric Hospital at Black Rock has improved the public image and the public relations attitude at the Psychiatric Hospital. It has of course brought new services to the densely populated community surrounding that stretch of Highway No. 1.

If I may move on, mention might be made of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. As I said before, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital eats up a substantial part of the health budget. It is a good hospital. I do not think that we want this morning to indulge in any exercise that would only serve to demoralize or destabilize the kind of service which the Queen Elizabeth Hospital delivers. It is a well equipped and well staffed hospital. There are however areas with which I am not satisfied. For instance I am not satisfied that there is sufficient professionalism among the non-medical staff, among persons such as orderlies, porters, ambulance drivers, etc. There has got to be increased and improved training and increased productivity and a greater show of professional conduct. I am not happy about the delivery of food services, medical supplies and drugs in particular. I am not happy about the security measures; not happy that we still have a situation where large quantities of items such as toilet paper, soap and various items of food still disappear from the stores and wards of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

If I may utter a special word of praise at this point in respect to the management of the Psychiatric Hospital. Many people do not recognize that the Psychiatric Hospital is a larger institution than Queen Elizabeth Hospital, but it enjoys a significantly lesser staff consciousness, about which we are trying to do something. It is the recipient of a far smaller slice of the health budget than the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and still in my view, generally speaking, it is a better managed institution, and I say that without any reservations.

Although I made it clear at the beginning that the main initial thrust of the health service will be in the area of the delivery of primary care, hon. members must not rush to the assumption that secondary and tertiary services will suffer in any way. In fact, we are making it our special business to continue to underline the importance of the preventive services which we deliver. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, where as I said the bulk of tertiary care is delivered, is going to see a certain amount of expansion in the coming year. We are hoping to build a new block which will afford increased accommodation to Obstetrics and Gynaecology. The Chief Medical Officer's report for 1977 will show that 78% of the deliveries in this Islands take place at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We consider that to be a good thing and it is hoped that the Maternity Hospital at Oistin will be transferring all of its services to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and a new block will afford the extra place required. The new block will also accommodate an auditorium, part of the cost of which the University of the West Indies will underwrite as the auditorium is largely going to facilitate the teaching service which the Queen Elizabeth Hospital offers as part of the University of the West Indies. Doctors and nurses also from time to time require that kind of accommodation for seminars, conferences, meetings, in-service training, etc. It is also hoped that this new block will accommodate new and improved canteen facilities for persons who visit the hospital either as visitors to patients or as out-patients or casualty patients.

During this financial year too we saw improved dining and canteen services for the staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I do not believe that this has been met with approval in all quarters. I have, without apology, put an end to a situation which was nothing other than discriminatory and segregationist practice among professionals at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We no longer have a situation where the doctors are getting maid service and eating off table cloths and the nurses are having self service and non-table cloth accommodation. We have streamlined the situation and doctors and nurses, as they do in hospitals everywhere else in the world, will all eat the same food and serve themselves in that dining room. We have streamlined it so that they can go in and pick up a tray and they will have a choice of menu – a hot meal, a cold meal, a salad, a sandwich or whatever; they all pass into the dining-room which is no longer segregated in that kind of fashion. There is increased speed in the turn around of persons going through the dining-room. I would like to think that the quality of the menu has been improved and that there is an increased selection of items, and I would like to think that this has done something to improve the general – I am searching for a good word because everybody does not accept the change – some members have refused to go to the dining-room because they now have to serve themselves. We sit down in the dining-room of this House and we eat at the table with other members of the Staff. I have eaten in the dining-room of this House with policemen and with other administrative staff from time to time and I can think of no good reason why doctors should enjoy one kind of dining service and nurses another.
11.43 a.m.

I believe too, Mr. Chairman, that another important question at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other hospitals must be a question of Security. I am not satisfied that security is as well organised as it might be at any of the hospitals.

If I may refer to the area of Sanitation – this item, of course, has seen a lot of public exposure and public discussion; but I would still like to draw it to the attention of the public authorities that the standard of the Sanitation Authority has considerably improved over the past few years. I think that congratulation is due to the new, trained management of the Sanitation Service. I wish, also, to say how grateful I am for the increased co-operation which the public is showing to the Ministry and the Sanitation Service Authority.

Only in this morning's paper – the Advocate-News – we see that the new type of service is good in the City of Bridgetown. We hope that it will give the same service to Oistin Town, Holetown and Speightstown. I hope that in the course of the coming year women will join the Sanitation Authority and do this kind of service that they did not do before. I think that the public will accept. I think that there is the general feeling that women will bring a new kind of dedication to the Sanitary Service. Those services are going to improve.

We hope that in the main central office of the Sanitation Services they will be getting new accommodation. There are plans already, and it is my view that they want to get out of Bridgetown and those cramped quarters at the old Town Hall, and a better workshop and maintenance facilities, and better and improved facilities for sanitary technician workers and for the administration for the service. We believe that those things which we will offer will improve the service even more.

The Pulverisation Plant – Mr. Chairman, construction actually started yesterday. The Sewerage Project has started. All hon. members who may care to pass through Lakes Folly will see that certain works have commenced. Other aspects, fundamental to Sanitation which we hope to set up during the year will be monitoring conditions at hotels and guest houses around this country. We also hope to set up a collection dispersal for scapped vehicles. The dog licensing and collection programme has started; and very early in the new year you will see new projects in the area of Health.

Generally speaking, Mr. Chairman, the Ministry of Health has started to undertake substantial works. I am glad that the Ministry of Health has had first start; because when the other Ministries started on their works programme later in the financial year, we do not really know where we are going to find the works. I am glad that we have had a head start in the Ministry of Health; because we will get the cream of the crop, so to speak. The work force on the sewerage plant, the work force on the pulverisation plant, the work force on the new block at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the work force which is even now working at Abergeldie on the new PAHO Office, the work force which is going to be required for three more polyclinic starts in *this* financial year – It is part of our agreement with Inter-America Development Bank in respect of loan funds for the polyclincs project that we should make three starts in this financial year – a start at Warrens which will be seriously expanded and rebuilt, a new clinic at the Glebe in St George and substantial expansion and rebuilding at Oistin. Those are the three starts that I am proposing to make in the financial year 1979–80, two of them in the calendar year 1979, and I hope that the third will begin in the calendar year 1980.

That is the works programme of the Ministry of Health. In addition to everything else, Mr. Chairman, there are certain areas where the Ministry of Health's priorities will require certain legislation to come before this hon. Chamber. High on the list of our priorities is of course legislation which will be required to launch the national health service scheme. High on the list of those priorities is to be the Water and Sewerage Authority for which Bills and Regulations are necessitated as a consequence of the sewerage project in Bridgetown. It is necessary that a Water and Sewerage Authority should be set up and that Rules and Regulations to be administered by the Authority should be made.

11.53 a.m.

The Abortion Bill which is presently in preparation I hope will come before this Honourable House during the course of this year. I was not happy, Mr. Chairman, that the subject of abortion had enjoyed a sufficient dialogue between the Ministry and important interest groups. It is true that before my time there had been an Abortion Commission which sat and which reported. Even so, having read the report and read behind the report, I became satisfied that the religious bodies in this country had not had a serious enough input, and I have gone out of my way to canvass those bodies afresh. That has been done and other bodies' opinions have been culled. The National Commission on the Status of Women has reported afresh to me and I hope to bring this legislation before the House.

I know that it is an issue about which Barbadians will feel it necessary to be hypocritical. I expect that, but there are certain facts which must be faced. The Chief Medical Officers' Report for 1977 will show again that abortion is still the third highest cause for hospitalisation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital every year. When we hear notices come out on the wireless and on the radio in this country for emergency supplies of blood and would blood donors please come in and give blood, it is more often than not arising out of a

situation where an abortion has gone wrong and the patient is haemorrhaging like mad at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and requires pints and pints of precious blood. We have got to face these facts. The figure for teenage pregnancies over the past two to three years will show that there is a disquieting rise in teenage pregnancies, particularly between the ages of 11 and 15, and we have got to face those facts and manage them as best we can.

Again high on the list of priority legislation will be the legislation required for the implementation of the National Drug Service. The Pharmacy Bill is ready but is being worked in the light of the National Drug Plan which is currently before the Ministry.

Before I sit, Mr. Chairman, on this Head, I should just like to make very general mention of the National Insurance for which I am partially responsible. It is preparing to accommodate the National Health Service within its benefits for Barbadians. The Director of the National Insurance Service had been nominated as a member of the National Health Service Steering Committee from its inception and continues to be so, and there has been much consultation especially between those members of the team such as the persons interested in advising on the financing of the National Health Service and the senior staff at the National Insurance. Perhaps I will report more on that when I come to the appropriate Head.

Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $5,195,976 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I believe that our approach on this side will be to confine these opening remarks to the question of direction and policy formulation and then deal with other matters under the appropriate Heads. It is under the provision for Direction and Policy Formulation that I would wish to make some comments at this point in time.

The whole question of delivery of health care to this population is one that has occupied the attention of a large number of people covering various political beliefs and political associations over a number of years, and if I may jolt your memory, as far back as 1962 I believe that you were a co-signatory of a document along with myself and members of the present Government in relation to certain aspects of community care delivery. I myself have been in the position where I have been trained in the situation where there exists a national health service both at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels. I have worked in that situation, I have worked in the situation here where there has been a mixed type of delivery of health care, and I have been very much involved in almost every aspect of health development in this country and the Caribbean over the past twelve years or so. However, I was very pleased to note that when many years ago I said it was utter nonsense for anyone to say that the provision of a comprehensive health service in this country would cost an additional $3 million to $5 million and that the figure would have to be over $100 million, the response to that was that I was only saying that because I was interested in the retention of private practice; but I want to declare my interest right here and now. Anything that can be done to reduce my practice by 80% I would be very happy for indeed. I would live a lot longer; so I want to get that straight.

I believe every single Barbadian would welcome any improvement in the health services of this country that would result in the increased delivery of health care, but they will not get involved in any system that compromises them professionally or in which they are not satisfied that the system itself would necessarily result in better health care delivery. From time to time there is a marked difference between conceptualisation, between emotional commitment and the ultimate in the delivery of the results of that emotional commitment and that conceptualisation.

Now the Hon. Minister has told us that the Government is contemplating over $50 million this year in the public sector and that a conservative estimate of at least another $50 million is spent in the private sector. Now that combination would be about $100 million, and I think it is well over $100 million; it is probably more in the region of $120 million, so this is the kind of figure that we have to be thinking about when you are talking now about any system that takes over the total responsibility in maintaining the same level of services. My judgment then was right and I am pleased to note that it has been confirmed today on the floor of this Honourable House.
12.03 p.m.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Health policies can be an instrument of national development but it is also most important to bear in mind that health policies can also constitute a barrier to national development. I can only caution that one should look at the example of India and recognise it is not by chance that Western countries are the beneficiaries of many of the products of Medical Schools after that country became independent and embarked on a massive programme on expansion of its schools. It has serious effects and alterations in the demographic patterns. It has had serious effects on the gains and returns in terms of how much increases the GDP of that country had achieved in any particular year. It has had a serious effect on the economic

pattern in that country and indeed I believe the Indian Government over the years has done absolutely nothing to prevent the exportation of their doctors right around the world for a variety of reasons which I do not want to go into. I just draw that as an example to show how important it is to relate your health policies to your overall growth of national development.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that our fundamental objective in health must be the promotion of adequate mental and physical health within the community. In other words our organisations, whatever institutions we have, should be primarily geared to the promotion of health and not necessarily to the treatment of diseases and you regard institutions that have to deal with diseases as situations existing when your health programmes have broken down. These are to be the failures of your health programmes. This is a fundamental philosophy that I hold and it is a fundamental philosophy that I feel should be built into any kind of policy formulation in relation to any Government developing or otherwise.

There is another very important area, Mr. Chairman, that is often not properly understood. There are multiple interrelated factors when dealing with a policy of health for any society. I will give you a few examples. The question of housing. The question of housing can have a very significant effect on the improvement of the health of the community. Proper housing presents a whole lot of emotional problems, a whole lot of problems that stem from improper educational facilities within the home and so on and consequently I think that a major thrust in a housing programme in this country to make sure that every single person essentially living in proper housing will have a fundamental effect on the health of this community or any community.

The second important area, Mr. Chairman, is the question of your agricultural policies. When people starve, when the prices of food rise too high and they cannot get an adequate calorie intake with a properly balanced diet, you can have the best institutions in the world and all you are doing would have no significant advantage because the fundamental proteins, calories and vital elements are not going into the tummies of those people from day to day.

Environmental Sanitation is another very vital fundamental area in terms of the health development in any society and I am looking forward to a realistic concept of a Ministry of Environment and no piecemeal approach to this particular area in the development of this country. Your water resources are very important, not only in terms of the water that you drink but to the availability of water for hygienic purposes, etc.

Communications are always fundamental in the context of a small country like Barbados, though it does have its influence. I remember that about eight years ago myself and my predecessor at that time, the late Dr. Pearson, had done a very interesting study here in Barbados which was forwarded to the Ministry of Health. I think it was in 1971, looking at the communication structure in Barbados and relating this to the distribution of the population within Barbados and indeed the siting of many of those polyclinics, which seem to have evolved over the years out of that very important study which was done by myself and Dr. Pearson some years ago, I have a copy of it here. I can show you.

Next is the question of unemployment, Mr. Chairman. Unemployment has an important effect on the health of any community. Unemployment is one of the greatest generators of poor health within a community and that is an area that needs to be looked at, education and the cultural pattern within the society and the development of those cultural patterns. Now it is important for us to determine what our priorities are going to be because there is no doubt that based on the literature that I see emerging out of under-developed countries, developing countries and developed countries who are now having to revert to certain basic understandings of the fundamental inputs in terms of health development that these things have to be carefully looked at and represent the fundamental infrastructural development which in the long-term will have a far more decisive influence on the health of this nation than many other up-front institutions that we might be rushing into and up-front formats of Health Care delivery.

This country has had, Mr. Chairman, since the days of slavery, and it is very interesting that since the days of slavery there has always been some kind of philosophical approach to health. This is one thing about Barbados. Now in the days of slavery the objective was to keep a slave in good health so long as he could work and when he ceased to work he went to the Almshouse and that kind of approach was the approach which resulted in the Almshouse situation which was later converted to District Hospitals, etc. There has always been a fundamental understanding in Barbados that preventive medicine, much cheaper than other forms of health delivery, is one that should form the corner stone in any health policy in this country.

The Airport, the Sea Port, the vaccination programme, the water engineering programme and a whole wide range of other programmes including the building of health centres like the Enmore Health Centre and so on have made a major impact and the impact of this, Mr. Chairman had been a drastic

reduction in the instances of contagious diseases in this country. For example, I think I was in a position some four or five days ago even to abolish the T.B. Wards in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, although it caused a bit of a stir but nevertheless I think that decision turned out to be the right one and in keeping with modern thinking on the subject.
12.13 p.m.

I believe that the Lazaretto – I am not talking about the political Lazaretto – I am not sure how many patients are there now, but there has been a substantial reduction in the number of people there and there are fewer and fewer new cases. I think there were probably about two new cases in the past ten years or so. Syphilis has become significantly less of a problem in this country, although the question of gonorrhea is a matter that must occupy our attention, because with the increasing use of the pill as distinct from other forms of contraception which do not permit contact, this is becoming more of a problem and the whole question of resistance and so on. But anyhow, the point I am making is that our public health at that time resulted in a significant reduction in the number of infectious diseases, and this is reflected very much in the change in the population structure of this society, and if you were to compare the Chief Medical Officer's Report of 1977 with one of probably 15 years ago and you look at the parametal structure of this society, you will see that Barbados is rapidly becoming an Asian society, as distinct from the type of picture that we might see of India and various parts of the Far East, and that also has a fundamental influence on our health planning for this society.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must begin to wind up.

Dr. HAYNES: But, Mr. Chairman, I have not even started yet, because I am speaking on policy and formulation, and I will assure you that I will reduce my contribution under the other Heads.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No, you are limited to fifteen minutes at any one time.

Dr. HAYNES: But, Mr. Chairman, when I discussed this with you earlier on.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let me just explain, and the hon. members on your side will help you. You have to sit after your fifteen minutes and let somebody else speak and then you can speak again, and you can have as many fifteen minutes as you wish. Those are the rules.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, all I was trying to explain to you was that this is such an important matter that continuity of my speech will be important, but if you so rule then I have no alternative.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: What I am saying is that you can save your speech. I am going to give you another minute or so to wind up this part, and after somebody else has spoken you can come and carry on Chapter 2 of your speech. If you have 50 chapters to deliver, deliver 50, but at intervals of fifteen minutes each.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, I just adverted to the change in population structure in this society, and it is interesting to note that I see nothing in these Estimates at any level that reflects this particular problem, because, Mr. Chairman, we will be facing the problem of an Asian society manifesting itself in Barbados principally in the forms of diabetes mellitus, hypertension and malignancy, and indeed our surveillance and our whole approach to health in this society must be highly orientated towards community care, delivery of health for the very particular reasons.

I am not keeping more noise because I am annoyed with you, although I am, but anyhow.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must not display open umbrage against the Chair. You cannot get annoyed with my ruling, or if you get annoyed don't say it.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I said I am not annoyed with your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Although you are annoyed with me.

Dr. HAYNES: No, no, no. I am not annoyed with you or your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Don't let us have any talk, I will let this one pass.

Dr. HAYNES: Anyhow, the point is that I will seek to demonstrate when I speak again how important it is to get into the area of community development, of medicine, because these particular problems which face the society can only be effectively dealt with at the community level, and I will continue my speech from that point on at a later stage.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this Head. Firstly, I would like to congratulate the Minister for the smooth way in which she is conducting the affairs of the Ministry of Health, and indeed the smooth way in which her Ministry is being run. As she touched on a number of Heads, I believe I made a list, Mr. Chairman, and I will go back to them later, but I will not do them in the order in

which she spoke, I will speak first of what she mentioned as to the national health service.
12.23 p.m.

I believe that a number of Barbadians do not realize how sophisticated our society is and how advanced we are compared with many countries more developed than ourselves. The fact that we are going to have a National Health Service will be of tremendous satisfaction to the people of Barbados and will be something of which all Barbadians will be very proud.

One thing I admired about the Minister was when she said that there were certain things she was not satisfied about. Too many people in high office do not have the courage to say they are not satisfied about something, and instead try to make out that everything is perfect and without flaw. But the Minister has said quite plainly that she is not satisfied with many things in her Ministry and we should applaud her for this.

Another thing I admired is the way she has laid the plan for phasing in the National Health Service. I would say that when the Government speaks of a National Health Service it cannot be turned on like a light but must be phased in gradually and could run into years. I have no doubt that if the Minister introduces the National Health Service before the end of the year we will take three or four or five years before it is complete in every aspect. We must understand this and not expect that everything is going to come about by waving a magic wand.

Another thing the Government is to be complimented on is the linking of the National Health Service and National Insurance. The hon. member who just spoke said that the National Health Service will cost us $1 million. But if it costs $18 million or $100 million, the fact is the time is right for a National Health Service in Barbados and we must have it. (ASIDES) Your party said it could not work so I don't want to hear you now; let us continue with our discussion in a friendly manner.

The fact is that every person will contribute to the National Health Service by way of insurance rather than taxation. You yourself Mr. Chairman, do not have the same difficulty in writing a cheque for insurance as you do for taxes. Taxes irritate everybody universally, and when a person knows that his taxes are going up be blames everything for it, whereas if people contribute to a National Health Service and know they themselves have paid out more this year than they have received but yet the benefits have gone to other persons they are happy in this regard because they know that in some year to come they will receive several times what they contributed. The Government therefore is to be congratulated on linking the National Health Service with National Insurance.

There are a few other things I would like to comment upon, and I would like to refer to Sanitation and the picking up of garbage, as mentioned by the Minister. I would like it to be known that it is a disgrace to Barbados that the Barbados Workers Union refuses to have a contract where garbage would be picked up on Sundays and Bank Holidays. All over the world where I have travelled – at least in Europe and North America – garbage is picked up seven days a week. Doctors work seven days a week, nurses work seven days a week, Police, hotel workers and others. I am not saying that an individual works seven days a week but the service works seven days a week, and I think it is a total disgrace that garbage in Barbados is not picked up seven days a week; and if there was a case of an epidemic I am sure that all those who are blocking this procedure would be the first to rush and clear themselves. The time has come when garbage in this country must be picked up seven days a week; the workers will work five days and get off two, but the service must be seven days a week; and whoever is blocking this is very irresponsible and should come to their senses.

One other thing about sanitation: When the first phase of the Deep Water Harbour was done, built into that project was a drain which ran parallel to the shore and then entered into the sea. It never caused any inconvenience until comparatively recently when the cluster block of factories for the IDC was built. Since that time the wash water from those factories goes into this drain and when you pass there at night, if the wind is not blowing, you get a terrible smell. The Barbados Board of Tourism has just moved into that area – Mr. Chairman, I believe I am supposed to address you but I do not know if you can listen to me and read a paper at the same time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Unlike some people, I have the capacity and mental ability to do several things at the same time.

Mr. WARD: This drain is next to the office of the Board of Tourism and this week many members of the staff had to go home because of being unable to stand the smell from this drain. I would suggest to the Minister to get a filing cabinet for her office because letters will be arriving from the Tourist Board every day, every hour, as long as that condition continues. We have just had to spend several thousand dollars airconditioning part of our office because of the smell. It is totally impossible for staff to work under such conditions; and I am not saying this because of tourists

I am talking about Barbadians who cannot endure the terrible smell.

If I may move from sanitation, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for a moment. The Minister mentioned about pilferage. I would warn the Minister that it is the custom not only at Government Institutions but at other places, such as hotels, to find that what was considered pilferage within the organisation really took place outside; that is to say, goods paid for and signed for never arrived at the institution. Many hotels have paid for thousands of cases of scotch, gin, champagne etc., which never arrived at the hotel. There was a scandal at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital some years ago, where when they took stock, thousands of pounds of meat could not be accounted for. But one of the interesting points which arose was that the authorities wondered if the supplier could have supplied that amount of meat. I do not know who the supplier was and I would like the Minister to mention it so that everyone can know who is supplying the hospital with meat and vegetables etc. I know in my own constituency that I have to deal with people in the vegetable business and they tell me they would go to the BMC and leave their produce and the man would tell them come back later. When they go back they are paid for four times the amount of produce they left, but with the understanding that they would pass back some of the money. The same thing might be taking place at the hospital.

The other thing I would like to deal with is making sure, as the Minister mentioned, that proper sanitary conditions prevail at hotels. Generally speaking the kitchens at the hotels are in pretty good shape since they form an important part of the publicity of the hotels. What is needed is looking into the laundries. Lots of hotels are using domestic washing machines at very low temperatures to wash their linens. We do not know how many people with diseases of various sorts pass through Barbados, and the laundry from the hotels should go to commercial laundries where the temperature of the water will kill any bacteria in the linens. No hotel should be allowed to wash its linen by domestic machines. *(Asides)* The Tourist Board cannot do anything about this; we have not got the legislation to enforce it.

The next point I would like to refer to is the dog pound and the collection of dogs. I am advising the Minister to remember that many people in Barbados who have dogs live in small house lots and they have the habit of loosing their dogs for a run. These dogs are licenced with tags on them. If we want political dynamite, let the dog catchers collect these dogs that are licenced and are just being let out for a run. If you collect a dog without a tag, carry it to the pound; but where a person lets out his dog for a run, I say to the Minister to be careful; and I would not advise any indiscriminate picking up of such dogs. Rather I would say this: start with the market and the bus stand; but when you come to residential areas I would say tread softly; that is my advice.

Mr. Chairman, these are the points I wanted to cover and will end by expressing my congratulations to the Minister on the way she is handling the Ministry, and I feel that as long as the Ministry is under her hands we have no need to worry.

12.33 p.m.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, we hear of this business of introducing a National Health Service. We hear of a free National Health Service and now we are hearing of a National Health Service that will be financed by International Monetary Fund contributions. Let me make this absolutely clear. Every country, and Barbados is no exception, has some form of National Health Service. And there was a form of National Health Service that existed in Barbados up to 1976. This was in the area of a Public Health Service, and it was paid for by the Treasury of Barbados. No individual paid for his public health service unless he elected to go to a private doctor and get an examination.

Take hospitalisation. It is not often appreciated that in Barbados where you have over 2,000 hospital beds, only about 120 are private beds. The majority of hospitalisation in Barbados is paid for by the Public Treasury. If you look at the statistics from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, although there is a large amount of money under that Head, I have produced a paper for study and the figure I came up with was that I believe as much as 60 per cent was spent on primary care rather than on secondary or tertiary care. So that in point of fact a very significant proportion of the primary care in this country was paid for by the Public Treasury of Barbados. It is approximately 30 per cent of the primary care that we are talking about.

For example, there are over 250,000 consultations done alone at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital on a primary basis. The idea of financing a National Health Service is nothing new. If you look at the figures in the U.K., you will see that despite the high level of employment and contributions to the National Insurance Scheme, we pay a small amount towards health services. It cost us 12.7 per cent in 1964 and has been going up since then; and there are various other minor contributions.

Basically, let us get this clear. Your National Insurance Contributions can only make a small contribution. You cannot nationalise what you have been doing for all these years, which is in truth and in fact a National Health Service. The area of private

practitioners is the only area that can be taken into the grasp of a National Health Service. Even in the hospital system – take a hospital like the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, while I understand that there will be no other changes in the private wards, I understand there may be other changes. That was in the 1977 Budget Speech.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member not to misquote me. I never gave any directive in the Budget Speech. There was never any suggestion except that in respect of rising rates, our rates had not risen for a very great length of time. We must have protection in here against wilful misrepresentations.

Dr. HAYNES: This is already a Document of the House on Page 70 of the Budgetary Proposals it is provided that private room (air conditioned with direct access to bathroom) would be $45 a day instead of $25 and other $90 per day. (b) Other private rooms to move from $20 per day to $40 per day. (c) Ward accommodation for persons eligible for free service to move from $5 per day to $10 per day. The Minister of Finance went on to say: "no alterations in the other conditions in the pay wards are proposed". Those are the written words of what the Prime Minister said. I do not know if the Prime Minister wants to read what he said.

To get back to more substantive matters, in the whole area of doctors' fees. I do not think that they are lower than those of our CARICOM partners. Medical fees on the whole are much lower, and indeed I would support Government intervention in having legislation along the lines of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Regulations which would prevent people from charging you $1,000 to remove one cataract and another $1,000 for removing the other cataract. I was one of those persons who suggested that the maximum fee should be $250.
12.43 p.m.

It is in the area of drugs that it is most important that the Government pay some attention. I did some little homework on this subject and the price of drugs used in disorders such as hypertension and diabetes is outrageous. From 1977 a common tablet like Aldomet has gone up from 30 cents to 40 cents; Brimerdin from 32 cents to 48 cents; Esedrix that should not cost more than half-cent has gone up from 12 cents to 18 cents; Diabenese used in diabetes which should not be sold in Barbados for more than 16 cents or probably if you had a combined foreign policy for the private and public sector not more than 10 cents, was 32 cents in 1977 and is now 48 cents, nothing but robbery of the public of this country, and it is important for Government to intervene in this particular area.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I just want to get it straight. The Government does not sell drugs. In the public sector it is known, and as a result of a survey, that some of the highest mark-ups on drugs are at the dispensary at the Delaware Clinic.

Dr. HAYNES: Well, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case I just simply would not know because I do no. run the Delaware Clinic. It is as simple and straightforward as all that.

Now what is even more important is that the Government has been considering going into the area of generics, and I was absolutely shocked at the total rascality involved in relation to a particular drug where the generic drug is about twice and a half the price of the proprietary drug in Barbados. For a well known drug as an appetite stimulator the generic costs about twice and a half as much as the proprietary drug. Isn't that a rip-off? That is an area in which Government can intervene, and I would suggest that Government be very highly selective in these areas of intervention in the health services, because it is in the area of hypertension and diabetes and the consequences of these diseases that the vast majority of money would be spent probably over the next fifty or 100 years, and you have an opportunity to intervene in that particular area. The Government must intervene to influence the cost of these drugs not only in the private sector but even in the Government sector.

I suggested on the floor of this House some time ago that Government should look at their purchasing practices, and I will say that by the time these Estimates are completed the Government of Barbados should know how many diabetes tablets they need for next year, how many anti-hypertensives they need for next year category by category, so that they can place their orders for the entire year, and they would get these drugs at a considerable reduction in cost.

I was in New York only the other day and I had a chat with one of those drug firms, and they have assured me that if they had a situation where they had orders that they knew would go into a three or four year period that they could supply the given drug to this country at about one-sixth the particular cost. So, Mr. Chairman, let it be understood that Barbados has always had a national health service. Let it be understood that its preventive services were completely free; let it be understood that 96% of its hospital services are free, and let it be understood that even in the area of primary care which is difficult to assess, my judgment is that certainly somewhere like 60% of primary care is in fact already handled by Government, and that it is only the remaining area which is handled by the private sector in this country, and that is the

area that the Government is talking about when they talk about a free national health service; so they are talking about extending Government involvement into that small area that was not covered before. I am not against it; I am just setting the record as straight as I possibly can, and also getting it straight not to expect national insurance funds under any circumstances to cover the total health service in Barbados. I doubt whether you can levy enough to meet probably more than 5% to 10% of the total cost of health delivery in Barbados.

Certainly on the United Kingdom experience it would seem to me that if you manage 10% of the total cost of health to the country that you are doing very well. They are now down to 6.7% and they started off in the days I think of Aneurin Bovan who pioneered this particular area of development in Britain. They started off at 12.7% and are now down to 7%. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: We are not copying that.) I am not saying that you are copying it, but there is a total cost and there is only so much you can get from national insurance, and I do not think that you have more than 10% contributions to the total cost of health to the country. Mr. Chairman, there are many more aspects I would like to speak on, but I will chip in on policy under other Heads from time to time.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I am interested to hear this debate on health, but I am really especially interested in the speech of the hon. member who has just sat down. In his interest I would like to tell him something. I am going to commit some serious interference with the Press. I am going to ask the Editor of the Beacon Newspaper not to publish his speech under the headline "Haynes does not Deny High Marks-up at Delaware Clinic". I would say that that would be an unfair presentation of what he said, but that little piece of interference apart, what does the hon. member.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of elucidation, let me get the records straight. Every patient who comes to see me in my office gets a prescription and is free to go to any drug store, and I have no idea what the mark-up is in the drug store at the Delaware Clinic. I believe there is a standard formula used by all druggists in Barbados at that level. I just want to get that clear.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I am sorry to embarrass the hon. member, but I hope that now he has been told there is a higher mark-up that he will positively advise his patients not to go to the Delaware Clinic in the interest of keeping down the price of drugs, because since he knows so much about the price of drugs everywhere else, he can quote all kinds of prices and say that drugs have gone up from 36 cents to 48 cents, from 30 cents to 40 cents, it is surprising to me he does not know the mark-up at his own front door, so to speak; but now that he knows it, I hope he will give a guarantee that his patients will be advised not to use Delaware, but to go to somewhere else where drugs are cheaper. I really think it astonishing that he should have a creed half a metre long from which he was making his points and reading his prices.....

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I want to make it clear to the hon. member that as a Member of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh I am specifically prevented under the terms of my membership from advising anyone to go to that dispensary or to the other dispensary. I am obligated to write a prescription and that is all I can do. I want to get that clear; so just come off that line altogether.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well I accept that the hon. member is unable to do anything about the captive market of patients who go to him and who will see the Delaware Clinic on the way out. One would have thought if he is so interested in the price of drugs that he might drop into the Delaware Clinic and say "You know I am obligated by my membership of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh not to tell any patient what dispensary they can go to or not, but I think you are charging too much for these drugs. I know that this drug should only cost 32 cents and you have it for 48 cents, why don't you bring down the price."
12.53 p.m.

If he is so interested in the public getting cheap drugs how come the Dispensary on premises owned by a Company in which I believe he has shares, how come that this has been discovered, to my knowledge, by the survey being carried out by the Ministry of Health? How come that it has been discovered that this Dispensary had such high mark-ups? How come it has escaped him? Anyhow I am not dealing with that.

What does the hon. member want us to do about the National Health Service? He has proved to us that in Great Britain the charge on the National Insurance was only 12% of the whole cost of hospital care as a maximum and has come down to 50% now. He has assure us that only 40% of the remaining primary care is paid for out of people's own pockets and he has said this. He has said that the National Insurance cannot pay the whole cost. We know it cannot pay the whole cost. We have not said that we are not going to vote money in the Estimates every year for the running of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We have not said that we are not going to vote money for the running of the Mental Hospitals and the other Hospitals. Does he not want us now to find some means of covering the remaining 40% of the delivery of preventive care?

If he wants to make a motion let him do so. Can there be no National Health Service along the National

Insurance line because National Insurance cannot pay all? Let him set it down as a Private Member's Motion. The point is that we are trying to save people's pockets of that remaining 40% or 50%.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I believe I was almost clear to point out that that was the only area to be assisted or covered by Government. I am pretty sure I made that statement so if the hon. member is now trying to suggest presumably for the consumption of the Press that I am making a different position I think he had better back off that again.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member seems very interested in my backing off. What is there to back off from in that particular instance? He is backing off the attack for the benefit of the Press on the principles of the National Health Service. He is the only person doing the backing off. He wants the Press to report his criticising the National Health Plan. That is what he wants and now that his criticism has been exposed he now has to do some backing off. I think that his speech was researched and the words I have no quarrels with.

The point about the matter is that we in this Party believe that primary health care should be delivered free of charge to every citizen if he want it and in circumstances a little more convenient that perhaps the Casualty System at the Hospital or the indigent system at the District Hospital or even the much improved delivery system now enforced at the Polyclinics. You see the Health policy stood very still, Mr. Chairman, in this country over a period of 15 years.

The hon. member for St. Michael South when he was Minister of Health was surprised when I told him that he would find that the statement in the Democratic Labour Party Manifesto for 1976 was very closely parallel to that of the Barbados Labour Party Manifesto for 1961 because in those 15 years what was done was the completion of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital but there was no initiative in Health. There was management, there was expansion but there was no initiative in the Management of Health in those 15 years. It was the same prescription as before but more expensive. The mark-up was higher.

There is now a new initiative in Health. People are to have free health with that element of privacy which is desired by so many not only our population but in all the populations and we are hoping that in catering to the wish for privacy, the desire to visit your own Private Doctor and receive your primary health care that we will be able to relieve the pressure on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and indeed some of the pressures ultimately at some of the very Polyclinics we are engaged in at the moment and in other Centres of Health delivery.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member please give way on a point of elucidation? I would just like to draw his attention to a document prepared by me in December 1972 which deals with the specific problems relating to General Practitioner Involvement and relieving congested areas and I can make it a document of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister would not know anything about it unless you now make it available so he would not be able to comment on something that is non-existent in his repertoire.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: You can rise on a point of elucidation to make something a document of the House? Nevertheless I do not know when it was printed or prepared, Sir. Was it in 1972 A.D. Christian Time? Not Muslin Time?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I do not know about that but it is December 2, 1972, whether it is D.S.T. or E.S.T., I do not know.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: I believe the hon. member can appreciate that if he makes it a document of the House that public money has to be spent in reproducing it in the Official Gazette. I wonder if he realises that? I wonder if he realises that somebody will have now to take up the taxpayers money which would be better used in reducing.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Sir. I am sure the Hon. Prime Minister does not mean that all documents that have been made documents of the House do re-appear in the Gazette. I think some discretion is exercised because they have not all been reproduced.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: They are supposed to be. It may just be that some documents have not been put in by people who are not totally familiar with the rules. The Clerk does exercise a humane discretion in dealing with these things. These childish exercises in themselves are a provocation. I cannot see it. Sir, as other than a very worthy aim to try to deliver primary health care free on the basis of the National Insurance payment of the people of Barbados. I cannot see it as other than that, Sir. I am really surprised that in a House where we are not divided along North American lines, there is no debate, no nonsense against socialised medicine as against non-socialised medicine in Barbados, and where 98% of the countries of the World consider that Health Care is one of the things that a Government owes to its people. The U.S. and some Canadian jurisdictions perhaps constitute a major part of the other 2%. The U.S. is socially backward in that. We are socially forward.

I am prepared to stand by that to the bitter end. I do not know if there is going to be a debate in here on a Capitation Tax as opposed to a fee for services as a way of the Doctors ripping off the Government and I am bitterly opposed to it and it will not happen in this Government. I believe that a Capitation Tax is the fairest way of assessing the remuneration which Doctors should receive. I do not know again if in fact Doctors are obligated to say so but what is frequently alleged is a false declaration of earnings to the Inland Revenue and there is some fear. They do it and I am sure that they do it.
1.03 p.m.

I was once approached when I was a young lawyer by another lawyer who said that he had understood that I had declared an income of such and such to Inland Revenue, and what was I trying to do, show up the rest of them. *(ASIDES)*. I know that if you look at my income tax returns you will find that my income tax returns were not falling below 35 and 40 thousand dollars a year back on 1970, 1971 and 1972 and you can judge whether I was evading income tax in those days when I tell you that they were the figures I used to return. But, Mr. Chairman, as I say, I don't know if that is in it, because under the national health scheme obviously a private doctor's income will be better known to the tax authorities, but we have even made allowances for that.

I don't know if the Hon. Minister minds my perhaps exposing my hand a little bit, but we have even made allowances for the fact that perhaps there is some under reporting of income. We are even making allowance for human frailty in the medical profession, allowing for that and deliberately pitching our charges at a level which will enable doctors perhaps to make a little more than the return that they make so far. We are being, in other words, realistic, we are doing our best in this matter in what I think is a noble aim to bring that final 40% of primary health care free to the recipients, and I think that the hon. member does us all, including himself, no service by reflecting on the Government's plans in this matter in any speech which he makes.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I just cannot understand what the hon. member for St. Thomas is getting at, all I have done in my speech is to identify the area of 40%. . . .

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Have you risen on a point of elucidation?

Dr. HAYNES: This is a point of order, because he says that I am reflecting on the Government when he knows perfectly well that all I have done is to seek to identify the only area to be covered, and I have made it quite clear that as far as I am concerned I am not opposed to that, provided it is done in a manner that is satisfactory to the profession and that would lead to an improvement in health care, and I am sure that no member of the medical profession would oppose it so long as that is the result of it. I want this to go on the record, because the hon. member for St. Thomas is being very very clever and he will then proceed to quote what he said, not what I said. I know him well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You may now take your seat. No point of order, it is a matter of understanding. You rose on a point of order in relation to your understanding. Matters of understanding are very personal things, your understanding may not be mine or the Prime Minister's.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Well, I am glad that in the course of my speech I have been able to elicit from the hon. member that he is in favour of the national health service, that the Government's plans are covering a portion of the delivery of health care not previously covered and that he is quite satisfied with the service as long as the doctors are satisfied and it is carried out in an efficient manner. Am I now misunderstanding him or misrepresenting him? I do not hear the hon. member. I hope that the Press and the public will take note that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is satisfied with the Government's plans for the national health service as long as the doctors' interests are looked after and as long as the matter is done in an efficient way. I hope the public will take note that he agrees with the Government that there is still an area where the delivery of free health care can be identified and that he accepts that the Government is trying to cover this area.

I am glad that I have given him the opportunity of elucidating his views so completely and making my understanding, your understanding and the understanding of everybody to be that he is not against the Government's plans in this matter. I have no need to say any more.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of matters which I would like to raise under this Head, but in as much as the Hon. Minister in her presentation ranged over the whole area of the Heads relating to Health I believe I could raise a number of matters here. Before I get into raising the particular issues that were identified, I want to respond to the statement which was made by the member for Christ Church North Central, I think it is. In his presentation the member for Christ Church North Central indicated that the Barbados Workers' Union refused to have a contract where garbage can be picked up on Saturdays and Sundays. Those are the words of the hon. member for

Christ Church North Central. I believe that when hon. members get up in the House to speak they should speak fortified in the information which they have and they should be sure about what they are speaking. The hon. member for Christ Church North Central for one reason or another – and I believe I understand very clearly his reason in this particular area – because to him the Barbados Workers' Union appears like a red rag before a black bull.

Mr. WARD: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. My staff that I employ are so well treated that they are not even members of the Barbados Workers' Union, so you are no red rag to me.

Mr. GREAVES: Maybe, Mr. Chairman, the Barbados Workers' Union appears to him like a black rag before a red bull, but I want to say this, that the Barbados Workers' Union has never indicated, there is no agreement which is signed by the Barbados Workers' Union with the Sanitation Service Authority, none has ever been signed, which states that no garbage should be picked up or collected on Saturdays or Sundays. This throws into focus, Mr. Chairman, this question about the five day week, and I recall very clearly that this matter was ventilated in this Parliament way back, I think, in 1974, at least certainly before this particular session took place, because it was at that time that this became an issue, and the issue arose out of a situation where the Barbados Workers' Union indicated that Sanitation workers if they were called upon to work on Saturdays and Sundays should be paid overtime rates, and this has been the position of the Barbados Workers' Union on this particular matter, and as a matter of fact garbage was collected on Saturdays and Sundays since that agreement was signed, but what has happened as I understand it is that the Ministry has indicated that it has no intention of collecting garbage on Saturdays and Sundays if it has to pay overtime rates, so it is not a question of the Union preventing workers from collecting garbage on Saturdays and Sundays.

The position is very clear, that is that the workers if they are called upon to work on Saturdays and Sundays should be paid overtime rates. I believe that now that has been clarified the hon. member would be more enlightened and I believe he needs a lot of enlightenment in here because I believe he is a little deficient not only in this area but in a lot of other areas.

1.13 p.m.

But let me move on to some of the other matters which I indicated I would want to raise in this particular area. I believe, like all other hon. members I think, that the health of this country is of fundamental importance and we have to ensure that we do whatever lies in our power to deliver the best possible health services to the people of this country. In doing so, there are obviously a number of issues which will arise. I do not think that one will ever get a perfect situation, but in spite of what the hon. member may have said, there are a number of complaints which have been made from time to time about various areas where health care is delivered. Let me just identify some of these areas, and I will deal with environmental sanitation first and will relate this to my constituency.

There has been a very irregular system of garbage collection in the constituency of St. Lucy. I have written to the Manager of the Sanitation Department for the North about this matter, pointing out to him the various areas in which garbage is piled up from time to time. There was a little improvement, but the situation has returned to almost what it was before; as a matter of fact, there was an occasion this month up to last week I believe – it was only rectified last week – but for over six weeks garbage was not collected in Josey Hill, Pie Corner, Hope Road and generally around that area. I drew this to the attention of the Manager and he promised he would see about it and the matter was looked into and the garbage collected. The truck goes around on Thursdays, but I understand it did not go yesterday.

What you have to recognize is that rather than patting ourselves on the back we should look at these areas and see how the situation can be improved; I think it is really scandalous to have a situation where people in an effort to make their contributions towards improving the health of this country by trying to be tidy find themselves in a situation where garbage is not collected and people forced to keep garbage in their houses, with the consequent bad smells etc., because if they put the garbage out they will run into the problem of dogs scattering the garbage. So I believe that this is a matter which needs urgent attention.

Continuing on this particular matter I want to refer to the dump which is in St. Lucy. I have had to pass there on more than one occasion and I must confess that I am not satisfied with the way in which that dump is kept. There are literally millions of flies, and when you pass there you have to wind up the glass of your car from the flies; and the stench coming from the dump is something terrible. I believe there should be more careful attention paid in order to ensure that the dump is kept in as sanitary a condition as possible. The whole point is that it can affect the people living in the nearby areas and I hope that the Minister will pay some attention to this matter.

On the question of cemeteries, I notice that there is a sum of money which is to be voted under one of the heads and I want to find out what is the policy of the

Ministry on the question of cemeteries particularly those owned by various small churches around Barbados. To give an example, St. Clements Church in St. Lucy. There is a cemetery there which I recall as a youngster was maintained by the St. Lucy Vestry but now it is church property and the church has the responsibility for ensuring that that particular cemetery is kept clean. But it is a cemetery which people of denominations other than the Anglican Church are buried in and I am wondering whether in view of the fact that it is used by taxpayers Government has any overall policy in this connection. I believe this situation applies to a number of cemeteries all over Barbados, and in the interest of beautification and otherwise there are lots of arguments one can use and there should be some indication from the Minister on this matter.

I would like to raise another question relating to the training of nurses in this country. It would seem to me that there is a surplus of nurses from what I have been able to understand. There a number of nurses in this country who find it difficult to get jobs, and I would think that with the plans we have here outlined – we hear about the implementation of a free national health service – provision would be made for additional nurses to be employed, because I think it is heart-breaking for a situation to exist where persons go to study a profession and then find difficulty in working in their own country; this is causing some amount of worry. There are a number of Barbadian nurses overseas who would like to come back to work in their own country but are prevented because of a lack of opportunity to practice their profession here.

I would like to join with the Minister of Health in paying tribute to the Barbados Family Planning Association. I think this is an organization which is doing this country a considerable amount of good in terms of its educational programmes and in terms of the service which it is delivering to the people of this country, and I would hope there would be a greater appreciation for the work of the Barbados Family Planning Association. In my own case I always make it possible when I have a group of students at the Barbados Labour College, whether they are from Barbados or overseas, for someone from the Barbados Family Planning Association to give a talk to them, and I must say that the Association has been able to reach out and meet the people in these educational programmes. We have to pay tribute to that Association and hope that it will continue to play a vital role in our national development.

On the question of occupational health and other environmental health I would like to draw the attention of the Minister once more to the problem of the emission of smoke from lorries and buses in particular. I believe, Sir, that you have had to drive behind lorries and buses, and I believe some motor cars too, and this causes a lot of problems. It is really a scandal when one sees black smoke which comes out and I think some attention should be paid to rectifying this situation. Perhaps we should determine the position of the exhaust pipe on these vehicles rather than having the smoke emitted on the ground.

1.23 p.m.

I am glad to hear the Hon. Minister say that on the question of the National Health Service we have to await the result on that. The Hon. Attorney General indicated last night that this is one of the Acts that he is working on, and I hope that the matter will be completed because this Act has been long in coming. I would implore the Attorney General to really speed up so that we can have it on the Statute Book as soon as possible.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, sufficient has been said on this Head as not to require a great deal of repetition. I have a number of questions which I would pose to the hon. member; and I would wish to say that I have to acknowledge that in so far as the Sanitation Service Authority is concerned with policy, that to a large extent in a number of cases much of the department has shown a decided change for the better. I have found, for example, that the professional officers in the Sanitation Service Authority are prepared to examine complaints promptly; and I would like to say that I appreciate the manner in which they have been dealing with my own queries and those of my constituents; but I would ask the hon. member as far as the area of the bottle neck is concerned whether we could get the service more efficiently and that the actual requirements be given priority.

I take the point that it is a small area and there is some difficulty. As I have informed my colleague there is some specific difficulty with the frequency of movement and I think that some consideration should be given to the answer of increasing the frequency of movement in the suburban areas, such as Parris Gap, Westbury Road, Lakes Folly and places like that where it might generally be said because houses are small frequency is not so much needed; but as a matter of fact those areas will need more frequency of movement because the houses are small; because putting out garbage on specific days at specific times will not come easily overnight. It seems to me that a daily collection will improve the situation. People like these get confused when the truck does not pass at the time it should pass. I have to explain to my constituents the difficulties.

There are some areas of policy with which I do not agree, but I do not propose to discuss them at this point in time. I think we will have to wait and see. I wish to ask the Minister what is the position with Dengue Fever in this country at the moment and to what extent we

have been able to bring it under control. I have heard Dr. Vaughan-Wells on the programme saying that the Aedes Egypti campaign has shown some intransigence, and I would like the Minister to indicate to the House what is the present position and how we are getting ahead with this matter. I have heard that there is an increase in leprosy in the country. I am not speaking in any alarmist manner, but you will know that steps have been taken to revise the institution; and I would like to know from the Minister if there has been any increase in leprosy in the last year.

On the question of Yellow Fever and the availability of vaccine, I think that we are quite short. It seems to me that a number of persons who went to get shots were told that they will have to come back under a particular grouping. I am told that there is not enough vaccine. I think that Barbadians are satisfied now that there is not enough vaccine available and are wondering how to go about getting a vaccination; because I do not think that it is reasonable to go for a vaccination on a particular day and then have to go back on another day. I understand that the vaccine comes in lots and should not be wasted. I think that a policy should be arrived at so that people also do not waste their precious time.
1.33 p.m.

I should like to know if there is any recent information from Trinidad on control of the yellow fever epidemic, and if the Minister considers it is not too sensitive to discuss, if there has been any actual incidents or suspected incidents of the disease in Barbados. If she says that is a matter she does not wish to discuss, it is all right with me.

On the question of policy I should like to ask the Minister if any consideration has been given by the Government, the Maurice Byer Clinic notwithstanding, to amalgamating the St. Joseph Hospital within the hospital services of Barbados. I believe the St. Joseph Hospital has given good service to Barbados. I myself can only say that I have benefited from resting in that hospital, and therefore would be the last to cast any aspersions on it or its administration, but I think that for economic reasons, I go no higher than that, in the last three years there has been a diminution of the quality of service which is available at that hospital, and I think that the Government should consider either (a) subsidising it or (b) absorbing it as part of the hospital and/or health policy, because for persons living in the north, in spite of the fact that we have the Maurice Byer Clinic, the question of quick access to a hospital in emergencies especially is of serious concern.

As the Minister must be aware, there is no resident doctor at the St. Joseph Hospital and a great deal of inconvenience and perhaps some pain is suffered as a result of persons in emergencies having to come all the way from north up to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the casualty situation. They can go to the St. Joseph Hospital, but they then have to wait the summoning of a doctor who may or may not be available, and they are in the first instance given qualified nursing care. It is true that the Sisters who run this Hospital are supposed to be a cut above the rest, but that is not the same as having doctors resident for emergencies. It may require no more than an arrangement between the Government and the St. Joseph Hospital that a doctor on the staff of the Government will be available as a resident doctor at that hospital. All I am asking for is some consideration, if it has not yet been given, of including that hospital as part of our health delivery services for the total Island.

Now there has not been much said in this country recently about a very serious problem, and I am speaking of noise pollution. As if to punctuate what I am talking about, even as I speak somebody with a high-pitched motor car is blowing his horn to accentuate the point I am making. I have found that among the young people of Barbados at the moment there is a need to speak in a tone and at a higher level in order for them to acknowledge that they are hearing you, and I have discussed this with one or two of the medical practitioners around, and they have indicated that they are beginning to notice this particular syndrome. It may very well be that the new mode of listening to music is the major cause of the apparent difficulties which may not be difficulties to them, but it is obvious to those of us who are accustomed to hearing in a quiet way. But the fact is that in Barbados the noise level has tended to rise, and I believe that the environmental people should start paying some serious attention to this whole question.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, in the area of family planning I should like the Minister to indicate whether in fact there has been any progress made in coordinating of policies between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health in this vital area of the dissemination of family planning information. I think it is a sensitive subject for parents. I know that many of the parents in Barbados would probably not like the idea of sex education in school, but I think the Government has to take a positive role in deciding a policy for the whole country, and sex education is not something that is personal; it is a community problem. In this regard I recommend to the Government that if they have not done so to give some serious consideration to a systematic programme of family planning education and other sex education within the schools. There is a lot of talk about it and I think that a clear policy decision by the Government would go a long way towards assisting those parents who have not yet come to terms with the particular problem.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that my time is running out. I have one or two more parochial questions which should not take long.

Mr. Chairman, one other problem which has come up and which I wish to advert to is that a number of the ancillary services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital have become costly so far as ordinary people are concerned. To get an X-ray at the hospital has suddenly, according to what people have been telling me, come to cost a lot more than it used to. It may very well be that people were not aware that they had to pay, but at the moment people are being asked to pay some fairly high fee for X-rays and other similar laboratory costs. $20 is the fee for one X-ray I am told, and I know of one case where the bill was supposed to be $75 for X-rays, and the man only had one area of complaint. I would like the Minister to clarify for me and the rest of Barbados what the position is now with these high costs at the hospital.

If the Minister can, I should like her to tell me what are the number of vacancies in the hospital at the moment for nurses and other para-medical personnel. I am going on to ask a question and it has to do with the supply of jobs for those persons who are qualified who claim daily that they go to the hospital, they are interviewed, they are told that they cannot do anything for them at the hospital, they have to wait until they hear from the Services Commission. I should like to know what is the position on acting appointments. If the Minister can tell me what is the current policy on (a) filling vacancies for acting appointments, (b) filling vacancies for permanent appointments, it would I think go a long way towards explaining why a large number of qualified persons, nurses, Registered Nurses, S.R.Ns, R.Ns, people with midwifery who find themselves not working in Barbados while at the same time there are statements that there are vacancies in the hospital system in the country.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Your Honour do now report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be suspended until 1445.

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

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

On Resumption:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: When the Suspension was taken the House was in Committee of Supply to which it now reverts.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: I will start like the former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Frederick Gladstone Smith and say I will be brief in this particular matter; I shall not be long, Mr. Chairman. I merely want to correct a few impressions which may have gone on the record and which have distorted the great contribution that the previous administration of the Democratic Labour Party had made to the development of the Health Services in this country.

Now in his contribution to the debate, the member for St. Thomas, the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance did indicate that there was no initiative in the Health Services and Health Administration in this country since 1961. Now I think that was a very elaborate and hyperbolic statement based only on the figment of the imagination of the member for St. Thomas and not certainly based on the facts of the situation; and I would like to identify, for the purpose of the records, some of those initiatives because I believe that we are capable of making political points; but I believe that there is no need whatsoever, least of all coming from the Prime Minister of this country, to try to distort in anyway the historical record as far as the development of our Health Services may be concerned.

Let me start in the area of Training. A bold initiative was taken by the Democratic Labour Party Administration in providing improved Health Services and Training for the Health Service of this country. We set up a Division of Health Sciences in the Barbados Community College which is acknowledged as already making a significant contribution; and more than that, it has a great potential for assisting in the transformation process as far as our Health Services are concerned.

Training was provided for the whole para-medical field so much so that the Minister is now contemplating the inclusion of Nursing Education into that Institution. I do not need to go through the Items that are offered in there because it is a matter of record and it is patently wrong for anyone, including the Prime Minister,

to say that there was no initiative taken in Health matters since 1961. Training in the Division of Health Sciences puts a lie to that particular statement by the Prime Minister.

Now I know I may get under the skin of the Minister of Health on this particular matter but let us take the question of these Polyclinics. It is true that we did not call them Polyclinics. We called them Multi-Purpose Health Clinics; and it is a matter of record that this was an initiative taken by the Democratic Labour Party Administration to set up these Institutions ' which would combine curative and preventive health care in a single institution for specific communities. The first of these Multi-Purpose Health Clinics, now restyled in Greek fashion, Polyclinics, was set up at Warrens. It is a matter of record that one was set up at Warrens.

It is a matter of record that the second one was initiated, the plans were drawn and the funds negotiated with the European Economic Community – one of the Agencies in that Community – and that was the first custom-designed Multi-Purpose Clinic, an initiative of the Democratic Labour Party Administration. We indicated, and I remember the Minister rushing into tantrums over this as she is quite accustomed to doing when unsure of herself! She rushed into tantrums and she rushed into print prematurely but it is a matter of record and the files of the Ministry of Health can illustrate this. We indicated that a Multi-Purpose Clinic combining preventive and curative medicine would go into Black Rock on the compound of the Mental Hospital, so-called at that time.

We indicated further that there would be an extension of the Health Centres at Six-Cross-Roads and at Christ Church and these would be converted into Multi-Purpose Clinics. We indicated that another of those Institutions, Multi-Purpose Clinics, Polyclinic is now the name, would be set up somewhere in the St. George/St. John area. We did not say the Glebe. We said in the St. John/St. George area to serve the needs of those areas. I have the information. There is no doubt about that. *(Asides.)* Do not get too hot! When you speak, you should speak very calmly.

I merely advert to those things, Mr. Chairman, not in anyway boasting about the programmes of the Democratic Labour Party as such; but when I have to advert to them, empty charges are made by the Head of this Government, the Great Combination, which is now quarrelling among themselves – *(Asides)*. Last night there was quarrelling among the front bench over there, one Minister against another Minister, talking about resigning, and all that sort of thing. That was going on among the Great Combination! They are not combining now at all! There are great problems within this Administration. They cannot deal with those problems. The problems of the country are too big. Anyhow, Mr. Chairman, I am not boasting about these things; this is a question of a political fall-out that you get. They can speak one against the other. There is nothing wrong with that at all.

Let me move on from the Multi-Purpose Clinics to the Dog Pound. The Dog Pound, now called the Animal Control Centre, the site for that – and there was a Dogs' Act of course introduced into this Legislature in 1975 during the previous administration – and I have dealt with the matter myself so I know the origin of that. I have visited similar set-ups in North America so there is no point claiming that there was no initiative in this regard by the previous administration. I believe that when one Administration takes over from another Administration that the new Administration has a lot of rope and a lot of scope to develop new programmes particularly in the area of Health, Education and Welfare.

The problems facing communities are so manifold that you have ample opportunity to develop your own programmes and policies without trying to deny the previous Administration what they themselves were able to contribute towards the development in those areas of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Animal Control Centre, the Dog Pound, we all know about that, and it must be a matter of record that an initiative was taken in that particular regard. No initiative? How about the Pulverisation Plant? That is an initiative. You can set it up now, but it is patently wrong to say that no initiative was taken by the previous administration. The equipment was there and it was an initiative to get the equipment here.

The rolling stock for the Sanitation Service Authority was an initiative to equip that particular outfit with some of the equipment that it is using today and putting it to good use.

We left programmes for the Community Nursing Service and when I hear that we are going to develop the Community Nursing Service it must be realised that Health Developments go like a kind of ladder. You make one step and you make another step and it is based on some kind of foundation.

2.55 p.m.

When the Democratic Labour Party came into power in this country there was a national health service – let me call it that – in this country, because a national health service properly defined relates to the cluster of services which provide a kind of protective health care cover for the citizens of a country to ensure that there is not only for the citizens an absence of disease but a complete state of mental, physical

spiritual and moral well-being defined according to the Constitution of the World Health Organisation. So don't come with those arguments, don't bring those arguments! If you are carrying out a programme in this country say these are the improvements that we propose to bring to the country, say we are going to improve the environmental aspect of the country, say we are going to take up the old cars and dump them and make Barbados a more beautiful place! Nothing wrong with that; you are going to dump them into the sea. But in other places of course they have big compactors and so on that the thing can be carried out efficiently; and it is only when you run into trouble, however, that you then come and try to duck under the coat tails of the previous administration and say that this was the policy that was there before.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. That is a most unfair slur. I didn't attempt to hide under anybody's coat tails, the hon. member has been talking for the last fifteen minutes about what plans the Democratic Labour Party left and what plans they didn't leave. In truth and in fact the Democratic Labour Party has rejected a lot of worthwhile ideas which were given by officers and advisers in the Ministry of Health. You had rejected the idea of the disposal of derelict vehicles at sea, I am not hiding behind your coat tail, I was answering something in the Press and I was not afraid to say that the Government of Barbados was advised by a certain individual during the regime of the Democratic Labour Party, but I didn't hide behind anybody's coat tail; man what you were too frightened to do I have gone on to do and I am still doing now. Since 1972 you had the advice about dumping the derelict vehicles and you played around with that and all the rest of advice that you had, so don't come in here and tell me about hiding behind any coat tail, you hid behind your own fears, you didn't have the courage of your convictions, you didn't have the respect for the advice you were getting at the Ministry of Health.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I accept the point of order. You will have enough time to reply suitably.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I warn the Minister, as a Minister in this country she must present a different image to this country. She should be calm and reasoned in these matters. Why are you getting so hot, Madam Minister? Are you afraid of coat tails? Don't get so hot, take it easy! You must give a different appearance to this country, you are the only lady Minister out there, don't get on like that, retain your dignity and composure. I am surprised, Madam Minister, surprised! Surprised! Let us move on, Mr. Chairman.

In the area of public health engineering – these are all initiatives – I have been dealing with this area, the whole question of the St. Michael District Hospital developing into what it is now, a geriatric hospital. We have discussed these matters and come to decisions in the Health Planning Committee of the Ministry of Health; a lot of work was done in upgrading that particular institution, and we have heard a well deserved tribute paid to the Manager of the Psychiatric Hospital, and I endorse those words. Of course the Minister may get annoyed that the recruitment was done in a previous administration, but the officer is a good officer, and the whole administration there is trying to cope with a very difficult situation. I would like to pay a tribute to all the administrators of the various health institutions in this country for operating under very difficult circumstances, particularly at the geriatric hospital, the Acting Manager up there has been very good.

I will not get on to the work of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Mr. Chairman, I think I will pause at this stage, because I can have an opportunity to make another speech.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: If I may be permitted to answer several points, Mr. Chairman, and to begin at the beginning, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central had a lot of high sounding talk and comments to make about the whole question of delivery of health care. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central loves to talk in superlatives, everything is always crisis, and he is always absolutely certain, and all the principles of democracy are always at stake. The whole question of delivery of health care is under review; that is the point. The hon. member, I am happy to hear, advises that the doctors of this country will welcome a national health service once it does not compromise them professionally and once they are satisfied that it is going to bring the best quality of care to the people of Barbados. I venture to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the doctors of this country are already compromised.

Our investigations have shown us that there are currently 52 general practitioners practising family medicine in Barbados. Of these 52, 33 are practising as sole practitioners, and then you have twelve of them broken into six groups of two, and then you have the other seven in either groups of three or four. It turns out, Mr. Chairman, that within the 33 individual practitioners there is only a total of 17 nurses or a combination of a nurse/receptionist servicing those 33 sole practitioners. The figures are better in group practices, but there are seven general practitioners in this country practising with no office aid at all, and it is not that the general practitioners cannot afford a practice nurse, so the doctors are already compromised about the quality of health care that they offer. I understand fully what the problem is with the doctors in this country; they are

worried No. 1, about whether the national health service is going to mean an increase in their personal incomes; they are worried, No. 2 about whether the national health service is going to affect in any way the relationship they will have with the Commissioner of Inland Revenue; and they are worried, No. 3, about the quality of care which the national health service will bring to their patients, in that order. Have no illusions about it, I have none; in that order, so I don't want to hear about compromising the doctors.

The national health service is proposing that the general practitioners within the national health service, those who opt to come into it, will practise within the concept of the team. We are proposing, as this document will show you all in due course.....(ASIDE). You cannot get my copy now. This document will show that we are proposing that each general practitioner should have not one but two nurses, a practice nurse and a community nurse, and that he will have also a trained medical records person who will look after record keeping and do other receptionist duties, and those three members of the team will be paid for by Government in the package which we are bringing to offer to the doctors in the national health service. So I don't want to hear anything about compromising doctors and that they are going to be worse rather than better off, it is my view that they are going to be better off. The seven general practitioners now who are practising without benefit of nurse, receptionist or otherwise are bound to be better off if they have two nurses to add four hands to them and a medical records person who will look after the administrative side of their practice, and that is only a part of the package.
3.05 p.m.

We are also proposing that the National Health Service general practitioners should have freely available certain laboratory services. Certain investigative procedures have to be done and it is felt that this service should be part of the incentive package which we will offer the general practitioner. Very few of them, if any, offer their patients that service built into the fee which the patients now pay. I do not know of one general practitioner who when he does a urine test or a blood test includes it in the $10 or $15 which the patient pays at the end – or with some doctors at the beginning – of the visit; there is always an extra charge for this. All this will now be built into the package, so the hon. member need have no fears about doctors or professionalism being compromised or about a lesser quality of care being delivered by the general practitioner in the National Health Service.

The hon. member went on to draw attention to the fact that health is part of a larger package; that development, generally speaking in this country presupposes certain interlocking relationships. I am fully in agreement with that. There are areas where health and housing must work closely; there are areas where health and agriculture must work closely; but there are certain things which cannot always be taken for granted. The hon. member made much of proper housing and described how certain contagious and other diseases might be better controlled. But the hon. member must know and must not overlook that improved housing also brings with it its own dangers and problems. Improved housing *per se* does not necessarily improve the health situation. For instance, we have had the continuing situation in this country where as people become more and more prosperous they begin to convert their chattel houses into stone dwellings. They have water services put in, and we are seeing, for instance, in certain backyards which now have water run into the premises, environmental problems which were not there when there was no running water on the premises. Improper disposal of waste water has sometimes led to pools of stagnant water in the backyards; often there is nowhere for the water to run off and you get a build up of stagnant water. So don't let us be carried away by sweeping generalisations that this will cure things overnight; we know different and so does the hon. member, and he must be a little more honest with that kind of statement.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the hon. Minister is suggesting that I am dishonest in my presentation. I think that stems from a misunderstanding of what I said. What I tried to point out was that there were certain infrastructural areas that have a major impact; I was not suggesting that housing would solve all the problems of Barbados. I think the Minister misunderstood what I was saying, that things like housing, food, environment, sanitation, water etc. are important infrastructural things that in the long term would have a major contribution to health.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, we heard from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central that the fact that our society - like many other societies outside Barbados – is becoming an open society is not reflected anywhere in the Estimates document. The truth is that it is not reflected as a specific Head in the Estimates document, but if you read the Estimates document carefully you will see that the emphasis which we are placing on this and the concern we are showing about this fact is reflected and built into the whole thing. The fact that the geriatric hospital now has its own head in the Estimates cannot be overlooked. The fact that the District Medical Officers' Service is going to be overtaken and expanded by the National Health Service does not appear specifically in that fashion in the Estimates, but that is a fact. So you will not see it written down in a note on the right hand side that you can say there it is. But our cognisance of it is built into the whole thing.

Now Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Christ Church North Central raised some questions. First of all, about the Sanitation Service, he made reference to the fact that sanitation is an essential service and ought to be a seven days a week service. I am fully in agreement with him on that, and I am hoping that the Unions in this country will come to understand that sanitation, like the hospital services and other services in the Ministry of Health, are essential services which the public is entitled to have seven days a week.
3.15 p.m.

The hon. member for St. Lucy rose and pointed out that the quarrel of the Ministry of Health with the Union has to do with the quantum of the five day week. That is a fact, and the reason why that quarrel is now suspended is because the last time I sat down with the Union I pointed out to them that although we had increased carrying capacity in the form of compactor trucks, we did not see the full tonnage of garbage collected; and until they could tell me that that was so, they would have to go away and come back again. They have not come back again. I am not convinced that the quantum of garbage collected daily in Barbados has reached a sufficiently high level. I am not satisfied that the expensive plant and equipment of the Sanitation Service Authority lies down idle in the yards of the Authority for half day from Monday to Friday and the whole of Saturday and Sunday. I am not satisfied that the Data Processing Unit, Mr. Chairman, processing certain medical records at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital can find it possible to go into the shift system in order to give more efficient service to our community.

I find it difficult to understand why the Union cannot see that it is in the interest of all of us, in the interest of the health of all of us that the sanitation workers should go on to a shift system working basis – working a seven day week. What the unions are in fact doing is denying increased employment which it will bring. It is a fact, for instance, that working a five day week from 6 a.m. to 2 p.m. we can hardly keep up with the daily collection that the taxpayers are paying for. It is also a fact that there is not a sufficient number of private commercial agencies to handle all the industrial and commercial garbage in this country; and that being the fact, the Sanitation Service Authority has to find ways and means of coping with the problem because in the end it will redound to us; and it is important that the sanitation workers should go on a shift system so that in the mornings we could direct ourselves to the collection of domestic garbage, and in the afternoons and evenings we could utilise the expensive stock which is better on the road doing what it was designed to do rather than lying idle in a garage or under a shed.

It will also be a source of revenue for the Sanitation Service Authority which, as the Estimates show, will be spending in this coming financial year something in excess of $6 million. It is time that the union faces these facts and let us work to give a service which the people of this island need and which the people of this island are demanding. The union is the only stumbling block at this point in time.

It was much talk about the noxious odours – the "Malodorous effluvia" emanating from the drains down on the Princess Alice Highway and the President Kennedy Drive. I know, because I have enquired what the source of these noxious odours is. It is the Bico Company; and I know that part of the problem some of the time has to do with the disposal of sewerage in these drainage works in a very illegal and improper fashion. These problems, I hope, and I have every reason to believe will be solved by the sewerage plant.

As regards the licencing of dogs which was another point raised by the hon. member for Christ Church North Central. He wanted to warn us about a public outcry if the Animal Control Officers pre-occupied themselves with picking up licenced dogs which were let out for the afternoon constitutional or for runs or walks or whatever you like. I believe that there is a third side to this, Mr. Chairman. There are two sides and there is a third side and then there is the edge to this matter of licenced dogs who go for constitutional walks and are therefore let out.

The hon. member for Christ Church North Central is not the only dog owner. I had two dogs and I let my dogs out at night to run. I do not know what one particular dog was doing. Maybe he was picking up somebody's garden, somebody's kitchen garden, or pulling down somebody's washing. My dog was poisoned. The other dog I do not let out any more. Now, if that dog had not been poisoned, and the Animal Control Officer had picked it up, I would have deserved that. Much as you want to let the dog exercise and you let it out, it is not fair that somebody next to me should have their kitchen garden trampled or their washing pulled away or their garbage scattered by my dog. So there are two sides to that coin. He must get a leash if he wants to walk the dog constitutionally at night. They must attach it to the chain and walk it. A lot of these people who own dogs need the constitutionals more than the dogs need the constitutionals.

Now, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central made a great deal out of the word "free" which some hon. members put before the words "National Health Service." Mr. Chairman, we heard in the 1960s about free school meals. From the beginning until this

day the children pay a token fee towards these school meals, but everybody still calls them free school meals. Mr. Chairman, nothing in this world is free. If you get something and you choose to consider it to be free, you may be sure if you are not paying for it somebody else is paying for it.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, if the hon.. member would give way for a point of elucidation.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: No. I am not giving away on any point of elucidation.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. The hon. member is inadvertently misleading the House.
3.25 p.m.

In this document, the manifesto of the Barbados Labour Party General Elections, 1976 – I do not know whether I can subject the House to the indignity of making it a document of the House...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was a document long before you came in here.

Dr. HAYNES: In this document it is stated: "The Barbados Labour Party Government will establish – and in bold print – A FREE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE FOR ALL BARBADIANS". I wonder if I can pass this over to the Minister.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: That is a fraudulent point of order, but it is nice to know you have the Barbados Labour Party manifesto and you have inwardly digested what it says. Getting back to this word "free", we have heard about free school meals from 1961, and the children of Barbados are still eating free school meals, never mind they pay the 10 cents every Monday morning. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central must not take so simplistic a view of the financing of the National Health Service. It is not envisaged that national insurance contributions will now replace the vote which you see before us and which we are currently debating. National insurance contributions are expected in large part to finance the new cost of the primary care service which will be the first thrust of the national health service, and the hon. member full well knows that, and it is irresponsible to get up and pretend that it is otherwise and quote percentages from the United Kingdom so that members of the Press may well be misled, because they do not make it their business to research these points. National insurance contributions are not going to pay the staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital; national health contributions are not going to pay the staff at the district hospitals or the staff at the Sanitation Service Authority. National insurance contributions will pay national health service doctors, nurses and other para-medical personnel who will work in it.

For all the talk I heard about the fact that we will be spending $50 million odd in the private sector and an estimated or guesstimated $70 million odd in the private sector we are going to hear that there is only a small portion of the delivery of health care left for us to deliver free. I do not know how far you can carry that contradiction. We heard how Barbados had a free national health service long before 1976; we heard how care at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is free, but what you have not heard is what I am going to tell you now, that for all the free hospital care that Barbados has had since God knows when, Mr. Chairman, Barbadians are still spending in excess of $2 million a year buying so called hospitalisation insurance plans.

There are a lot of insurance companies doing a disservice in this country by selling so-called hospitalisation plans to poor people in Barbados, fooling them that if they get sick they will be able to go to Pay Ward and live the life of Riley in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. They go around and soft soap these people with fancy talk. Sometimes it is as little as 75 cents a week, but the agent will go and collect the 75 cents. More often than not, and this is the rip-off, a poor man or poor woman who pays 50 cents, 75 cents or $1.00 every week or two weeks, and the agent will go to the house no matter how far he has to travel in the country and collect it, falls ill and then they begin to find out that they did not read the fine print on the policy to see that it does not cover this, it does not cover that and it only covers a percentage of the surgeon's fees, and if you have access to free care elsewhere, you cannot benefit under the policy. In desperation and frustration in more cases than you would like to believe, the policy is ignored, these people go into the Pay Ward at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and not a claim is made. *In extenso* $2 million a year Barbadians are spending outside of national insurance contributions for hospital care. You see, it is usual for the hon. member to get up and make sweeping statements that this is free and that is free. A lot of things appear to be free, but Barbadians are being ripped off, and as I said in the beginning they are foolishly spending money without recognising that they are not getting true value in return for it. $2.7 million last year these insurance companies hauled in in hospitalisation plans. *(Asides)* How much taxes they pay? That has nothing to do with it. The fact is that they are collecting $2.7 million and people are not getting service for the money they pay out. *(Asides)* They are not to be shut down; they are to go and sell fire insurance and motor insurance, but they are not to make this kind of living out of people's health and out of people's fear for their health.

I do not want to hear anything from the doctors about that because those same insurance companies employ doctors as medical advisers; so I do not want to hear anything about that. If the doctors knew that the Government can close them down and something should have been done about it, the doctors have an association known as the Barbados Association of Medical Practitioners which has a certain responsibility to bring these things to light. This has been going on for years, but I know it has come as a surprise and shock to a lot of us in here today. You see you pay 50 cents and 75 cents, but it adds up to $2.7 million.

Now the hon. member for St. Michael South Central also had a lot to say about fees at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the cost of drugs, but the hon. member was very careful, Mr. Chairman, to tell us nothing about fees in excess of hospital charges which certain doctors are charging for some of the patients who go into the Intensive Care Unit, another rip off. Here is a patient consumer going into his pocket yet again. You do not hear anything about that, but the hon. member for St. Michael South West put some bogus question to me about the cost of X-rays at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the fees for X-rays. The hon. member must know that persons who are in-patients in the public wards at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital do not pay for X-rays which are done for them when they are in-patients. Persons who go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital referred there by a private doctor are asked and are expected to pay for these services, and may I say that for all the talk about the cost of X-rays, it is a fact that of all the other places in Barbados where X-rays may be had, the charges at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital are the least expensive to my knowledge.

3.35 p.m.

If people can go to their Specialists and Private Practitioners and pay them $25 and $30 for a visit and those Practitioners want to refer them to the services paid for by the taxpayers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital they must pay $30 to get their X-rays done so I do not want to hear those bogus questions coming from the member for St. Michael South West.

Now if I may follow on, Mr. Chairman, Sir the member for St. Michael South Central had a great deal to say about the cost of drugs. He did not come off well. The truth is that he has gotten better off because in essence, what the member for St. Michael South Central has put across to us is that as a Doctor in his Office when he hands his patient a prescription it is none of his business whether that patient can afford to pay for it or not.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I said that I have a professional obligation when I see a patient to make sure that that patient gets a prescription and that patient is free to take that prescription wherever he wishes to take it. I cannot direct him to go here or not to go there. That is a matter of professional distinction between someone who has a First Degree in Medicine as a General Practitioner and someone who is a Doctor of the Royal College.

I also will take this opportunity to say that I have checked, Mr. Chairman, with Mr. Clarke, a well-known Barbados Labour Party supporter, who in fact runs Delaware Dispensary and he has assured me that the mark-up at that Dispensary is the same that is applied by all Dispensaries in Barbados with the exception that because Specialists prescriptions are usually of a larger volume, almost universally there is a 5% discount applied to most of the patients that attend there. I just want to make that point clear. I am glad that inadvertently a strong Barbados Labour Party Supporter got some heavy lashes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: It is not a Barbados Labour Party supporter that got some heavy lashes and I am not accepting any of that, Mr. Chairman. To my own knowledge I know that there is no consensus among the Pharmacies of this country on mark-ups. I know of someone who took a prescription from a Specialist in Delaware Clinic and took it downstairs to the Dispensary there. The Dispensary there is not placed at the door for nothing. When the patients leave the Doctors at Delaware Clinic they expect them to stop at the first Dispensary, the one by the door and I am not against Mr. Clarke making a living out of that. I do not care how much Barbados Labour Party supporter you are the Pharmacists in this country are not expected to become millionaires out of the poor health of the people of this country. If you want to become a millionaire you can go and open a Supermarket, you can run Mini-Mokes, you can do anything you like but not when it comes to Drugs.

That prescription had two items on it. The man was told that it was going to cost him $42 at that particular Dispensary. The man left and went to every Drug Store in Bridgetown. In the end he had the prescription filled at a cost of $19. He was quoted $32 by one Drug Store, Sir, that I cannot remember and $20 and something by another but I cannot remember the exact amount, but it was that kind of fluctuation in prices. So do not give me any talk about any agreement about mark-ups between the Pharmacists of this country. They are raking it in at the expense of people's health and Doctors are all part and parcel of that. The Pharmaceutical Industry, after the Advertising Industry, is one of the highest money earners and profiteering industries in the world and it is being attacked not only in this country but in every single one, so I do not want to hear that.

I am very glad to hear, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is well

acquainted with the Government's Drug Plan. This is the second time I have heard him in this Honourable Chamber alluding to it. It is clear that he knows about it. I know that he knows about it because of the points that he made about calories and about how careful we have to be about genetics and so on and so forth. I am glad that he is so well informed of the plan. He knows that even now it is in the first draft. I am sure and I hope that if he informs me that he wants it I would be very happy to make it available to him.

Now the hon. member for St. Lucy, Mr. Chairman, spoke about the Union's attitude to the Sanitation Service which the Ministry of Health delivers in this country. I have said my say about that already and I hope that in another place discussions will follow. He made what he described as a parochial point. He said there were serious non-collections of garbage in the parish of St. Lucy and he complained about the conditions of the dump at Cottage. I would like to use this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to answer those points. I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that there have been collection problems in St. Lucy and there are two main reasons why we have collection problems. One is, and I think I have mentioned this before, that the Sanitation Workers are still not picking up the tonnage which they have the capacity to do. The second point is that we have a fleet which has among it several old units which are subject to breakdowns and sometimes, more often that we would like, there are breakdowns and the garbage piles up.

If hon. members would look at the Capital pages in the Estimates under Health they will see that a substantial investment is being asked for for the coming financial year. I would expect that the hon. member for St. Lucy would give his full support for that. The problem with the dump at Cottage, for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Lucy, works in two ways. It is true that it is not the best kept dump but part of the problem is that people in the surrounding districts would not stop picking over dumps. We know how land-fills are kept. You spread down to traxcavate garbage and then you spread mole over that and you go on with these alternate layers. More often than you may care to believe the residents of St. Lucy go to that dump at Cottage and pick over the garbage, exposing it through the mole again. Exposing it for their health it is not good and for the condition of the dump it is not good either and it is not entirely fair for residents who live around there now to be heard to complain about flies and mosquitoes. We know it is not the best kept dump. We know that there are problems there and every effort is being made to control the situation. I am instructed that even this morning or yesterday morning, whichever it was, a Traxcavator was despatched to the dump at Cottage.

The hon. member for St. Lucy also inquired after the Ministry's basic policy in respect to Cemeteries. With respect to Cemeteries I inadvertently omitted to mention when I was listing the priority Legislation for the Ministry of Health that among those priorities we were asking the Attorney General's Chamber to finalise for us the drafted proposals for the regulation of the registration of Funeral Establishments.

3.45 p.m.

So it is not as though the business of the burial of the dead which falls in my portfolio does not enjoy some priority. In respect of cemeteries, I am aware that the public cemeteries are not in the best kept condition, and this problem has a history to it. The fact is, especially at the Westbury Cemetery, there are a lot, I mean thousands, of graves which were bought from between 60 and 90 years ago which have no owners, we can say, have never been upkept for sometimes 60, 70 years in which there is only one body, and there is a proposal in motion in the Ministry of Health that we should so to speak recycle the public cemeteries, starting with the Westbury Cemetery. It will not be the case of digging up anybody's grandmother, or anybody's father or uncle or child, what we are proposing is that those graves which are genuinely abandoned, which for 50, 60 or 70 years – in fact, the time limit I wish to put on it is 50 years in the first instance – nobody has tended them, nobody has been buried in them and we have no idea about the ownership of them, that those graves should be reclaimed in a legal fashion by the Ministry of Health and pressed back into use.

We are also examining in this coming financial year, Sir, the possibility of a small crematorium, not at Warrens but rather at Westbury. It turns out that with serious recycling at Westbury we can reclaim almost 5,000 graves, and it is my own belief that some of the acreage at Westbury which is quite unsuitable for conventional burial as we know it, might be quite suitable as what is euphemistically termed a field of remembrance for people who have been cremated. There is a chapel at Westbury which has been refurbished in this last financial year, and there is another structure at Westbury which was I believe another chapel which has now fallen into disuse, and there is the very serious possibility of a very small crematorium at Westbury. Land runs at a premium in this country and just as we are forced in urban areas now to go up, so too we have to be very mindful of the number of acres which are used in Barbados simply for the burial of bodies.

Cremating will not come quickly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that Barbadians will take to it in droves, but like everything else in due course people will see the health aspect of it and they will see that it is quite possible for a person's dead body to be cremated and

not have the kind of misconceptions and the kind of notions that people have about the burning of bodies. In India cremation is the national style of disposal of dead bodies. I for one, Mr. Chairman, would very much like when my turn comes that I can be cremated rather than be buried in a hole in the ground. I think that burial in a hole in the ground is not at all sanitary, I would much prefer to be cremated. So I believe that rather than go to a site like Warrens and put down a huge crematorium, not at all sure of the kind of reception that it will have among Barbadians, there is something to be said for the proposal which is under investigation now, that we should start with a small crematorium and see how Barbadians receive the whole concept of cremation, and it can be accommodated at Westbury in my view.

The hon. member for St. Lucy made two other points. He talked about the training of nurses and the surplus. It is a fact that there is a surplus of nurses in this country, and it is a fact that the national health service is going to absorb some of the better trained of those persons, but it is a fact too which we have to face that we will not be able to absorb in our health service all the nurses who continue to return from overseas. We know that doors are closing in the United Kingdom, they are closing in Canada and they are closing in the United States, and the Barbadians and other West Indians who are finding their way slowly back here, in particular to Barbados, will not all be absorbed in the nursing service of Barbados. But what I would like to point out is this, that there is a great need for other paramedicals. The programme at the Health Sciences Division at the Community College I believe must start as a vocational guidance exercise so that those people who have certain basic training might have their interest opened to other areas of allied medicine.

A lot was said last year by a very interfering gentleman of the cloth – I believe he is known as Polly, Sir – he had a lot to say about the fact that we were moving the Tercentenary School of Nursing from the Ministry of Health and putting it into the Ministry of Education into the said Community College, where it rightfully belongs. I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that opinion has changed on this subject, I have had letters written to me to that effect, and I hope that the changeover will go smoothly.

Smoke pollution is something which is monitored from time to time by the Ministry of Health. I don't think I have to go into any detail about it, Mr. Chairman, but I was happy to hear during the luncheon interval that the Barbados Workers' Union has now got new vans and that the Barbadian public is not suffering from smoke pollution from the old van of the BWU.

Mr. GREAVES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I would just like the Hon. Minister to know that the Barbados Workers' Union never had any old vans, we use new vans.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: If I may move a little more quickly, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. Michael South West talked about the frequency of collection in suburban areas. Again, this is part and parcel of the problem facing the Sanitation Service Authority. If we could only move into the shift system seven days a week we could increase not only the domestic collection but commercial collection of garbage. I believe that hon. members may have seen the new huge, blue, two cubic yard cans, the member for St. Michael South West may be pleased to know that it is planned that one should be placed near the Eagle Hall Market and that the old concrete bin there will be demolished to accommodate it.
3.55 p.m.

As regards the situation with dengue fever, yellow fever and leprosy: the figures of the Ministry of Health report that in 1976 there were three new cases of leprosy; in 1977 there were three and there were three in 1978: so I do not know what is the source of this new outbreak. It is a disease that has to be notified to the Ministry of Health. The dengue situation is that in 1977 there were three cases reported and to our certain knowledge two of these were imported cases. In 1978, however, and in particular during the period of heavy rain, there were 142 cases of dengue reported. We have never been on the opinion that the dengue situation in Barbados was anywhere near epidemic proportions as in other sister territories. It is well under control and it is part of an on-going programme. The Aedes Egypti mosquito is the carrier of dengue and yellow fever and we are fighting a daily battle against it. The Barbados situation with yellow fever is that we have no confirmed cases of yellow fever this year. We have monitored one or two cases very closely where people have come through Trinidad but nothing has developed from it.

The yellow fever vaccine situation is a delicate one. The vaccine has to be refrigerated. I think it comes in packets of three or four shots and when you open the packet you have to use all at that time. I think the hon. member is knowledgeable about this that if you have only one patient ready for an injection you have to dump the rest of the vaccine. So it is a very expensive matter. In the event of a threat of an outbreak it is always possible at short notice to get adequate supplies for an inoculation programme. But we were never in any great fear; the only fear was the possibility of importation from Trinidad, and that is why we had to take what were perhaps unpopular

measures; people who went down to Trinidad for Carnival not caring whether they got yellow fever or not and had not been vaccinated sufficiently long in advance had to report to Enmore or some other health centre for some time until we were quite satisfied there was no possibility of yellow fever.

I would not like at this stage to make any public comment on the relationship between the Ministry and the St. Joseph hospital. There is a role for the St. Joseph hospital to play and I am to discuss it with them, so I would not like to discuss it in here before discussing it with them.

Noise pollution is monitored on a systematic basis and we are quite satisfied that nowhere are our noise levels, even at the airport, above what is tolerable. The trouble at the airport is that even though they have been warned time and time again, the people who work on the tarmac will not wear the earmuffs provided and are therefore putting themselves at the risk of damage to their hearing.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the points raised by the Hon. member for St. Michael South merit any reply from me. The hon. member has spent the whole time from Monday morning acting as a apologist for the Democratic Labour Party, and I am not prepared to enter into that kind of exercise. Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 17(1) stand part.

The question that the sum of $5,195,976 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (1) Direction and Policy Formulation stand part of the Schedule was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (2) COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (2) Community Health Services – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of 1,471,968 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (2) Community Health Services, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (3) ENVIRONMENTAL SANITATION

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (3) Environmental Sanitation – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that the sum of $8,081,890 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (3) Environmental Sanitation, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (4) – NUTRITION

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (4) Nutrition – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I beg to move that the sum of $156,304 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (4) Nutrition stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (5) AMBULANCE SERVICES

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (5) Ambulance Services – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $322,840 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (5) Ambulance Services, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (6) THE GERIATRIC HOSPITAL

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (6) The Geriatric Hospital – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,340,620 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (6) The Geriatric Hospital, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE
(7) OTHER HOSPITALS

Head 17– Ministry of Health and National Insurance (7) Other Hospitals – was called.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I intend to be very brief on this particular Head. At this particular time I might give a little preamble before my contribution. At this stage of my life I cannot try to emulate previous speakers who may have forgotten that there is such a disease known as hypertension, which in some cases, if we carry on as we have been doing, could end our lives prematurely. I think we have been going very well with the Estimates and are reaching the end. I suggest that we control our tempers and ourselves so that we can end in peace and happiness.
4.05 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, in speaking on the Head, I think that if there is one person who is in a position and who knows the background of these institutions, it would be your humble servant. You will remember, Sir, that in the past with the vestry system of Local Government in each parish, they had what we called in those days the Almshouses. With the abolition of the vestry system and then the Local Government those members were reduced. I am not here to criticise the reduction, because I must admit that with the smaller numbers these institutions have been upgraded; and I am very happy to say that; but I want to make a few observations on the functioning of these institutions.

I would like to draw to the attention of this Hon. House that I find great difficulties from time to time in getting paupers to enter those institutions; and when I query it from the Welfare Department or the institution, I am told that there is no accommodation. In many cases, Sir, old people are seriously ill. They may or may not have relatives to take care of them at home; and therefore you can see the problems which we still have with us. This, Sir, can be very embarrassing to the representative of a constituency, and in this case I know that you, as Chairman of Committees cannot speak; but I have no doubt that you can substantiate all that I am saying here today, and therefore, I consider it my duty to let this House know that we must find a solution to this major problem.

I have made some notes here, Sir, and I am willing to make some suggestions to the Minister whom I notice for the past few minutes has been in a very placid mood; and I can only hope that she will listen attentively and will do her utmost to alleviate these problems. In speaking here today, I am speaking for the community of the entire island.

Now, Sir, I have investigated the matter, and I have been informed from a fairly reliable source that it takes approximately $11.50 a day to keep an inmate there; and if my calculation is right, Sir, I would say that is $4,197.50 a year. Now, Sir, the background of the inmates of these institutions is that they are all from the lower bracket; and as you are aware, they have contributed to the economy of this island in the past; and many of them are sent to these institutions by relatives who are unable to keep them at their homes.

I can only suggest to the Minister that her Ministry should have a new look at this particular issue; and I am sure that they can come up with some kind of scheme which would give the relatives of these people approximately 50 per cent of that amount to look after their old people, which would be an asset to the Government of Barbados.
4.15 p.m.

When one takes into consideration the number of inmates in the institutions and their demands, you must come to the conclusion that Government should give this matter careful consideration. Imagine saving approximately $3,000 per year on each inmate by giving their relatives one-third, one-quarter or one-half of the amount which it takes to keep the inmate there, and I can assure you that that will ease the problem because some member of the family would then be in a position to take on that as a duty, and I repeat the Government would be saving large sums of money only by giving favourable consideration to such a scheme. There are reasons why these people are sent there. As one who is from among the people I am in a position to tell you it is poverty. Their relatives just cannot afford to support them, therefore the time has come with all the improvements that we have been making in this country to do something to help these people by assisting their relatives, and I can assure you you would not have to face that serious problem, especially when it comes to accommodation.

I do not want to waste the time of this House because we are coming to the end of dealing with the Estimates, but from time to time I consider it my duty to remind the Minister of the point I have made here today, and I can only hope that she and her senior officers will discuss all aspects of the matter, go into the ramifications of it and give it very careful consideration.

The question that the sum of $1,244,958 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (7) Other Hospitals, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (8) LAZARETTO

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (8) Lazaretto – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $62,836 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (8) Lazaretto, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (9) THE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (9) The Psychiatric Hospital – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,275,450 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (9) The Psychiatric Hospital, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (10) QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (10) Queen Elizabeth Hospital, was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $12,183,879 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (10) Queen Elizabeth Hospital, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a few observations here which I trust will be taken in the spirit in which they are made, and I say this for this reason. I am deeply conscious of many problems at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital over the years. I myself have been involved in that institution and I dare say have made some contribution, although some people may not think so. That is not important. I should like to draw the following matters to the Hon. Minister's attention because I think they are very important. The first is the question of the shortages of drugs and supplies at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

Now this has been a very serious problem which has caused a considerable amount of concern to both patients and staff over the years, and I think that to be precise I should like to mention some of these, because I really do feel that these things can be avoided. For example, there have been shortages of drugs such as Aspirin, Panadol, Codene, APC, Flaminon, Butacote and Poustan. These are drugs that are analgesic, but they are drugs in the lower and medium range of analgesics which are creating very serious problems, because pain is one of the most frequent complaints with which patients would be faced in any acute institution of this kind.

In the antibiotic series there have been shortages. In areas of antacids there are simple things like Gelusil, Magnesium Tricilicate, but there are two particular series, one which I think I must draw to the attention of the Hon. Minister. There is a temporary shortage of a drug called Cortisone and a drug called Hydro-Cortisone in particular. This raises many serious not only medical but legal questions. For any patient who arrives at the Casualty Department it is a standard practice in an emergency to administer Hydro-Cortisone. This is a live-saving measure. In certain X-ray examinations, for example X-rays of the kidneys, that drug must be available, and I think it was a matter of gross negligence that there should be a shortage of that drug at any time because it could land the Government in a lot of trouble. You have shortages of plaster-of-Paris. This kind of thing should never take place.

Then, further, Mr. Chairman, you have the ridiculous situation where operations were postponed because of shortages of linen either for staff or for patients, sometimes problems with syringes and/or parts of anaesthetic machines and so on, and then of course tremendous delays in the laboratories because of shortages of coronary agents, thyroid function tests and inadequate equipment and this kind of problem like that. I have been a great believer in the promotion of these infrastructural services in a hospital because they not only help to develop their health standards, but they constitute a major saving to Government in terms of utilisation of beds and so on.

Then there is another area I would like to draw to the Minister's attention. Some years ago the previous administration embarked on a major expansion of the X-ray facilities at the hospital and I note that your Government is continuing in this exercise. There is no quarrel with that; I think it is in the right direction. It is important, and for years I have been saying this, that

when you invest in plant that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars and when you are in a society where employment is a problem, that plant should be working on a twenty-four hour basis. I am not talking about what obtains where staff goes to work at 9 o'clock and work until 4 o'clock and then they are available for emergencies and so on.
4.25 p.m.

I am talking about active service on a 24-hour basis. It is better for the machinery and it is better for the country as a whole. For example, the output of the X-Ray Department can be multiplied by a factor of 2½ and you do not need more Radiologists. What you need are more Radiotherapists employed on the understanding that they would work on a shift-basis because they are many people who would get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and go and get a Chest X-Ray done and then go to work or go home and go back at 10 o'clock and get an X-Ray done rather than to have the kind of pile-ups and lots of major problems like loss of work, etc., and I would strongly recommend that some attention be paid to this.

Now the Casualty Department is a headache. It is a problem and I really do not wish to raise any alarms about it because I am fully *au fait* with the problems there and I believe that the problems can be alleviated but I am not getting involved in that today. Everybody knows what the problems are anyhow so I would not want to waste the time of the House to get involved with that.

I remember once when I was Chairman of the Medical Staff Committee, although I really had more responsibility for the Casualty, putting I think six House Officers in Casualty on a round-the-clock basis. The net result of that was that the waiting time in the Casualty within one week was reduced to about half hour but I was shocked one Monday morning when I turned up at the Hospital and saw that the queues were no longer in the Casualty but the queues were at the Dispensary, reaching from the Dispensary almost right out to the road. When you make certain improvements in that area, then right down the line you have your problems and the other spin-off from what was a very accelerated rate of admissions to the Hospital consequential of the higher turn over.

There were two important points I wanted to make. One was the X-Ray and the second one was shortages of drugs and I would urge the Hon. Minister to give consideration to what I am saying here on the floor of this House, and what I have said elsewhere again and again, that it is purely a question of planning. These shortages need not take place. We know that the Estimates are coming up. We know how much money will be in those Estimates so all this can be placed preferably externally for adequate supplies of those drugs. I have always recommended that you have your orders placed three or four months ahead in order to avoid shortages.

Now another very dangerous area that has occurred in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is the shortage of intravenous fluids. You are on a very ticklish ground here and these are things that need to be looked at. Things like normal saline, dextro-saline and so on. These things are intimately related to survival under many situations. There is no need for that to occur. There is something fundamentally wrong with the planning or alternatively there has not been enough money. I do not know which is which but I happen to know that I had personally set up a situation there that nobody ever followed. It was a draft by the Administration.

It was approved by the Ministry. It was approved by the Administration but further down the line you could never get it implemented at anytime and it is a simple matter of knowing the quantities that you want and placing those orders. I hope that the Hon. Minister will accept these criticisms. Although I am an hon. member of this House and a politician, I also have a responsibility as a Physician and it is in that combination that I make those points. If it is not looked into, if care is not taken to make sure that this does not recur in this year, you are likely to land yourself in a lot of trouble.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong the House under this Head. There are two points which I will like to advert to. The first one is the Hon. Minister indicated that we have a surplus of nurses in Barbados. I take it that what the Minister meant was that in term of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and other hospital services there would be a surplus of nurses in Barbados, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I am now giving the Government a way in which they may improve their employment policies.

There are a number of areas in which SRN's must be available to a society of this kind. If they are not working in the hospital, there is absolutely no reason why we in Barbados cannot now look forward to the position where in several schools with over 500 pupils they should be a nurse. Every school in Barbados, Sir, where they are over 500 pupils, a place can be found for a nurse and there is a whole area too like the Industrial Parks. We have been trying to industrialise in Barbados. The Government is continuing the Industrialisation of Parks. We have reached the point where we ought to insist that there should be at least one nurse in each Industrial Park. We are no longer an agricultural society of the 1920's or the 1930's.

If we have reached a stage where we have qualified persons going around in the community and cannot find employment, we have areas where we can absorb this expertise and I find it rather strange that we in Barbados ought to be in a position where we have trained personnel in a peculiar field in which it takes some four to five to six years to arrive at a position of expertise and those persons are walking around not being able to find work. We will soon find that we will have a situation where instead of having a gradation from a surplus of seniority that we will move from one extreme to another. We have to be extremely careful that we are not in a position where at the one stage we are saying that we have a surplus and in a relatively short time we find that there is a scarcity of nurses because we find that a number of young people who ought to logically go into the profession deciding that since there is no future in that they would do something else.
4.35 p.m.

You have to be extremely careful that that does not occur. Related to that is this question of the filling of vacancies; I adverted to it in the second reading debate and I now wish to deal with it specifically. I am told that whereas in the past in places like the hospital the Director or the Matron or the Manager was able to make certain appointments based on suitability, especially acting appointments, that now this direction is coming from some political head – I do not say it is the Prime Minister himself because I refuse to believe that the Prime Minister would get involved – I am talking about appointments at the hospital of nurses and acting appointments, and that what is happening now is that a Matron or Manager can find him or herself in a position where somebody is being dictated as the person to replace somebody else, when the efficiency of the department requires that a person who is known to be competent in the particular field is the one who should go into that acting position. I do not know, but that is a consistent report which is coming out. I have received it, other of my colleagues have received that report, and I am saying that if the Government feels it must control most of the jobs in the community at the hospitals and at the Ministry in general, it is one of the areas where that ought not to be the general policy. It ought to be that those persons who work in the department who know about the capabilities, because as you will know, Mr. Chairman, a lot of people can qualify as nurses but not everybody who is an R.N. or S.R.N. can work in a particular area with the same competence, and for that reason of those kinds such as the hospital ought not to be dealt with in that manner.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, do I understand the hon. member to say nursing appointments or appointments at the hospital? He referred to a political head giving guidance as to who should be either appointed or not appointed. Is he referring to nurses, orderlies, drivers, doctors or whom?

Mr. TAITT: My understanding is that it applies to all categories. Obviously it would not apply to the doctors because the doctors are not in that kind of thing, it applies to acting positions for which the Director of the hospital used to have responsibility, that when they have sent up a particular person who is accustomed acting they get a directive coming back down from either the Prime Minister's Office or Services Commissions saying that such and such a person is not to go into such and such a position.

Recently in the Stores Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital there was an impending crisis precisely because the person who sent down a replacement for some gentleman who had gone to cut canes – apparently this is one of the practices, that some people go off to cut canes during the crop – his replacement had been a traditional person but on this occasion whoever sends down these people or sends them across... *(Aside)*. I am drawing the position to the attention of the Minister, perhaps the Minister does not know about it. I am told that some 18 or 19 year old boy was sent across, and when the other members of the Stores staff saw who was coming they downed tools and went searching for the Union or something.

I do not believe we ought to have that kind of problem inside a hospital, I believe that on the nursing side you have professional administrators, whether it is your Manager or Matron or what have you, and on the other side you have your Director of the hospital, and if it is an area where you wish your political people to get employment let it be known that you know a lot of people who need employment, if that is the case, but I do not believe that with the hospital the Government or the politicians should get involved. It is being reported as a fact by people who ought to know, and all I am saying to you is, if it is so it should stop. If you get up and say it is not so I would welcome hearing you say it is not so, because I would be very glad if it is not so.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the issue of the shortage of drugs and supplies at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was raised. Again, I would like to say that there are three sides to a coin, the front, the back and the edge. A lot of people forget the edge, you always hear there are two sides. We were warned in all this superlative language about this business of shortage of medical supplies and drugs. It is my understanding that there is a certain drug list, a formulary of sorts, instituted since February 1978 at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital which is circulated among doctors giving the names of the various drugs which are stocked by the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Dispensary. I am reliably informed by my officer

that for each item on that list there is always an alternate drug, so it is all right to get up in here and say how dangerous it is if there is no cortisone or if there is no aspirin, but if there is an alternate drug which can be used in its place it is a completely different situation.

I am made to understand that from time to time certain drugs are not available at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I know that for a fact, and I know why. Part of the problem at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has to do with the source of the supply, the Central Purchasing Department, which is a department which I abominate from the bottom of my soul, and because of the problems I have had with it from the time I went in there, a drug plan which is now in the making is not going to operate out of the Central Purchasing Department. I cannot continue with the situation where an officer at Central Purchasing will have a list in front of him and will consider that chairs for the Library is of higher priority than drugs, as mentioned by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, and that is why we are going to have our own drug purchasing department in the Ministry of Health. But I am saying that I know sometimes these shortages occur, but always there is an alternate. But you see, the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is not going to tell this Hon. House that consultants at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, many of whom see themselves as great prima donnas who feel they have all the solutions for the problems at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, he is not going to tell this House that a lot of these prima donnas insist on prescribing certain drugs or none at all, but you know that is so. I am not saying you are guilty of it, but you know that is so, so it is all right to paint a lurid picture of one side of the coin, we must look at the other side. If you are going to have a situation where a doctor is going to know that an alternate drug is available and is going to insist that this is his personal choice and the hospital does not have it, then his patient or the relatives must go down to Bridgetown and buy what he thinks the patient must have, in here is not the place to come in and complain about this kind of situation.

We also know that certain of the consultants at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital who use the private consulting offices there to see their private patients use the hospital prescription pads, and knowing that certain items are not stocked and that there are alternatives at all times, still send the patient to the Dispensary because they know that a certain price will obtain at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Dispensary as opposed to another price in town, so all that kind of nonsense goes on and the doctors contribute to it.

4.45 p.m.

The situation at the Casualty, Mr. Chairman, I have said in here before and on public platforms, is not going to be cured until the National Health Service gets going. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was designed as an acute general hospital. It was not meant to be.....

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wish to draw to attention that there is no quorum.

(The Bell was rung and a quorum obtained.)

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, Sir, I do not know what to say sometimes of the hon. member on the other side. He indicated to me that we had not got a quorum and I said I would get the members in. Yet he had to get up and parade before the Gallery about no quorum.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has got it all wrong.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both hon. members cannot be on their feet at the same time.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I am on a point of order, Sir. The member indicated there was no quorum and I said I would get the members in.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Very well, we have a quorum now.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the Acting Leader of the House finds it necessary on this occasion to behave in this manner, because when I indicated to him that there was no quorum I got the distinct impression that in order to embarrass his colleagues he asked me to do what I did. I am sorry if that is now what he intended.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You must withdraw that; you are imputing improper motives to the hon. Leader.

Mr. TAITT: I withdraw.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister may continue her speech.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, the Queen Elizabeth hospital was designed as an acute general hospital; it was not meant to be a primary care out-patient clinic; it was not designed to deliver primary care services. But as long as you continue to have this inequitable situation where people are paying through general taxes for health care, they are paying national insurance contribution for health care and they are paying out of their pockets for health care – some times in one family they are paying five different kinds of health care – as long as you have that situation where primary care from general practitioners is the general order of the day, you will always have a situation where those who cannot afford it will gravitate

to the one or two sources where it is afforded without cost, and until we set up our community-base primary care system where everyone will select his own family doctor and be put on these panels and if your finger, you foot or your ear hurts you you go to him – until this is done people who do not have $10 or $15 or $25 will continue to go to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and wait for nineteen hours or however long it takes – if they are genuine emergency cases they won't be waiting for nineteen hours else they would be dead. A lot of them are people who go for companionship of others, people who have nowhere else to go.

The point raised earlier by the hon. member for St. Philip South was the point unfortunately not properly directed to the Minister of Health but more suitably directed to the Minister of Community Services. But certainly you can't forget what has been described as the hostel that was handed over by the Ministry of Community Services last year, where you have people who are described as indigent who are not really ill but have no one to really keep them. They need a place to go where they can be with other people; people with whom they can communicate and have some sort of life. All that is built into the Casualty and no amount of high strategy or special planning will solve this. It will always revolve around the hotel system and reach back to the Casualty because the problems can only be solved as the hon. member for St. Michael South Central says in the community, and that is where the National Health Service is going to be delivered from.

As regards the suggestion about surplus nurses being employed in schools and industrial parks, I am shocked at this supposed crash solution the hon. member for St. Michael South West is suggesting. It would be a serious misuse of a nurses training to put her in an industrial park waiting for a woman to faint or get a period pain. That is not the function of a SRN. The real solution to that problem is to retrain these people in other para-medical fields where we do need manpower. But we do not need qualified nurses in every school; that is not the solution to the problem.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of elucidation, if the member will give way.....

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: I am not giving way to a point of elucidation.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, I think the Minister may very well be misleading without intending to do so. What I recommended to the Minister and the point I was making is that these persons who are trained as SRNs are presently out of work. These persons have taken seven years to be trained and the Minister has not indicated that she has a programme for training them in the new para-medical areas, and all we want to know is what are the areas in which she is going to train them and if it is going to be done quickly so that these people can get some work.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Do not take the opportunity to make a speech; that is no point of order.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The hon. member is getting on as if this surplus of nurses is a new thing. For years nurses have been selling baby foods about the streets and that sort of thing. So don't let the hon. member get up as though this surplus of nurses is something that grew up in the last year. There are areas in the National Health Service where we will need para-medics and other medical personnel and people who have a certain amount of basic training must be encouraged to look to these fields.

The last point about the business of filling vacancies. I have never during my terms as Minister seen any kind of job application or any kind of form to do with the appointment of nurses.
4.55 p.m.

What I have been asking for as Minister in very recent weeks is to see the list of appointments on a daily basis, if necessary, of persons who are being appointed to act in casual posts or temporary posts like maids and that kind of thing; because it has come to my attention that these persons, in 90 cases out of 100 have addresses in St. Michael South. I have never – and the staff at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital – can bear this out – I have never once written on that file other than "noted". I have never given a direction, I have never crossed out anything, or said "why not?".

The only query I have ever made is that an appointment was set down and recommended for a date further in the future than the appointment should have come up for; and there was obviously a typographical or clerical error; but I am saying this now. The situation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is not going to continue where people like porters and orderlies who go off on vacation or other kinds of leave are to be replaced from a list of persons whose sole qualification is that they must live in St. Michael South. That is going to stop. I tell you that straight; but when it comes to professional, medical personnel, I have never seen a form for them and I have never interfered with any kind of form, not even for the lowliest job at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

So they can down tools. They can go to the union. They can do what they like; but I am not going to perpetuate something that obviously began before my time.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clear the air with comments which were made by the hon. member. Now, I was fully aware that it involved two ministries; because I discussed the matter with the Chairman; but owing to the time limit at our disposal, I decided to speak on the matter. But I want to reiterate a particular point I made; and it is a point which should be taken seriously.

Now, I am saying that if it takes over $4,000 per annum to keep the inmate at the institution when those people go there through poverty, if Government could consider some kind of scheme, and give their relatives a third or a fourth of that amount, it would be an asset to Government. They would be saving money. The people who go to those institutions are agricultural labourers, artisans, and all kinds of people in the lowest bracket. It would also generate employment for a member of the family who may be unemployed, and through poverty becomes disgruntled owing to illness of the poor old lady. Consequently, they apply to the institutions and they get a negative answer, and in some cases, "there is no accommodation."

That is what I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and if it does not concern your Ministry when it is dealing with hospitals, I would be grateful if you would hand it over to the appropriate Ministry.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief. I just want to say that I entirely disagree with the Hon. Minister when she says that it would be a waste of resources to have a nurse in every school. One of the problems we have in Barbados is that there is not effective teaching of hygiene and health care in schools. *(Aside).* I was never a Minister of Education. Do not ask me why I did not do anything. If I get up in this house and ask a question or give information, the best you can do is to take it. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You cannot advise me).

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Let us have a little order, please, and cut out these asides.

Mr. TAITT: I shall not bother to advise the Minister in the future; but I do not agree with her that having a registered nurse on the staff of a school that has more than 500 children is the same as waiting around for someone to faint. The Hon. Minister may have left school too long to remember what it is like in a school of 500; and in most of our secondary schools we have 1,200, 1,400 children, and in many of them the teachers are ill-equipped to teach the things that a nurse will teach with ease.

We have been talking about sex education in schools. Many of the teachers who are now employed in schools are totally ill-equipped to go into it. I do not wish to spend a long time. Many of them are scared to discuss the issue. Nurses are trained to deal in those matters; but I am disappointed that the Minister, in the face of a suggestion, and in keeping with what happens in all the industrialised countries in the world, many of which she is alleged to have visited. I am disappointed that she would get up and consider that to be a waste of resources. *(Asides).* I am not discussing whether she went to the Soviet Union. I am not raising it for that purpose.

The other point, Mr. Chairman, is that I specifically stated that I did not believe that the Minister herself was involved. She could not be involved. Her name is not O'Brien anything. You have a gentleman in the Prime Minister's office. *(At this stage certain words were expunged from the record)* There are certain areas now where some people believe that they are "gorillephants". There are areas where in order to do something in this country you have to salute and form fours and tell lies. I wanted to be very cool, and not to get involved in any political histrionics – of a certain kind, Sir. I thought that we had agreed almost by implication that we would not deal with the new kind of "yardfowlism" that exists. It is different now from how it used to be.
5.05 p.m.

In the days past I am told that the odd politician could get the odd person in the odd job. Today even members of the front bench over there cannot get a man or women in a job unless they go through some gully-boar or gorillephant, a cross between a gorilla and an elephant. He is walking about this country checking up on everybody, he and his other friend, the arch-director of perversity, whose major occupation is intrigue, whose central direction in life seems to be to do nothing else but to create mischief of a certain kind. These are the kinds of persons who have been in the issue of work permits. I do not know if they have a right to do this; but you have all sorts of touts in James Street; you have other similar types of people who work as purveyors, who work as .... I think I had better not worry to discuss that, Mr. Chairman. They are solicitors, not legal solicitors; they seem to have no particular job but to go around soliciting for those on high, if you know what I mean, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is a little too high for me. I do not understand you at all.

Mr. TAITT: I am talking in the Estimates about this business connected with a hospital and how to get a job, and so I can understand the Minister saying that she does not know anything about that. If the Leader gets up and says he does not know about it, I can understand that. The Leader of the House is an honest and decent man.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: On a point of order, I know the hon. member would like to get a toe-hold to break new ground because he is talking a bunch of nonsense all afternoon. Are you saying that to get a job you have to go and consult somebody or go through some gully-boar? You only had one gully-boar to go through to get a job with you, and that was the hon. member for St. John. I do not understand what you are talking about. Sir, I must defend the statement which he made because I know as Minister ....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should really withdraw the allegation that the hon. member for St. John, even though not in his place, is a gully-boar.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I withdraw the term "gully-boar", that you had to go through the hon. member because all roads led to him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Is that the point of order?

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Yes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: No point of order.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: It is an additional point of order.

Mr. TAITT: In this case, this one that I am discussing leads to all roads. If you go down Black Rock you can find him; if you go in Belleville you can find him; if you go down on the beach you can find him; if you go up in the mountains you can find him. Wherever you turn in Barbados you can find him; he leads to all roads, this one I am talking about. I am going to finish with this because we have gone pretty well.

I want to tell the Hon. Minister that I have clear evidence and it is incontrovertible evidence, and I hope that no one will provoke me to speak about some matters I know which are not in the interest of this country, and for which I believe it is not desirable publicly to discuss them even in this Honourable Chamber. There are some things which are happening which ought not to happen within the hospital structure. I repeat what I said. I feel that the managers, the Matron, the Directors of the Hospital ought to be allowed in so far as the para-medical personnel are concerned to run their departments. The Services Commission if they insist must see every appointment; I am not questioning the Minister's right to look at them; the Minister has that right, but I want to make it clear that I am not accusing that Minister of it. I am saying that at the Hospital the Matron cannot put any nurse into an acting position until she has got a directive from somebody at the top in the Services Commission or somewhere to tell her that person X can go into that position, and if the Minister is not aware of that she should investigate it, because it is a different thing when you are talking about hospital services from when you are discussing some other services in the country, and if it is a fact that you have to get clearance from somebody other than the Services Commission, that is even worse.

The question that the sum of $12,183,879 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (10) Queen Elizabeth Hospital, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 17 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE (11) NATIONAL INSURANCE DEPARTMENT

Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (11) National Insurance Department – was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $4,936 under Head 17 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance (11) National Insurance Department, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 117 – MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND NATIONAL INSURANCE

Head 117 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance was called.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, there are certain amendments which have been circulated under this Head of Capital Expenditure and I would assume that all hon. members are cognisant of them. In respect of the Capital Estimates for this coming year, they are as usual very clearly itemised on pages 104 and 105. It is a long list, Mr. Chairman.

The Ministry of Health has a reputation for getting through the better part of its capital expenditure, and I really would not like at this time in the proceedings to go through this list item by item. I would much prefer if hon. members wish to raise a particular sub-item to get up and do so and I will deal with it.

I therefore beg to move that the sum of $18,076,000 under Head 117 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, speaking on these Capital Estimates, there is just one short point I wish to

make and that relates to the Item 8 – Occupational and other Environmental Health. I think this country has been very much interested in the question of the environment and environmental health, and apparently the disposal of derelict vehicles is part of that concern. Let me make it clear that I believe the whole of this country is in agreement with any programme that would remove any unsightly vehicles or other material from this country in order to make it a more beautiful place, and that these be adequately disposed of. The Minister has a policy for disposing of these derelict vehicles in a watery grave, and I am wondering if she can give us any information as to the cost of this particular programme to date. Tell us in particular when the programme was actually started, whether it is still in progress or whether it has been suspended, and in particular, what has been the cost for converting any barge or whatever vessel maybe used for transporting these dead car bodies out to their watery grave. I am merely interested in the cost at this stage. I am not querying your programme for disposal at sea.
5.15 p.m.

I am merely asking for some information in this regard and your comments on the programme.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to enquire from the Hon. Minister about Item 9. Yesterday I was happy with the news that a new Primary School would be situated in St. Michael South East and I know that a couple of hard courts were planned for down there. In this particular Item I would like to know if St. Michael South East would be getting one of the Polyclinics as itemised here.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, just one or two very brief comments under this Head, Item 1(c). I note here that there is a proposal to buy a mid-line echo encephalograph. I have no qualms about that. When you look at these categories of equipment you are really moving into the areas of Tertiary Medical Care and I want to say something here. We have at the moment in the U.S. and the U.K. many highly qualified and skilled people in a wide variety of skills such as Neuro-Surgery, Cardiology, Enterology, Gastro-Enterology, etc., and whereas one does appreciate that the Government might not be able or adequate to offer appointments for each person who makes himself available, it should have a careful look at either an expansion of the associated grades or offering facilities to people who are skilled in sub-specialities of this kind.

For example if you were working in the X-Ray Department on a mid-line echo encephalograph, and some one got a head injury they would not have to do any kind of invasive studies. The Machine would pick up that the person has a clot on the brain. Now there is one thing to say that there is no need for Neuro-Surgeons in Barbados, but the fact remains that for those people who *(Asides)*. – I said some people say. I did not say I said that because my position has been quite different because if one of us should go out there and get into an accident tonight you would have to get a General Surgeon to go inside there and it is like a mason doing a carpenter's job with all due respect to the General Surgeons and we do have those people there.

I can think of at least half a dozen of them whom I, myself know and other people who would have connections with major Institutions abroad with places of training and they want to come home, but they are stuck there and they cannot get a job. For example a Genital Urinary Surgeon. We have one of the best trained Genital Urinary Surgeons. *(Asides)* what?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Please, please. I wish that if questions are being ask of a member that they should come through the Chair.

Dr. HAYNES: This is one of the problems that has to be looked at, the question of Tertiary Care. Another important area is the impact that that would have on continuity of training because I think I am still a very young man and the fact is that I started my training in Medicine some 20 years ago and the kind of training that people are getting on a post-graduate Course in Medicine is so far superior to what we would have got 20 years ago. I think we may have the benefit of experience but they have now the benefit of improved technology that is important in the continuation of further training. At my stage in professional life I do not have to bother about these things. I can tell you straight what the score is and that is an area that needs to be looked into.

There were one or two other points. I notice something here about elevators. I believe that it is time that one looks into the question of passenger elevators at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital because those elevators there create serious problems because half of them are out of order almost every day. They take ages to get from top to bottom and there are a whole lot of associated problems. I think that the problems come when they need replacement and some thought should be given to that.

There is one other point I wanted to make earlier in the day and I take the freedom that is normally accorded when discussing the Capital sector of the Estimates, as I understand, and I hope that the Chairman will indulge me on this occasion.

I believe that the time has come when the whole management structure of our institutions have to be looked at. We have good people in charge of those

institutions and I have been pretty convinced about that for many years. One of the problems is how do they relate to the general service? I believe this kind of problem was raised in a different connection some time ago. Now I have always been a firm advocate that these hospitals should be run by Boards; that they should be autonomous and that they should have sufficient flexibility in terms of possibilities of promotions so that the skills required within the institution can remain with this particular institution at least within that particular area.

A Secretary who gets to know all the Medical technology may simply for the purpose of promotion be moved into another area and then she has to start all over again. Now the previous Government tried to grapple with this problem and they were realistic problems. I think there was a 1965 Queen Elizabeth Hospital Act, for example, that was passed by this Honourable House but was never promulgated because there were subsequent opinions to the effect that changing the employing authority from the Government of Barbados to a Board would in effect amount to the dismissal of staff and hence might land the Government into problems of compensation and so on. I understand that was the basic of the opinion.

There have been several attempts made since then. They are Boards created for these institutions and I believe another look should be taken at this and also to the principle of secondment of staff, those who are already employed by the Government. I believe that is a part of the arrangement that they can be seconded. It might mean that for a period of time you may have a dual discipline authority but over a 10 or 15 year period you will get a phasing out of the situation.

There is one other important point before I leave Health and it is this. We boast that we have 100 doctors at an institution and people of this country would be surprised to know that for substantial periods of the year, four to six months of the year, that the number of doctors operating in that institution and functioning in that institution is probably down to about 35%. You are probably paying about 35 doctors for not doing any work and the problem is this.

The problem relates to the Laws of Evidence in Barbados. I have researched the matter. I have made a perfect submission to the Attorney General's Office and nothing has been done about it. I have even gone to the extent of drawing examples in Commonwealth Caribbean countries such as Jamaica to show quite clearly that evidence can be submitted on a prescribed form. I have brought U.K. experience. I have done all that research myself and nothing has been done about it for years.

5.25 p.m.

Now you have to understand the size of this problem, and on any day the Assizes are on you can find perhaps 20 or 30 doctors knocking around the courts because they have to appear in cases and give evidence. In the memorandum I submitted to Government I set out clearly the experience over a particular period of time. I can think of one situation where I was called up, because there were eight doctors who were supposed to be present in a particular department and seven had to go to court on that day. I can think of another experience where a surgeon was called in the middle of an operation on a trivial matter, because someone arrived at the hospital to arrest him or something because he did not appear in court at the particular time. But it is a matter that needs to be looked at and it requires a simple amendment to the Evidence Act or whatever the Act is in order to release these people and make them available to the hospital. I can tell you that that is one reason why in minor injury cases doctors refuse to see people when they know it will end up in court, because you can spend three or four days in the court while your services are needed in the hospital, and this is a serious problem because you lose as much as 30% of our productivity. It is all right to say a doctor is on stand-by and somebody will call him when the time comes, but his whole day's work is disrupted and you lose almost invariably a day's work on that particular day.

It is not only related to the Supreme Court, it is also as far as the Magistrates courts are concerned right around the place, and that is another problem that creates major problems with the staffing of the Casualty and other departments. (ASIDE). The information is there, it is in the Attorney General's Office and it is a matter that needs to be looked at, and if he needs legal advice on which amendment is required to the Act I will supply it for him.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I shall not be long, I wish to ask the Hon. Minister a question because I am a little perplexed now, Sir. Earlier we were discussing para-medical training and I got the impression that the Minister said the Tercentenary School of Nursing was where it properly belongs, in the Community College, and now I look at the Capital Estimates I see "construction of school of nursing and the purchase of a truck, etc." under Item 2 – Psychiatric Hospital.

5.35 p.m.

Do we have to have a separate school of nursing for the Psychiatric Hospital? *(Asides)* Can I give way to the Minister so that she may correct the Note if necessary.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: You are referring to Item 2?

Mr. TAITT: Page 104 Item 2 Psychiatric Hospital. If you look across to the Note.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The Head has been amended and the amendment circulated.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on Item 7(d), provision of refuse bins throughout the country. I take it that we are going to be having some linkages and that these refuse bins are going to be constructed in Barbados. The hon. Minister will appreciate that from my experience in the field of Industry that is something that would particularly appeal to me.

Mr. Chairman, I see in the note that Item 8(h) "Token provision for control of oil pollution programme." It seems to me we need a little more than a token provision in terms of an oil pollution programme. It is a well known fact that our eastern coast is polluted to the stage where just walking on the beach one comes into contact with oil on the sand, and it seems to me we are at the stage, bearing in mind that a great portion of our income comes from tourism, we ought to be in a position of doing something more than tokenism in the field of oil pollution control. I will ask the hon. Minister in the event that one of those super tankers that pass relatively close to Barbados should have an accident, what is the present position of Barbados in dealing with the oil pollution? I do not understand why you have only a token provision. I would have thought that we would see steps being taken to clean up the east coast and to deal with any emergencies arising from pollution.

I see also the Note at Item 10(b) "Institutional study of Water and Sewerage Authority." I am a little confused about this. What is it you are suggesting? That you are going to do a study on water and sewerage? It is my understanding that this Authority is scheduled to come into effect in October, 1979. What are you telling me about a study when the Authority is to come into effect shortly? It is well known that the hon. member for St. Michael South signed documents which instituted all that relates to the Sewerage Authority.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would not like the hon. member to mislead this House or the public of Barbados. He must not make his speech in halves but in wholes; he must go on to say that the hon. member in signing that agreement will cause the people of Barbados to pay 100% increase in water rates by 1981 or 1982. If he wants to make a play about honouring the agreement he must also say that water rates will go up by 100% .

Mr. TAITT: As I was saying, Sir, the hon. member for St. Michael South signed an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank. When the hon. member signed the agreement with the IADB the member did not commit the IADB to do anything about an increase in the water rate. And you will recall that soon after they came into power the Government over there tried to give the people of this country the impression that the water rate bills which they carried up was as a result of the activities of the hon. member.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I warn the hon. member to keep out of this. The DLP Government misled the people of this country about the sewerage project and are still continuing to do so. When the hon. member for St. Michael South was Minister of Health in April, 1976, he signed an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank, and it is part and parcel of that agreement that an institutional study be done, and following on that a Water and Sewerage Authority must be set up.

Mr. TAITT: The point I am trying to make is that after they came into power they said that because we had signed the agreement the water rates would have to go up.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: The hon. member is still seeking to mislead this House. The Government does not intend that the whole burden of increased water rates should be put on the backs of the people of this country at one time. The Government intends to phase in these rates and the hon. member well knows this.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, I am certain that they attempted to give the impression that the increase in water rates, and as mentioned in his budget by the Minister of Finance was the result of the signing of the agreement. Now they come here telling us about a vote for an institutional study. The institution itself is going to be set up on 1st October, 1979 and they are telling us they want money for the study when they know the Authority has to be set up under the terms of the agreement on 1st October, 1979. This is all part of the problem relating to credibility giving one set of information at one time and a different set of information at another time.

Mr. Chairman, the other point I want to raise on the construction of the Bridgetown Sewerage Project at a cost of $10 million – Item 10(a). I would like to know from the hon. Minister why this project which was negotiated and decided on has suddenly taken a cost increase of so high a percentage that it goes beyond what can be considered normal. I would also like to know from the Minister who had indicated to her constituents on a previous occasion that she would not move them from the site and that they should not be moved under any circumstances, I would like to know why they were removed.

Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not believe that the hon. member for St.

Michael South West ever attended a meeting at which I spoke and he is not to misrepresent what I said. I was trying to put over to the people of the City that the matter was signed, sealed and delivered and I said that Emmerton was not the best place for the project.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, the sewerage project is one to which a great deal of thought was given. I recall of my own knowledge when the experts came down they selected three sites for the project – one at the Harbour Industrial Park, one at the exit of the river that flows through my constituency – Indian River I think – and the third site, which was the first priority, is where the project is to be sited now.
5.45 p.m.

Sufficient and good reason was given, but the hon. member – I heard it with my own ears. (Hon. Miss B. A. MILLER: You lie). You heard that Mr. Chairman? She said "you lie". You did not hear that?

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I did not hear that. I heard her saying something about blood.

Mr. TAITT: The constituents with whom she will be discussing this matter next time will tell her if I am lying or not. The point is that they will not be the people from the area of the constituency because she promised them that they would not be moved and they were moved. Now, the hon. member for Christ Church West – after last night I do not expect him to run again.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Will you stop the hon. member from talking garbage and sewerage all afternoon?

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman...

Mr. CHAIRMAN: In about 30 seconds.

Mr. TAITT: I am winding up. The Prime Minister did not ask me to resign. He asked the hon. member to resign. Why does he not resign?

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: The Prime Minister never asked me to resign. I being a man, and he being a man, he should have been in a position to stand up to his Prime Minister.

Mr. TAITT: If you had a shred of self respect you would resign and not let the Prime Minister treat you like a door mat.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE rose.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Both members cannot be on their feet at the same time. Both members will take their seats, now. The hon. member's time has expired. I will now hear the hon. member for St. Joseph.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for having watched the clock and appreciating that there is somebody on this side who wants to talk. Mr. Chairman, I have 15 minutes to do my job and I hope to do it in less than 15 minutes. The President of the Democratic Labour Party opened these Estimates by talking about toilet paper.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, we have not got any leader of any Democratic Labour Party in here. He must be talking about another DLP. *(Cheers).*

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Thank you, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I knew long ago that there was only one leader of the Democratic Labour Party, and that is the old man; and when he is not in here there is no other leader.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I am saying with all due respect to you that all members are representatives of constituencies, and they should be addressed that way in here and not as any leader of any party.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I will bow to the wishes of the member for St. Philip South.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I want to hear something about Health.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: The hon. member for St. Michael South West, in opening these Estimates, started the discussion with toilet paper. You only use toilet paper in one place. He proceeded to Health and he ended up on sewerage. In between there was sewerage, garbage and then stench.

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Clearly that was most foul mouthed and offensive.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will have you to withdraw that because you are imputing that I am allowing this because of my position in the Chair. You will withdraw the words starting with "garbage" and ending with "sewerage". I will ask hon. members to try and confine their remarks to the item under Head 117, and keep this debate on a level keel.

Mr. TAITT: Sir, he also said that after having referred to toilet paper, what the hon. member had said left a stench. The imputation was obvious.

Mr. Chairman, there were certain imputations in the last part of what the Hon. Minister for Communications and Works was saying, and I would ask the hon. member

to withdraw those imputations, those imputations about garbage and stench.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw any imputation. All I am saying is that from that bench we heard about stench, we heard about garbage and in between was rubbish; and it ended up with toilet paper.

Now, I want to deal with the hon. member for St. Michael South Central quickly because I believe that the Minister of Health should reply. Now, I have heard the Leader of Government Business in here say that he is an alarmist. Now he comes in here to claim that the reason for the breakdown in the Casualty at the Hospital is because doctors go to court. Now, I was a practising lawyer.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I never said anything of the kind. All I did was to draw to the attention of the House a matter which was of grave concern to me for many years, that it was a misuse of public funds to have a proportion of junior staff usually, hanging around the courts; and that amendments to the Evidence Act which I had researched in conjunction with legal officers in Government and one or two persons on the bench were necessary; and I believe that in my private capacity at the time I had discussed that matter with the present Attorney General of Barbados. I believe that I sought his advice on the matter. I am saying that there should be a better utilisation of staff. I do not wish to be misrepresented in that way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I take your point of order.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, you know as well as anybody else that I have complained as a practising lawyer that cases have been held up because doctors could come to the Court, to give evidence and go back in the space of half an hour. When I was in the Opposition and asked for an amendment to the Evidence Act to stop people from queuing up in the Courtyard to apply for rum licences and to stop doctors coming to give evidence, the present leader of the Opposition told me that I could not run the Government, and that I did not know what I was talking about. Now there is dishonesty of coming at this stage and asking us to do things which they refused to do.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I object to the word "dishonesty".

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that he was dishonest if he knows that he is dishonest.....

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is suggesting to this Hon. House that I have been dishonest in making my presentations in view of the fact that he was making representations when I was not a member of this House.

5.55 p.m.

I think it is certainly reflecting on my integrity as a member, and I ask him to withdraw, and I hope you also ask that they be expunged from the records.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: That is an area of my discretion; you cannot help me to exercise that. The hon. member for St. Joseph has in fact used the word "dishonesty" in relation to members on the other side without naming anyone in particular. I do not believe that it is necessary to identify any particular person and I rule that the words are capable of affecting all the members on that side and that they constitute a reflection against those hon. members. I would ask the Hon. Minister to withdraw the allegation of dishonesty.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: I withdraw the allegation of dishonesty, but I now say that the members on the other side including the hon. member who protested, not only has he been a member of the Democratic Labour Party, not only has he been a member of the Executive Council of the D.L.P., but he was the personal physician and personal friend of the then Prime Minister of this country at the given time, and he has said in this very House what he has been recommending to the D.L.P. from 1970 and they did not do it, so when he comes in here today and tells us that the hospital is suffering as a result of doctors being withdrawn, I say again that there is a lot to be discerned in the real ambition of that hon. member. I go further. As regards the hon. member for St. Michael South West, when he talks about sewage rates, water still belongs to M.C.W. up to this day and until it moves I am responsible for it, and he full well knows that had it not been for a document which found its way into the hands of the then Opposition party which was brought out in a Budget debate in this House, the people in Barbados would not have known that the then hon. member who signed the agreement had agreed to raise the water rates in this country by 500%.

Mr. TAITT: On a point of order, the hon. member is suggesting.....

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to your attention that it is 6 o'clock.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: At this moment I can entertain no more debate on the Estimates,

The question that the sum of $18,076,000 under Head 117 – Ministry of Health and National Insurance, as amended, stand part of the Schedule, was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

HEAD 7 – AUDIT

Head 7 – Audit – was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $91,790 under Head 7 – Audit, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,213,890 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (1) Direction and Policy Formulation, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (2) AGRICULTURAL FARMS AND STATIONS

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (2) Agricultural Farms and Stations – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $410,575 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (2) Agricultural Farms and Stations, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (3) AGRICULTURAL EXTENSIONS

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (3) Agricultural Extensions – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $738,750 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (3) Agricultural Extensions, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (4) AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (4) Agricultural Research – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,322,490 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (4) Agricultural Research, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (5) MARKETS

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (5) Markets, was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $365,294 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (5) Markets, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (6) LAND DEVELOPMENT AND SOIL CONSERVATION

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (6) Land Development and Soil Conservation – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,031,998 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (6) Land Development and Soil Conservation, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (7) PLANT PROTECTION

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (7) Plant Protection – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $426,718 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (7) Plant Protection, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (8) FISHERIES

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (8) Fisheries – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $177,185 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (8) Fisheries, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (9) LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (9) Livestock Development – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,137,962 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (9) Livestock Development, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (10) ANALYTICAL SERVICES

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (10) Analytical Services – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $67,879 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (10) Analytical Services, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (11) METEOROLOGY

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (11) Meteorology – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $138,884 under Head 9 -- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (11) Meteorology, as amended, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (12) COOPERATIVES DEVELOPMENT

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (12) Co-operatives Development – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $22,678 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (12) Co-operatives Development, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (13) PRICE CONTROL

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (13) Price Control – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $169,292 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (13) Price Control, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (14) PUBLIC UTILITIES

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (14) Public Utilities – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $82,981 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (14) Public Utilities, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (15) BARBADOS MARKETING CORPORATION

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (15) Barbados Marketing Corporation – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $400,000 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (15) Barbados Marketing Corporation, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 9 – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (16) AGRICULTURAL CREDIT BANK

Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (16) Agricultural Credit Bank – was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $6,410 under Head 9 – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs (16) Agricultural Credit Bank, stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

6.05 p.m.

HEAD 109 – CAPITAL – MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS – AS AMENDED

Head 109 – Capital – Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer Affairs as amended in the sum of $9,862,200 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 109 as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 11(1) – SUPREME COURT

Head 11(1) – Supreme Court – in the sum of $245,384 – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11(1) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 11(2) – MAGISTRATES' COURTS

Head 11(2) – Magistrates' Courts – in the sum of $137,842 – was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 11(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 12 – MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM AND INDUSTRY – (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 12 – Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry – (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – in the sum of $771,558 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12(1) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 12(2) INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Head 12(2) – Industrial Development – in the sum of $1,700,000 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 12(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 112 – CAPITAL – MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM AND INDUSTRY

Head 112 – Capital – Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry – in the sum of $7,890,100 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 112 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 13 – MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM AND INDUSTRY – (1) CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION – AS AMENDED

Head 13 – Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry – (1) Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – as amended – in the sum of $3,885,729 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 13(1) as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 13 – MINISTRY OF TRADE, TOURISM AND INDUSTRY – (2) TOURISM – AS AMENDED

Head 13 – Ministry of Trade, Tourism and Industry – (2) Tourism – as amended – in the sum of $5,213,000 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 13(2) as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 113 – CAPITAL – CIVIL AVIATION AND TOURISM DIVISION

Head 113 – Capital – Civil Aviation and Tourism Division – in the sum of $13,382,729 was called.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 113 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS – (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION – AS AMENDED

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works – (1) Direction and Policy Formulation – as amended – in the sum of $6,995, 409 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14 (1) as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS – (2) PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works – (2) Public Buildings – in the sum of $2,519,900 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS – (3) ROADS, CAR PARKS AND BUS STANDS

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works – (3) Roads, Car Parks and Bus Stands – in the sum of $9,545,508 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(3) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS – (4) VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT WORKSHOP

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works – (4) Vehicles and Equipment Workshop – in the sum of $3,009,621 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(4) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (5) DRAINAGE AND SAFETY

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (5) Drainage and Safety – in the sum of $1,001,000 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(5) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (6) TELECOMMUNICATIONS UNIT

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (6) Telecommunications Unit – in the sum of $19,962 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(6) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OE COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (7) ELECTRICAL ENGINEER'S DEPARTMENT

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (7) Electrical Engineer's Department – in the sum of $216,800 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(7) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 14 – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS (8) WATER RESOURCES

Head 14 – Ministry of Communications and Works (8) Water Resources – in the sum of $10,594,331 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 14(8) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 114 – CAPITAL – MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS AND WORKS – AS AMENDED

Head 114 – Capital – Ministry of Communications and Works – as amended – in the sum of $19,936,226 was called.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 114 – Capital – as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 16 – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (1) GENERAL – AS AMENDED

Head 16 – Ministry of External Affairs (1) General – as amended – in the sum of $4,961,481 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16(1) as amended stand part.

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

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

HEAD 16 – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS – (2) CONTRIBUTIONS

Head 16 – Ministry of External Affairs – (2) Contributions – in the sum of $2,308,637 was called.

Hon H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 16(2) stand part.

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

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

HEAD 116 – CAPITAL – MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Head 116 – Capital – Ministry of External Affairs – in the sum of $532,832 was called.

Hon. H. deB. FORDE: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 116 stand part.

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

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

HEAD 18 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LAND AND THE ENVIRONMENT (1) DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Head 18 – Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment (1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – in the sum of $364,887 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Head 18(1) stand part.

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

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

6.15 p.m.

MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT HEAD 18(2) – CAVES AUTHORITY

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $42,576 under Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – Head 18(2) – Caves Authority – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT HEAD 18(3) – LANDS AND SURVEYS DEPARTMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $276,291 under Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – Head 18(3) – Lands and Surveys Department – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT HEAD 18(4) – PARKS AND BEACHES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,352,436 under Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – Head 18(4) – Parks and Beaches – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF HQUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT HEAD 18(5) – NATIONAL HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $3,292,403 under Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – Head 18(5) – National Housing Corporation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT HEAD 18(6) – TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $96,654 under Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – Head 18(6) – Town and Country Planning – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 118 – MINISTRY OF HOUSING, LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $16,028,750 under Capital Expenditure – Head 118 – Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES HEAD 19(1) – DIRECTION AND POLICY FORMULATION

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $4,509,406 under Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Head 19(1) – Direction and Policy Formulation – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES HEAD 19(2) – LABOUR DEPARTMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $77,276 under Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Head 19(2) – Labour Department – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES HEAD 19(3) – WELFARE

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $19,867,968 under Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Head 19(3) – Welfare – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES HEAD 19(4) – YOUTH AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $284,834 under Ministry of Labour and Community Services – Head 19(4) – Youth and Community Development – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

HEAD 119 – MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,410,950 under Capital Expenditure – Head 119 – Ministry of Labour and Community Services, as amended – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND PLANNING HEAD 20 – PENSIONS

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $5,000,500 under Ministry of Finance and Planning – Head 20 – Pensions – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

HEAD 22 – LOANS AND ADVANCES

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $1,100,000 under Head 22 – Loans and Advances – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

ANNEXED ESTIMATES

HEAD 1 – POST OFFICE

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the sum of $2,918,850 under Annexed Estimates – Head 1 – Post Office – stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

The Schedule was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the Schedule as amended stand part of the Schedule.

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

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

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that clause 2 be amended by substituting the figure 316,724,282 for the figure therein.

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

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

Clauses 3 and 4 were called and passed.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that with your permission and with the permission of my colleagues I will be granted approval to say a few words from the depth of my heart on your behalf in directing us in our deliberations during these Estimates.
6.25 p.m.

This is my fourth term in this ancient and Honourable House of Assembly, and I must say that on no occasion in the past did I enjoy the pleasant atmosphere as existed under your chairmanship. I consider you on this occasion to have rendered efficient and inestimable service to this country, which I shall always remember. The way you performed your duties in the Chair brought joy to my mind and to members of the Opposition. The tranquility which we saw in this House on this occasion was never seen before. It is therefore my duty, as a senior member of this House, to let you know in no uncertain terms how much I appreciate the placid manner in which you dealt with these Estimates. I know, Sir, you are my colleague in the parish of St. Philip which we have the honour to represent and therefore I feel it is my duty to let you know that you have lived up to the standards and high tradition of this ancient and honourable House.

Mr. SISNETT: Mr. Chairman, I too would like to be associated with the kind remarks made by the hon. member for St. Philip South, but must admit that he beat me to it, because I had always intended to make some comment about the fine way in which you presided during the past two weeks over the debate on the Appropriation Bill. Like the hon. member for St. Philip South, I am happy to see that you have brought a measure of dignity and respect to this House. As the hon. member has said we know that the standard over the past years – and I do not mean the last two years – had fallen under the previous administration. I am happy to see tonight that what the hon. member for St. Philip South has said – and he spoke from the depth of his heart when he said he does not recall having sat during the Estimates before and feeling such assurance from the rulings of the Chair. You, Mr. Chairman, have brought that measure of respect to this House.

I want to go on record further and also commend the acting Leader of the House for the way he has performed the duties entrusted to him during the past two weeks. He has brooded over us like a hen over her chicks to make sure that we were here on time. He has cleverly called the Heads to facilitate the Ministers so as to make sure that the work was completed on time. He has ably done this to the best of his ability. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that you and the hon. member for St. James have done a good job this week and I would like to wish you well in the future if at any time again you are called upon to perform this duty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I would just like to say that I am deeply appreciative at the sentiments expressed by my colleague from St. Philip South and my backbench colleague from St. Michael North East. I am flattered by the commendations and tribute paid to me this evening and I wish to state that if we have been able to get through these Estimates without much rancour, it is a living testament to the ability of members of both sides of this House who made my task as arbiter very easy and pleasant, even if a little tiring.

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

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

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. CHAIRMAN reported the passing of one Bill in Committee, as amended, and Mr. SPEAKER resumed the Chair and reported accordingly.
6.35 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman has reported the passing of the Appropriation Bill and the Estimates in Committee.

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

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

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

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: I beg to move that this Bill do now pass.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Sitting be suspended until 7.30 p.m. today.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, on the motion for suspension, I wonder if the Acting Leader of the House can indicate to us what exactly is the business to be transacted when we have resumed the sitting. I was under the impression that at the end of the Appropriation Bill which was just passed that the intention was to end this particular sitting. I am merely seeking information.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate if the hon. member assumed that it was the end of Government Business. It was the end of that Bill.

The question that the sitting be suspended until 7.30 p.m. was put and resolved in the affirmative without division, and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the sitting accordingly.
6.40 p.m.

RESUMPTION

On the Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This sitting is now resumed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I have asked your Honour's leave to raise two matters of privilege relating to newspaper reports. I do not want to appear to be always hounding the Press, but on Wednesday, 21st March, an article appeared in the Advocate-News on the front page under the caption "College Must Define Role". It opened with the words "Barbados has threatened to review its policy towards the BWU College" etc. It quoted some comments that I made, and also the hon. member for St. Lucy as saying that the chicanery and buffoonery of the ruling Barbados Labour Party will be exposed to students of the College, and that students of the college are able to sift information for themselves. If that was what the hon. member really said, it would present my comment as a threat and in a very bad light. I am informed that what the hon. member really said did not contain the words "sift information" at all. What he really said was that the kind of chicanery and buffoonery that used to be practised certainly by the Barbados Labour Party would be seen through very clearly by people who have been exposed to the programmes at the Labour College; because we are able to expose people in a very clear way, and we can analyse the problems of society. That is a different matter from saying that students will be able to sift information. I think my comments would be seen in a very different light if the newspaper had reported the hon. member accurately, what they have done is to put words in the hon. member's mouth that make my comments appear to be brutal and bullying, where in fact the hon. member's comments that if people were exposed to the Labour College's programmes they would see through our buffoonery which is what brought my original comment. I submit to Your Honour that it is a matter for the Committee of Privileges. Mis-reporting of a sort to reflect on an hon. member's motives in speeches has always been a matter of privilege.

I have also spoken to the hon. member for St. Michael North East. We have looked at a copy of the speech which he made, and which appeared in today's Advocate on Page 2. The hon. member is reported as saying that the staff at the Corporation are fearful of the political mechanisms in this country, when in fact the hon. member did not put it in the present tense at all. The hon. member put it in the past tense. It was also said that there was a level of political control over CBC by successive administrations. The hon. member and I have looked carefully at his speech and we have agreed that no such allegations were contained in his speech. Indeed, the report bears little relationship to the speech itself. He said

that he knew of nine instances of political interference by the past Government in CBC. He said that members of the past Government rang and said that the Opposition was not to have coverage on certain occasions. The question of fears of political mechanisms reads this way: he said that journalists reporting with the Caribbean Broadcasting Corporation operated out of fear of the political machine in this country. They were not sure whom they were offending and this referred to the news-editor who in 1976 had been sitting in that Chair there. I submit that it is a gross piece of misreporting of the hon. member's speech and again this is suitable for consideration by the Committee of Privileges.
7.35 p.m.

Of course the hon. member's speech is very short and if the Advocate Newspaper should choose to publish it in full, perhaps the hon. member might not feel so grieved that he should have been represented in this light; but nonetheless if reporters come in here and can't get what we say precisely right; we are entitled to raise this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am grateful to the hon. member for drawing my attention to the matters under reference. I have read the articles and I have compared what was said in each case with the reports of our Hansard, and I am satisfied beyond shadow of doubt that there are instances of gross misrepresentation of what hon. members have said on each occasion. Under these circumstances and on the motion of the Hon. Prime Minister I rule that both articles be referred to the Committee of Privileges for the Committee's consideration.

Now I should like to take this opportunity as well to draw to hon. members' attention that the Clerk on my instructions has done everything possible in the past week to summon meetings of the Privileges Committee, but we have not been able to muster a quorum on any occasion, consequently, the meetings have become abortive. I should like to urge hon. members of this Committee to do their utmost to attend when summoned if at all possible because we are now having quite a number of matters on the Agenda of this Committee, and I am appealing for the assistance of hon. members so as to clear our Agenda where these breaches are up for consideration.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, there is a matter which fortunately I do not think I have to ask the House to do in all its stages tonight, but I would ask leave of the House to reopen the Item "Government Notices".

Mr. SPEAKER: You are asking leave to give notices? I do not see there is any objection from either side of the House. You may proceed.

GOVERNMENT NOTICES

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay the Order entitled "The Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1979.

Can I give notice too, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER: You may.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to give notice of a Resolution to approve the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order, 1979.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is the concern of members of the Opposition that copies have not been circulated to them and they cannot be expected to participate.

THE ADJOURNMENT

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, at this stage this concludes Government Business.

I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Monday, 26th March, 1979, at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on the motion for adjournment until Monday. I think, Mr. Speaker, it will be appreciated that hon. members prepare for debate of the Annual Estimates and the Annual Estimates run for a five day period, and hon. members reasonably assume some respite after that intense activity from further similar activity would be given for a reasonable time. All I am saying is that they would have arranged their various businesses in a particular way, not anticipating a meeting of the House on the following Monday. I am not contesting the hon. member's right or the Government's right to adjourn the House until that time, but I am merely drawing to attention that if in fact there are no members of the Opposition in their places on Monday, it must not be taken that members of the Opposition have deliberately stayed away from the House of Assembly; it is simply that Monday has some element of inconvenience built into it.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, just to reply very briefly to my colleague. I can appreciate the problem which the hon. member may encounter for not coming on Monday, but you have to appreciate that as far as I am concerned Parliament's business is supreme and whatever business I have to do on Monday I have to cancel also, and though sympathetic towards the hon. member, he will have to really accept it as it is. The Senate is meeting on Tuesday, it is likely to meet on Wednesday and possibly on Thursday and possibly Friday, and you know that we

have important business in the light of what the Prime Minister has just laid; so the only time we will have to do it is on Monday. I am sorry, but I cannot accommodate the Opposition, though I have tried on several occasions and they have rejected whatever I have suggested to them.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, I am not rejecting what has been said but there is one point which perhaps you could give me some light on and it is this; if we are going to deal with a matter of importance on Monday, as you are aware tomorrow is Saturday and the next day is Sunday. I am wondering when we will receive our papers to deal with such a matter, as you will know that we would expect some reasonable time to be given. I am willing to return here on Monday, but I am querying how soon the papers will be sent so that we can study them and be able to contribute to the debate on the particular issue.

Mr. SPEAKER: I venture to assure the hon. member for St. Philip South that the administrative machinery of Parliament will see that everything possible is done to ensure that hon. members receive their papers in a reasonable time so as to be able to familiarise themselves with what comes up in Parliament on Monday.

Mr. WEEKES: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, I should like to make an amendment to the motion which I put for the adjournment of the House.

In the light of an administrative development, if I may say so, I would like to withdraw my motion for the adjournment of the House and substitute "the suspension of the House until Monday, 26th March, 1979, at 12 o'clock noon.
7.45 p.m.

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is seeking leave to withdraw his motion for the adjournment of the House. There is no objection to the Hon. member withdrawing his Motion.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker I beg to move, Sir, that this Sitting be suspended until Monday, the 26th March at noon and to deal with all matters which had been circulated and are also on the Order Paper and those matters of which notice have been given.

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

Mr. TAITT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to seek your guidance on the matter. I was under the impression that there is a specific Standing Order, I think it is Standing Order Number 66, which specifically deals with the Debate of the Estimates. The procedure in Committee of Supply, Standing Order Number 66 says....

Mr. SPEAKER: I may draw it to the hon. member's attention that we have passed Committee of Supply and this is Sitting of the full House.

Mr. TAITT: Yes, Sir, I have not finished. The point I was making, and I was under the impression, and I am seeking your guidance on this, Mr. Speaker, that the Sitting would be for five days and then at the end of five days that Sitting which would have been called for Debate of the Estimates would automatically end and that they would be need for an Adjournment of this Sitting rather than a Suspension. I am drawing this to the hon. member's attention and raising a question not to be contentious but to seek to have the proper procedure in this matter. I am not in anyway attempting to stall the hon. member but it seems to me that an adjournment would have been the proper procedure as compared to a suspension.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Sir, I have always been told when in doubt stop. I do not profess to know or to interpret all the Standing Orders correctly. However, when in doubt I seek the advice of the Clerk at the Table. My years of experience in here tells me that in watching other members lead the House that the Leader of the House can suspend the House or adjourn the House. *(Asides).* He can move the suspension or the adjournment. What the other member on the other side is seeking to find out is when I should adjourn and when I should suspend.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think it is but right I should make the position perfectly clear. Five days are allotted for Debate of the Estimates. At the end of that five days we are free to suspend, and suspend, and suspend or to adjourn as the case might be. We have come to the end of our five days, so there is nothing wrong with the Hon. Leader of the House moving the Suspension until Monday the 26th at 12 o'clock noon.

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.
7.55 p.m.

On Resumption

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. SPEAKER: Order No. 2 is the instant Order of the Day.

Order No. 2 was called to move the Second Reading of a Bill to provide for the extension of the monetary limits of the jurisdiction of Magistrates and related matters.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I am asking if I may deal with this matter in the absence of the Attorney General.

Mr. SPEAKER: You may proceed.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties of living under what is known as the Common Law Jurisdiction such as ours is that we inherited a lot of Law and there are some advantages in inheriting legal systems because it means that it will be a whole bit of interpretation and a whole set of decisions on which you can rely but equally you tend to find that the Law which you have inherited is changing in the country from which you inherited it and that inevitably you lag behind with implementation of the changes.

The Legislators in the State of Illinois in their wisdom over 100 years ago provided that the Common Law of that State should be the Common Law of England as it stood in the time of Sir Edward Cooke. Sir Edward Cooke was a 15th Century Chief Justice and many theses were written and many doctorates earned in Britain by learned gentlemen trying to assess what was the Common Law at the time of Sir Edward Cooke.

We in Barbados have provisions relating to larceny, malicious damage to property, forgery and the like which were originally passed in the reforming style of legislation in England, I believe in the 1860's. I think our Larceny Act embodies the English Larceny Act of 1861. It is some years since I did my Legal History and I think you will find that the Malicious Damage to Property Act also stems from conditions which existed in those days so that you will find some very involved language in this Malicious Damage to Property Act.

You will find for example that emptying out a fish pond in Barbados carries a penalty of 7 years imprisonment with the option of flogging or damaging a work of art. If you came in here and deliberately broke one of these stained glass windows I believe the maximum fine would be something like $24. Not to speak of if you damaged a work of art at a value of $100,000 of which there may be some in Barbados and of course of which there are many in other countries.

The law also the way it stands at present dealing with larceny and malicious damage to property has been overtaken by inflation. Malicious damage to property above the value of £ 5, a limit which was set in the 1890's is liable for Session so when two people have a fight and one pushes down the other and one's lens of the spectacles is broken and it may cost $30 to repair that is a Session matter. Where it is still law that if you take a piece of iron and drive some lashes into a man which is subject to the consent of Police representation and even where there may be broken limbs, yet it is still possible for Magistrates in the absence of representation from the Police and by the consent of the accused can try these very serious matters.

The whole issue will need comprehensive legislation. Your Honour may remember that 10 years ago a Select Committee was appointed in the House consisting of Sir Theodore Brancker, the then Speaker; Mr. Elliot Mottley; Mr. Garfield Sargeant and myself, to go into some of these matters and the Select Committee had begun to sit and indeed had identified virtually all of the areas that you will find in the instance and made certain proposals there as well as other proposals relating to appeals from Magistrates' decisions, but the then Attorney General, Mr. Fredrick Gladstone Smith, then a Senator, attended the hearings in the People's Chamber, made a fuss outside the door of the Committee Room and said that the Chief Justice was not consulted. He said he did not want to hear any amendment from – and he used some language, Sir – and there was a little clash of personalities and almost of physical persons. Your Honour will be well aware of the potential behaviour of that gentleman so unfortunately realised in actuality from time to time and therefore these very necessary reforms have had to be put down for 10 years.

Now the Bar Association has examined them and they are now before the House and I recommend them to the House. The reforms of the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act raises the jurisdiction and limitations and deals with all cases of larceny. Petty larceny is now raised from $50 to $500 and the fine raised from $100 to $1,000. This is for Petty Larceny. There are one or two things here combined and special larceny and the like. We have had in one case to waive the imprisonment limits, Sir, for Compound Larceny. We have had to correct the words "Counsel" and "Solicitor" to "Attorneys-at-Law". These are the main amendments that have been made to the Magistrates Jurisdiction and Procedure Act, Sir, except that we have widely expanded the number of cases that may be tried by Magistrates.

The Magistrates are a little overworked and Assizes cost money, it take up the time of Lawyers and the time of a Jury, which in many ways trivial with some of the larcenies which come to the Assizes. It is trivial and a waste

of people's time for nine jurors to be convoked to try a larceny for $65. We think that the administration of Justice will be speeded up and improved and indeed, Sir, when you get down to it, everybody seems to like trials by Magistrates. This is not Britain where people do not take a chance with the Magistrate but would want to go and try to impress a jury.

It has never been my experience that if you ask a prisoner if he wishes to be sent to be tried by a Judge and Jury in the Assizes or be tried by a Magistrate that he has said, "go to Session". I have never heard a prisoner made that option and I think that those innocent persons that are proved guilty and come before the Courts will welcome the increased speed in which these matters can be cleared up one way or the other. The Police I think will also be glad that they will be able to speed up their process and restraint of the Common Law Officers having to prosecute many petty cases and the Assizes will be relieved.

We are also making an alteration in the Appeal procedure for Magistrates. At present it is possible for anyone convicted in a Magistrates' Court with a penalty of the payment of $25 to be released from imprisonment if he has been sentenced to such. Some years ago I appeared in a case in which this point was established in the Supreme Court with the first of the cocaine cases ever to come before the Island, and which resulted in a term of imprisonment, I think for two years, Sir. It was my client and he was able to escape from serving the two years' imprisonment because in the interval between my establishing the payment of $25 for the posting of the bond I was able to get him out of jail pending an Appeal and before the hearing of the Appeal he vanished from the Island without the benefit of having passed through, so far as the records go, either the Airport or the Port of Bridgetown.
12.15 p.m.

I hope that the new section 138 will now close this loophole. It will allow a Magistrate to increase the amount of the bond and also allows the imposition of the surety, and it will relieve the courts of the present application being served, especially the sort of case where the person is not a Barbadian – because in the case to which I referred the person was not a Barbadian, he was a citizen of the United States – but you have to be very careful to make sure that you keep people in prison once they are sentenced. Hon. members may remember not only a person but in the jurisdiction of a Magistrate in Jamaica a whole aeroplane which was seized and was intended to be an exhibit also disappeared before the hearing of the case.

The Second Schedule of that Act will explain the different offences and indicate crimes that may be tried both by Magistrates and by a Judge and jury. Stealing livestock is one, and in this day and age I believe if you steal a sheep you will probably have to go to Sessions, and there are a number of offences. It is strange, but you can be tried for burglary which is a very serious offence, more serious than larceny in a dwelling house, by a Magistrate but you have to be tried by a Judge and jury for larceny in a dwelling house. There are still all those 19th century conceptions which are applied in Barbados.

In my opinion the whole Act needs revision, there are too many little provisions, but we have tried our best to change all these things. We have to change all but we have assessed it in terms of the damage generally and we are passing some intricate provisions, to improve the ambit of the Act without extending in any way the exaggerated protection given to owners of property 100 years ago.

Now, at the very end of the Schedule will be found several important provisions. To take the last first, the Petty Debt Act – and I ask all concerned to take note of this, because there are more petty debt trials than criminal trials – I will really ask all concerned to remember we are raising the jurisdiction in petty debt courts to $2,500. The Magistrates have proved well capable of handling cases where a claim is up to $1,000 and we think that we will relieve a great deal of the Special Court work which is medium term.

There will be consequential amendments, Sir, no doubt the lawyers will want increased costs on the $2,500, I suppose the responsibility is more, but this is an important provision we are asking the House to pass today. Consequential upon this, we are increasing the amounts which the Magistrates courts can order as compensation for this damage, because there is no point having a jurisdiction in the Petty Debt Court at $2,500 unless, in this case involving damage to property, there is a corresponding amount of compensation. If you deliberately damage a man's motor car or deliberately throw stones in his house, you must in my view pay a penalty corresponding to the amount of the damage.

I hope that I have dealt with both the principle and nearly all the details, but in respect of damages we are also to some extent asking for compensation in criminal cases, because again, up to now if you prosecute a man for beating and there is an appeal – this is a private prosecution, Sir, – and at the moment there is some danger if you go and prosecute for something in the wrong jurisdiction and that sort of thing. I do not want to go into all the details, but there are some dangers, and therefore we are trying to straighten all this out.
12.25 p.m.

So you get somebody who starts a police case, and when the police case is over they then bring a Petty Debt case, so that the Court's time has to be spent twice on hearing the same matter. We are raising the amount of compensation that can be given to $1,000, so that if the

police bring a case against somebody for beating or assault or whatever, the magistrate will now be able to award $1,000 damages and if the person does not pay he can be sent to prison – something not normally done in the Petty Debt court. That is one of the provisions, I understand, effected by the change. I recommend this as a useful piece of law reform and I know that the legal profession has expressed a wish to see this Legislation pass. Indeed, valuable time has already been lost. Cabinet has reviewed some aspects of it and extended the ambit somewhat. It is a bit wider than what the Bar Association submitted to us, but I think it is a good piece of legislation. Government has accepted it and recommends it to the House of Assembly and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I obviously am not competent to deal with the various legal aspects of this particular Bill, but there are certain social aspects of it that are a matter of some concern to me and I would think to the public at large. Going through this Bill there are certain matters that strike one very forcibly. First of all we notice that, generally speaking, most of the fines have been increased ten-fold in general and some more than that, and by and large the periods for imprisonment have been doubled. Now I am a bit concerned since I have become a member of this Honourable House over a series of legislation that seems to be oppressive in nature.

Another aspect of this Bill that is causing some concern is that it seems to me to entrench even further the protection of property rather than to find in it any kind of social approach to the whole question of crime prevention. It would seem to me that with the increase in fines more and more people will probably find themselves in prison and I will imagine that this kind of legislation might well result in congestion of the prisons in this country, because we are really talking in some instances of fines of $1,000 and well over.

The second point is that I think it is time that the Government look very carefully at the kind of fees being charged by attorneys-at-law to appear before the courts of this country on behalf of citizens who find themselves in trouble from time to time. It is not uncommon, for example, for a lawyer to charge as much as $500 to appear before the court on behalf of someone and not appear on the day of the case. I have had a recent example of this where a constituent of mine paid $500 for a lawyer to appear on his behalf and on the day of the case the lawyer was not there. I am still trying to bring some pressure on the lawyer to refund at least part of the money paid to him. *(Asides)* I would agree with the Leader of the House that all should be repaid, and I think the Government should look into the question of controlling the fees chargeable by attorneys-at-law to appear before the magistrate's court; that would be a very important step in securing justice in this country and I think it is some thing that attention should be paid to. The fact that this House is largely dominated by lawyers should certainly give them some insight into the problems citizens of this country face and I hope that the Bar Association would do something about the situation, because if justice is to be meted out fairly and be available to all citizens then that kind of barrier should not be there.

Now as regards the hon. member for St. Thomas, I was very pleased to see him appear in the role of Attorney General. I do not know if this would be a frequent feature, judging from events not so long ago, but he differed very much from the previous presentation in such matters in that it was relatively free and to the point, and I take this opportunity to extend my sympathy to the hon. member for Christ Church West, the hon. Attorney General.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether this is a misprint or whether I am reading correctly or not, but I notice – and this is in relation to the kind of oppressive legislation I am talking about – where it is stated here that any person unlawfully killing or maiming any cattle is guilty of an offense and if the amount of damage done exceeds the value of $500 is liable on conviction to imprisonment for a term of fourteen years. Fourteen years for killing a cow? I think that has got to be a mistake, because it does not seem to me to be at all reasonable, for I believe that for someone found guilty of manslaughter the term of imprisonment is around fourteen years as a rule. So I would hope that this is a misprint for I cannot see anyone in this day and age bringing legislation to lock up people for fourteen years for killing a cow. But as the hon. member for St. Thomas has said, the general principle behind this Bill relates to the protection of plantation property and those who have replaced the plantation owners as the property lords in this society, the fundamental philosophy has not changed and I certainly welcome his indication that we will see a much more comprehensive Act in the future and that indeed there will be some different type of approach to the question of justice.

I am also a little concerned whether these heavy fines are not part and parcel of the general policy of the Government to increase revenues from various departments, because this has been a constant theme of the hon. Minister of Finance.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I must express my concern about the heaviness of these fines and the severity of the penalty, not only in relation to cattle but also in relation to damage to plants, vegetables, etc. where I see fines amounting to $1,000 and periods of imprisonment of up to three years.

12.35 p.m.

It is necessary for us really to think back and consider whether it is necessary for this country at this stage to embark on this kind of legislation. My feeling is that this is because both in respect of fines and of the period of imprisonment there are far too high and represent fairly oppressive legislation. I certainly hope that this measure, when passed, will be hurriedly replaced by legislation which will express a much more modern approach to the problem of the dispensation of justice in this country.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member started off by saying that he was not competent...

Dr. HAYNES: I said that I did not consider myself competent to deal with the legal aspects of the matter, but competent to deal with the social aspects of the matter.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: The hon. member when he is looking at this society will recognise that for some period of time there have been repeated complaints from all sections in agriculture in Barbados; and there has been a growing disincentive because of the fact that a large number of incidents have occurred in which small farms have suffered at reaping time the loss of the fruits of their labour arising from lawlessness by some people who wish to reap without the burden of sowing.

There has been a case in which the High Court had to sentence to five years' imprisonment an individual for selling vegetables to hotels in this country without producing one. Their chief occupation is in the dead of night and raid other people's land when the people had gone to bed. *(Aside).* I will not have these interruptions from the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. There is no society in the world which does not have provisions for punishing that kind of thing. If the Government does not accept responsibility in this respect, we will find that the individuals who have been wronged will take the law into their own hands. We will find that these individuals will have such contempt for law and order, that they will take the law into their own hands, and we will find murder cases arising out of predial larceny and things of that kind.

It would not be proper for me to comment on any issue recent or otherwise. It is not a question of collecting a few votes. It is a question that we are trying our level best in this country to encourage diversification – vegetable production, livestock production and things of that kind; and it is very clear that there are great disincentives arising from the fact of theft. Nobody is exposed to any of the penalties contained in this law unless he breaks the law and when he does so, the penal process must be gone through.

In addition, the hon. member must recognise that these are all maximum fines; and the judicial officer is entitled to fine, convict, reprimand and discharge and use his discretion from the maximum fine. The hon. member is talking about section 28. This is where the hon. member's incompetence really shows itself because this is the existing law, and it has been the law all the years. The hon. member's political party introduced a consolidation of the statutes, and we have not changed that law.

In 1969–70 we find that it says that the object was to protect animals; and there are some societies which take a deliberate view as to the maiming of animals because you are taking advantage of a poor, dumb animal, and that is why the fine is put as high as that. I will say that even with these offences, it may be arguable by penologists or some sociologists that this is not the right way to deal with the matter. In other societies – for example the Islamic societies – do it with the sword or by taking off the offending finger. I do not subscribe to that. There are societies that demand that compensation be made. If you steal crops from a farm, you must undertake to do labour on the farm to the extent of the value of the things that you stole.
12.45 p.m.

Now all of these are matters which must be looked at in the context of a new scheme of penalties in Barbados, and I know that efforts are being made to look at all the aspects of punishment in Barbados and try to introduce flexibility in the forms of punishment, but in the meantime we are faced with an immediate problem; and let the hon. member not try in this country to talk about property owners because the hon. member is one of the biggest property owners in Barbados. The hon. member is very fond of talking about disincentives, but when he talks about disincentives, let him understand that other people regard certain types of incentives as disincentives to their rational and lawful pursuits.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, I think I must at this point point out that the Hon. Leader of the House is inadvertently misleading the House by saying I am one of the biggest property owners in Barbados. This is certainly untrue.

Hon. H. B. ST. JOHN: That is my opinion. Are you going to quarrel with me for my opinion? The basic position is that in agriculture in Barbados we are talking about some 12,000 people who engage in productive activity. The hon. member is one of those. He does indulge in some type of agricultural activity, and he knows that with the prices that one receives for the crops the margins are tight and there is nothing that would give rise to greater feelings of injustice than when a poor man or any man at all spends all of his time preparing the land

and sowing the crop, and as it is about to fructify somebody else who has done nothing in relation to it comes in the dead of the night and tries to reap the benefits. There are people in this country who spend all their Sundays driving around the country capturing people's livestock. This happens not only in Barbados. Cattle-rustling is a big thing. As a matter of fact, I will draw to the hon. member's attention that he will see that this is a phenomenon that is a world-wide one, and if he looks at the 26th Edition of the U.S. News of the World Report – and I caution the hon. member that when he speaks from now he is in politics he must constantly try to keep himself up-to-date with what is going on around the world – he would see an article there on page 10 that since soaring beef prices in the United States, thefts of cattle have gone up 50% in the state of Texas. You have the same problem in the United Kingdom in Germany and in Ireland. You have a big problem in Trinidad and in Jamaica. The hon. member forgot that a couple of years ago a land owner in Trinidad was charged with manslaughter because he had repeated incidents of theft of his tree crops and stayed up all night and waited for the thieves and fired a gun and the people were killed, and he was convicted of manslaughter. Now does the hon. member want that? Does he want this society to be a society in which there is a contempt for the judicial process and people feel that they must only indulge in self-help? I say, Sir, that this is an attempt to prevent that, and we are quite happy with the fact that interposed between the imposition of these fines there is the judicial process and the magistrates are perfectly confident to exercise their discretion bearing in mind all the circumstances.

Now I do not think that there is anything else that is worthy of note. The Prime Minister in introducing the Bill pointed out that as a matter of fact in looking at the distribution of judicial time in Barbados there are some areas where swifter and speedier resolution of offences could take place if they were dealt with by the magistrates, and this Bill provides for enlargement of the jurisdiction of the magistrates so that they will have a greater jurisdiction, and it is hoped that between the commission of a crime and completion of investigations, a resolution of the offence will be considerably shortened.

Now the hon. member has also taken this opportunity to talk about certain injustices alleged to have been carried out to his constituents by some lawyers. The legal profession in Barbados has statutory machinery for dealing with its delinquent members, and I would advise the hon. member in pursuit of his responsibilities as a member of Parliament to draw the incident that he spoke of to the attention of the Disciplinary machinery, and I am sure that the disciplinary machinery will be put into action. Like in the medical profession and in any other profession there are a few black sheep. In all societies you have it, and that is why you have a disciplinary body established by statute to ensure that certain standards of professional ethics are maintained. I hold no brief for any profession. As far as I am concerned in some instances in all the professions in Barbados there are people who can be best classified as rip-off commercial operators, and that is why it is the responsibility not only of politicians but of all institutions in Barbados to ensure that these rip-off unethical operators in the various professions are vigorously exposed and are subjected to the disciplinary machinery which the society in the form of disciplinary bodies under the Professional Acts have established to deal with this situation.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, an aspect of this particular matter that I wish to draw attention to is that relating specifically to the extension of the monetary limits of the jurisdiction of the magistrates, and I should like to get some indication from the Prime Minister who is holding the papers for the Attorney General today whether this extension in the jurisdiction of the magistrates when taken with other extensions of their jurisdiction is not tending to increase the workload of the magistracy, and whether this would have any effect on the smooth, speedy and efficient administration of the dispensing of justice at that particular level. It seems to me as layman that if we continue to extend the jurisdiction of the magistrates that this will tend to increase the number of cases upon which they will have to adjudicate and increase their workload, and unless there is some increase in the number of magistrates operating that the inevitable effect may be a slowing down of the dispensation of justice.
12.55 p.m.

I just throw this out. I am not dealing with it in any detail. Maybe the point I am raising is not a major point and maybe justice is being administered speedily and efficiently and that the workload has not increased in any untrue manner but I simply draw the attention of the House to this particular matter and I hope that I will get some response on this matter from the Prime Minister who is leading this debate.

I am really wondering if they are not pending to increase the workload of the Magistracy and to come with other extensions of the jurisdiction and whether it is having any visible effect on dispensation of Justice and the workload at that particular level.

Mr. BRADSHAW: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened attentively to the member for St. Michael South Central and he alluded to some Attorneys who charged very high fees and refused to turn up in some of the Courts. Now this raises a very interesting point because the member is not without support. I, too, am very concerned about this particular matter because as he readily said there are some poor people who stand to suffer. People who can ill

afford to raise the fees charged and yet there are without representation when they are called or summoned before the Law Courts.

What is rather interesting here is to hear the hon. member talking about Attorneys without realising that some of the Attorneys and a particular Attorney, I am not going to mention the Attorney's name, but the hon. member for St. Michael South Central knows this man pretty well, and there was a case where one of my constituents, since he mentioned one of his constituents, who was involved in a case. I can mention the case in which my constituent was involved.

The lady was ripped off and this particular Attorney, who is well known by the hon. member for St. Michael South Central, charged a woman $700 to plea her case. He told her that he would prefer to by-pass the Magistrates' Court and go to the High Courts where the damages would be considerably higher because it would seem, according to my legal knowledge which I got from my colleagues, that the Magistrates' Court is only able to try cases under a maximum of $100,000 and therefore his instructions to this lady was to pursue the matter in the High Courts where he would hope to get higher damages.

What happened is this. The defendant went out of the Island and the case never came off and when my constituent, who is his client, sought to have her money back the Attorney refused to give her her money back and after several appeals and threats the Attorney did not see the woman but told her to see his Secretary and he gave her back part of the fees that were charged. Not all, Sir, not all. In other words, the Attorney charged money, charged money for work which he did not in fact do, and what happened is the woman had to suffer thereby.

I will go a little further, Sir, the Attorney told the woman to go to Doctors and accumulate bills so that he would be able to produce them all in Court and this woman is now left with an accumulation of bills, paid him a part of the fees and no justice. That is the situation and the hon. member for St. Michael South Central should have advised his colleague, his friend, about that injustice. He should have given that woman all of her fees back because he did not do the job.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have no idea of the particular case or the particular person to whom the hon. member has spoken and therefore I am not in a position to give advice. I have no idea of what he is talking about.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point is taken.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: I am going to treat you with a little bit of courtesy on this occasion. I will speak to you outside and tell you who it is, your good friend. But you see, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want anyone to accuse me of political spite. I do not want to be accused and this is why I am going to make it my personal business and meet the hon. member on the outside and disclose to him about his personal friend, his buddy and colleague that did this to the person. She was a poor old woman and because he was talking about poor people. She is 75.

You see what we must remember is this and I want the hon. member to understand that we do not have short memories despite the fact that the hon. member for St. John did say so on occasions. It was he who warned the people of Barbados to get away from the Law Courts and I have a tendency to agree with him because I feel that people should be encouraged to desist from breaking the law. The vandalism we have around the place, the stealing at nights and people reaping crops they did not sow, this is cause for concern, Mr. Speaker.

There are some farmers who are saying they are not going to cultivate their land, they are not going to plant carrots, beets, cabbage and the like because they will not be the harvesters and at the same time the Government and the people of Barbados must be aware that we must be able to produce agricultural commodities in Barbados. At the sametime we are calling upon the foreign agencies, who are being asked to encourage us to develop agricultural techniques and to help and assist in this direction and at the sametime without due thought, people come at nights and they come and steal the people's crops. Now we cannot have a situation like this. We cannot encourage this. I have said and I have made a note here, Mr. Speaker, that the fee might seem a little burdensome and a little steep. I would sympathise with the fact, but at the same time, Sir, if it is a deterrent, then I am in agreement with that.
1.05 p.m.

We have got to appear harsh at times in order to deter people who would not only steal but will pose a threat to ordinary people's lives. After all, the farmer has to work his land, he has to pay his tax bills, he has to feed his family, and then you find some lawless person who has contributed absolutely nothing towards the actual cultivation of that land coming and reaping what he has planted. It is depriving the man and his family of an income, so you can see, Sir, the wisdom of such a piece of legislation.

For some time we have had people in this country saying that it does not matter whether they commit a crime or not because the fine is too small. We have cases where people would go down the road using the most abusive and indecent language knowing that the fine is $9.60, and they would take it upon themselves to abuse

people and abuse the law so that they will be hauled before the law courts and get away with a mere $9.60. We have to look at these laws and see how best we can deter people from breaking them. It is surely not this Government's duty to have people placed in Glendairy, we do not want to see this because it costs the taxpayers money to feed them. We would like to have those people who are in there reformed and on the outside so that they can fit into the society and play their role in the total development of this society, and therefore we do not have any intention of having people just pay fines, but at the same time we have to be very serious about what we are doing. We have to understand that we have to prevent lawlessness in this society, we have to stop people from maligning and molesting others, because some people do not care what sort of molestation or injury they do to other people. That is the state of affairs in this country and it is time that we look at the laws not only the one that is before this Chamber today but to look at the entire laws and the Acts and see how best we can deter some of these people whose main duty it is to go around the place breaking the law or inciting people to break the laws of this country.

There is nothing wrong with laws, the people who are law abiding will not care about the laws to that extent, but you find people who want to be active participants getting concerned about the fines that are imposed under the laws. I am one who is for this sort of legislation to deter people from breaking the laws so that we can continue to have a peaceful country. That is the aim of this Government, and therefore I will subscribe to this sort of legislation which will not only act as a deterrent to those who like breaking the law and indulge in breaking the law, but also to encourage people to keep away from the law courts.

Finally, Sir, I want some of the young people to understand that there is nothing wrong, nothing humiliating, absolutely nothing degrading in getting a piece of land and tilling it. I am a member of Parliament, and as a man I have been doing some of this, getting myself involved in the land, and I will encourage, and I would like some of the younger people today to understand how I feel when I hear some of them getting in groups saying that they belong to some movement, going around talking of reaping people's crops that they did not have a part in cultivating. I am not for that, if they want to do anything, if they want to help, and if they want to have their "itals" and their vegetables, they must grow them. There are lots of waste land knocking around and if they want to help they can come to me and I will try to seek up some of the owners and ask them to donate some of the waste land around the place and let them work it and grow the crops. I think that would be a better proposition. Therefore, if we as responsible members of this community can encourage those people who say they would like to have these so-called "itals" to help cultivate the land to help themselves, we will do a better job and some of the social problems which are prevalent in this community can be solved. We need people to come out and rather than criticise those people, first of all seek to encourage them to get involved and educate them.

We must be bold enough to speak to those people and encourage them to get a hoe or a fork and whatever implements they need to turn the soil and help cultivate it, and I do not mean cultivate what is know as herbs or weed, I am not for that, I want people to be able to conform with the laws of this country, they can cultivate crops that they can sell, that people can eat, that they can survive on and get themselves the necessary income, and my appeal goos out to them today.

I want to lend my support to this piece of legislation, because I feel it is this sort of legislation that this country is in great demand of today.

Mr. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will pardon me if I inadvertently rehash any of the speeches or arguments made prior to my arrival in the House. I was in another jurisdiction until a few minutes ago.

There can be no doubt that the Acts which are sought to be amended by the legislation before us today were in great need of amendment. Some of the Acts which are being amended have their origins in the 19th century, some of the fines which are being increased today are being increased to reflect the advance of the society in its several ways, not the least of which is the economic advance and the enhancement of the value of money. As one hon. member has pointed out already, a fine of $9.60, or even $10.00, as I believe the revision now is, is inefficacious in today's society in terms of acting as a deterrent or in whatever form of punishment which was originally put in the Bill.

1.15 p.m.

I do not necessarily share the view advanced by the last speaker that heavy fines necessarily will act as a deterrent. There are too many areas of grace, if you like, for one to determine the efficacy of deterrents because deterrents may be individual deterrents or general deterrents in the sense that you may hope that by the imposition of a particular punishment that the punishment may deter the particular individual against whom it is visited. On the other hand, the imposition of a penalty may be meant in terms of its severity to deter persons in society at large who may be minded to commit a particular offence. But whether that punishment will have any efficacy or not depends upon the response of the individual if the aim is individual deterrence or alternatively the response of the members of the larger society to a swift penalty. There is some criminological evidence that in the areas of rape, severe sentences of

imprisonment – and in some cases allied to that a flogging or corporal punishment of some sort or other – these harsh penalties have on analytical evidence found to have some efficacy as a deterrent. But ultimately the aim of punishment must be to mete out justice in the society, not only to deter; not only to protect society but to use justice for compensation – not in the civil sense but in the sense of setting right wrongs that have been done to those who have been affected by the commission of crime. There is no doubt that not only in Barbados but I venture to say throughout the whole Caribbean area there seems to be a move towards lawlessness, a move in which people in the society are not proving themselves receptive to authority, and they are obviously searching for something which the society is failing to give them. I remember in the 1960s just after I left the London School of Economics a spate of what was then called student riots emerged. These students riots emerged because students felt that they were being denied a voice in the administration in the affairs of the Universities, and secondly on very moralistic grounds student riots erupted in the sense that the students found an ambivalence between university teachers who may have been promulgating very laudable ideas either by word or on paper but their actions belied what they were saying. It was found, for example, that at the London School of Economics we had personnel on the staff who were outwardly progressive but at the same time were found to be closely allied to business interests in Rhodesia and South Africa. When the glare of these facts was made known to them, the students erupted against this ambivalence. I do not know if that is the same kind of situation facing the Caribbean or the World at large where there is this subculture of lawlessness and the lack of respect for authority. I do not know what is the answer to these problems where they manifest themselves in criminality and I do not know that the answer is the stiffening of penalties. But I believe that in respect of all crimes and anti-social behaviour it is imperative that an attempt be made to get at the historology of the crime and the causes of criminality, and until this is done we are perhaps closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. But for purely short-term purposes and with a view to bringing fines in line with contemporary conditions in society, this Bill before us today is a step which may be a palliative for some people; it may have some short term efficacy, but I am not satisfied it will necessarily go to the heart of the problem. The fact that bottles have been thrown in Barbados, Trinidad and Guyana during the current World Series tour may be the result of several things. It may be the result, as I earlier indicated, of a type of lawlessness in the society; it may be the result of frustration from tying up people for long hours without proper communication being made to them as to what is going on; and in that period when they are almost claustrophobic and languishing in expectancy of a cricket game probably imbibe strong drink and then get mentally capsized by this strong drink – all this might perhaps be the reasons for what appeared to some to be vandalism. The Rasta cult that has grown up in Barbados has been adequately described in 1979 as imitation rastas. The Rasta cult had no root in Barbados; it origins were in Jamaica. But just as the Beatles in the 1960s started the cult of Beatlemania with their long hair and you had an era of long-haired nuts, we have found that perhaps as a result of the association of musical personalities people like Bob Marley and Eddie Grant who represented something that has been a natural development in West Indian music at the same time have chosen to wear their hair long; I believe just as Trinidad has gone mad on a soca fad, similarly in this part of the Caribbean – and I am not sure that it is not happening in North America – I am a very infrequent visitor to those white climes – but I am not sure that the Rasta cult that has tended to develop in other areas of the Caribbean has not been the result of some psychological or musical linkage with the music coming out of Jamaica.

1.25 p.m.

On the question of philosophy, I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that they are talking about some of those so called Rastas whose philosophy is not the genuine philosophy. They are probably searching again for an identity; but the Government as the overall guardian of the people's interest must not shy away from meeting these problems which in some cases can result in a minority group. It is almost always assumed that a Rasta must necessarily be smoking Ganja. That is not necessarily so, although perhaps the Jamaica connection is applicable in these circumstances because Ganja to the Jamaican Rasta is part of the daily intake and there is no doubt that there has been a spreading of drugs, at least of marijuana in all the societies in the Caribbean; and members of this society are calling for a liberalisation of the law concerning cannabis. I do not think, however, that this society is yet ready to entertain the demand for a liberalisation of those laws in this area; and so far as the laws are there, people have to respect them.

I think that 80 per cent of all cases are heard in the Magistrates Courts. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to declare that I have an interest in the magistrates by virtue of a magisterial connection. My wife is a magistrate. I also take this opportunity to make it clear that it must not be assumed that there is any special feeling on my part because I was a member of the Bar Council for four years and I was a party to several documents which led to the last document asking for an upgrading not only for the post of magistrate, but an upgrading of the facilities under which magistrates have to operate.

There are many lawyers on this side, both on the front bench and on the back bench who will know and who are aware of the inadequacies of the magisterial system as far as facilities are concerned. I trust that the petitions which have been made over the years – they go back a long time for something to be done in a meaningful way to redress the situation in the Magistrates Courts will be taken seriously by those on the front bench – the fact that there

has never been a senior magistrate in this country. Trinidad does have the post of senior magistrate, but in Barbados there is no one who stands above all the other magistrates and who can supervise the running of the Magistrates Courts and so on.

I call on the Government to give serious consideration to the appointment of a Senior Magistrate at the relevant level in the Civil Service structure. I believe that such an appointment would go a long way towards an alleviation of the complaints as to the work load presently being shared by magistrates, and a streamlining of the work in the Magistrates Courts which ultimately will redound to a fairer and swifter administration of justice.

The Civil Court at District A in my view, Mr. Speaker, could be sub-divided into two divisions and have two magistrates to deal with the work. What we are doing today is expanding the jurisdiction of the magistrates in certain areas, and by that corollary reducing the jurisdiction of the High Court while putting a heavier strain on the magistrates; for example, in a case of malicious damage where somebody breaks a window or a door and the value exceeds $25 that case must be tried before a High Court Judge. Very often I have seen recently a number of cases where people have been using the rules of the High Court as a privilege for suing people in the High Court for $1,200 and $1,300. I know of a case for $1,023.

Now, with this legislation these cases will be tried before a magistrate. So I think that it will be fair to assume that the work-load of the magistrates will be increased. So it is only fair to assume that their physical environment will be enhanced, and that along with the policy of this legislation there should be an attempt to do something, if only temporarily, in improving the physical conditions of the courts throughout the length and breadth of this island. I say temporarily because I am aware of the statement of the Attorney General about the new Hall of Justice which will be built in another couple of years, and which will result in removing the judges from their present place to another location, and the magistrates will probably occupy what is now occupied by the judges of the Supreme Court; but I think that the ability of the magistrates to get hold of the current judicial or legal thought is important. You give them a new Law Journal; but what they also want are reference books relating to what is happening in law throughout the world. It would not be wasted money because those same journals or books can be carried with them when they go to new places.

There is a question of toilet facilities, lighting etc. So I am calling on the Government for the upgrading of the physical amenities for magistrates and the appointment of a Senior Magistrate.

1.35 p.m.

Perhaps we are not going to discuss the question of remuneration of magistrates in so far as I have already determined it. Somebody else can deal with that, but I believe the legislation today was a long time in coming. There can be no quarrel from either side that the penalties we are voting for are realistic and are quite in accordance with contemporary social and economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to see also some attempt made to grapple with the problem of juvenile crime. Now only yesterday before I went to St. Vincent, I stopped in at the Government Industrial School for boys in St. Philip to hear some of the problems that they have at the School. This was as a result of a request of the boys. I went to the school and spent about two hours with the boys and I listened to some of their problems and made certain statements from what I observed. I have had a long connection with the Government Industrial School, even though Eric Sealy may say I am the worst thing that came out of Dodds. He said so a few times; that is a good platform joke because in reality I was never an inmate; I may have been close to the inmates, but nobody every had the pleasure as they may have had with others of turning the key on me as the key was turned on him at Glendairy Prison by Mr. Humphrey Walcott when he was then Acting Superintendent of Glendairy Prison. But in the future I will deal with all that.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be two problems at the Government Industrial School. I must say that some of the problems have been compounded as the boys themselves told me that as a result of what appeared on the front page of the Nation some weeks ago. The headline was "Dodds in the Dumps" and the boys told me openly that the Nation said Dodds was in the dumps, that meant it is a dump and we will treat it like a dump. I had to explain to them that that was not the purport and intent of the Nation's article, and that they had a responsibility to the taxpayers of this country. The two problems at Dodds – forget about homosexuality; that is not the problem. It has always been there; from the time my father went in 1948 there was buggery. There was buggery at Lodge School. Wherever you throw together, especially in a boarding establishment, or I would say exclusively in the boarding establishment in my time in the ten years I was at Lodge School, and you could tell who were the fancy boys at the time from the way they used to walk and give you the hand work. Wherever you throw together a heap of boys or men without the necessary facilities for sexual release in the appropriate and accepted form, you will have that. That is not the problem at Dodds. Bed-wetting is not the problem at Dodds. You have one or two in the records, but that is not the problem.

The problems at Dodds are (a) vandalism and (b) absconding. I say this from my close contact with the staff and the pupils at Dodds over the last four weeks. The place is not a dump but there is evidence that attacks

have been made on the real property. Windows are broken out, glass panes are broken, desks and chairs in the school room are broken up by the boys venting their aggression against these inanimate objects for some reason. There is absconding, and I am going to take a little blame for this. St. Philip North can boast since I have been the representative of an improved bus service. It is not yet perfect because there is still a shortage of units, but we have additional routes and the bus service which has now been improved passes through Padmore Village more frequently than in the past. The boys are not in any state of confinement. Seven or eight of them will take it upon themselves to go to the gate or down past the hedge, get on a bus and go to town, spend a couple of hours, get back on and go back in and this takes place between the hours of 4 o'clock and 9 o'clock.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member must now wind up.

Mr. SIMMONS: This takes place between the hours of 4 o'clock and 9 o'clock and what is needed at these hours is increased and improved supervision. Very often there is one man on duty. I am not talking about Mr. Alleyne or Mr. Conliffe who may be in his own residence. He cannot handle 66 boys and the boys get up to all the old tricks to get a little feel of the open society. Some –thing should be done like giving them sea bathes or a few excursions. When my father was there he used to take them on camps down Half Moon Fort, Walkers and so on. Let them get out for a week; put some out with parents who would like to take one or two. Those are some of the problems at Dodds, but the two main problems are vandalism and absconding.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Speaker, I want to make three points in the course of this debate. The first one relates to the operation and function of the Magistrates Criminal Court at District "A". The criminal court at District "A" is pressed, the magistrate is pressed, the court is full of criminal cases and the court is in need of repairs. The major point in connection with the court is this: there are about 40 cases on the list every morning. Some of them are adjourned cases and some are new cases, but the point which I wish to make is that I think somehow we have got to relieve the pressure on the magistrates in the District "A" Criminal Court. A criminal case heard before the magistrate with two lawyers or a lawyer and the police prosecutor can take as long as a day sometimes, and when that happens it means all the other cases have to be necessarily adjourned, and that is one of the problems which is clogging up the system in the District "A" Criminal Court.

Now the magistrate in that court does not only do summary cases, cases which are done in the magistrate's court, he also does indictable cases and that causes a further clogging of the system because the magistrate has to sit there, hear the evidence, hear the cross examination and write it all down in long hand, and I think that the time has come when one must look at some mechanical method of taking evidence in criminal cases, certainly in indictable matters and probably in all sorts of matters which come before the magistrates court. Perhaps the time is ripe for the introduction of the system which now obtains in England where evidence is produced in written deposition form and handed to the lawyer and the lawyer can then determine whether he wishes the witness to come to court to give evidence, or whether the magistrate can commit the case without the hearing of evidence and calling of witnesses.

1.45 p.m.

With my submission something must be done to relieve the pressure on the District "A" Criminal Court. The same thing can be said for the Civil Court and I think this piece of legislation which is before this Chamber is bound to increase the pressure on the Civil Court because the Civil Court is now to receive some of the load of the cases which used to be dealt with in the High Court on Monday mornings.

The problem with the Civil Court, Mr. Speaker, has been compounded by the fact that during last year there was no permanent Magistrate in that Court for something like 6 months and I think that those of us who practice in the Court became a little frustrated because cases could not be heard and the Magistrate now sitting there is faced with a backlog of about 6 months cases and this is a very serious problem which has arisen there. What we are now doing is to place further cases on that workload and I think the solution must be to create a second Civil Court at District "A".

These are some of the points I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, because unlike criminal cases, civil cases tend to be long and drawn out with the Defence and his witnesses, the Plaintiff and his witnesses, the submission and the medical reports, legal arguments, in fact the District "A" Civil Court is operating like a Mini-High Court. I think the time has come when one has to look seriously at the provision of two new Courts at District "A". One in the Civil Division and the other one, in my submission, in the Criminal Division.

Of course the hon. member for St. Philip North has made a point that the physical accommodation is not good. It may surprise hon. members to know that the Attorneys have to sit on a bench which is partly broken up. There is a table on which you write which resembles something like what you used to write on at school. The Magistrate's Office is really a shamble and most of all some of the Clerks of the Supreme Courts use the Magistrate's Court, the Civil Court that is, as a lunch room so that all in all there is a great deal of pressure on

the Civil Court and I think that whilst we are about to increase the jurisdiction and hence the workload of the Civil Court at District "A" that some serious consideration must be given to an immediate alleviation of the problems existing in the Civil Court.

I just want to make one final point. Eighty percent or so of the cases in Barbados are heard in the Magistrate's Court. That is a fair percentage. There is no system at the moment for the collection of decisions given by the Magistrate. Some of the decisions are in fact worth collecting. Some of the most important cases are being dealt with in this Court and I think some serious consideration must be given to a system for collecting the decisions of the Magistrate otherwise we are bound to be in a position where we are uncertain as to what the actual practise of the law is in certain respects.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only observations which I would wish to make on the Bill before the House. I think apart from what is in the new Bill that is urgently needed, I hope that consideration would be given to the general upgrading of the Magistracy and that we would not only have an increase in the fines and increases of the jurisdiction but some general consideration to persons who are called "Junior Judges."

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M.ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I will be short to deal with the speeches of the hon. member opposite. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central whose social conscience in these matters is known to be well delivered shares with many of our concerns over the retributive aspect of justice. In many ways I must say I agree with the hon. member about the undesirability for savage penalties. However it should be noted that these penalties are all maximum and may follow a particular scheme. If he looks at the original Act he will discover that generally speaking the maximum penalty is placed at twice the amount of the stolen property and since we are raising the value of the stolen property which has gone from $50 to $500 you therefore have to raise the penalty from $100 to $1,000. For what it is worth, the previous penalty was unlimited.

There is no penalty under the Common Law for what fine you must impose for demeanour and the Court of Grand Sessions has the power to impose any fine it cares to impose. If it wishes to impose on various offences for which no fine is fixed by law for $1 million that would be the fine. It is an abstruse point because most fines are fixed by Law but it does come about particularly in custodial cases where the custodial sentence is not thought desirable and the Law of Conspiracy in Barbados as in England is not controlled generally except in the case of murder by statute but dealing in law offences the penalty is at large. If you are charged with criminal conspiracy the fine can be anything. I think that recent English cases will reveal fines of £300,000. From that point of view the penalty of $1,000 is not an increase but it is a decrease. It is a limit and it is set on a specified basis. It is not that this Government is seeking to raise revenue. We are preserving the same relativity that has existed under the previous regime.

As far as the 14 years for maiming of cattle is concerned I can add very little to that. I do not think that 14 years is a penalty that can now be applied. If you were going about deciding how to punish people that maim cattle you might not decide that but I think that I am right in saying that this penalty originally came about at the time of what was known as the Pinion Outrages in Ireland which was the Act of economic warfare against the political oppressors of Ireland. The Irish Revolutionaries used to maim cattle deliberately. We are not talking now about stealing cows as they were not necessarily thieves but an agrarian outrage was the order of the day and a 14-year penalty was imposed.

That penalty was the response for that case as hon. members may be aware but that was about the 18th century in England and the earlier part of the 19th Century in which felonies were punishable by death. Stealing more than £5 was death. Burglary was death. Forging the Ace of Spades in a pack of cards was death. A man was actually hanged for forging the Ace of Spades in 1808 and what was called a bloody coup was abolished and a new general policy of 14 years for felony was introduced. There were some felonies that carried more. Rapes used to carry death for some time; then life imprisonment, but I think it has now come down to 14 years. The general felony penalty was 14 years and if there was no reason to impose any other penalty once you committed a crime it carried a penalty of 14 years. 1.55 p.m.

Dr.. HAYNES: On a very brief point of elucidation.

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

Dr. HAYNES: A point of elucidation. In view of the obvious concern on both sides for a variety of reasons.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Are you elucidating a point or are you making a speech?

Dr. HAYNES: I am elucidating a point.

Mr. SPEAKER: State the point you are elucidating.

Dr. HAYNES: The point I am elucidating is that the Government should consider reducing the 14 years to 5 years, but I do not wish to divide the House on this.

Mr. SPEAKER: No point of elucidation.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Nevertheless, the Government will certainly consider it. Whether we will deal with it in this Bill or in the Bill on general reform is a different matter, but I will give the hon. member the assurance that that penalty will be considered, but I did want to say something about penalties, Sir.

We have inherited the 14 year penalties for felony not just from the Democratic Labour Party but from the Legislatures of the last 100 to 111 years. This penalty was imposed in this Chamber in this room in May 1868, or at the end of 1867, so it is some years that this has been going on. Hon. members opposite had their chance to change it, I will look forward to seeing the main ideas of the hon. member brought to fruition in due course, but whether we can do it in this Bill I don't know.

Lawyers' fees, the Hon. Leader of the House has already dealt with that, I would only say that sometimes you have to be very careful how you listen to complaints about professional people. The hon. member for St. Michael South Central will not be surprised, I think, to hear that there are doctors, and particularly certain doctors, against whom complaints of over-charging or under-servicing are made to members on this side regularly. I believe there may even be a dossier of cases, I believe that the records of the Law Courts have been searched for a particular doctor's case to see how often he has sued for his fees, and the defence has been extortion, but it does not mean that in every case where these complaints are made – and certainly, Sir, I am aware of cases where a doctor has sued for his fees and there has been a defence on file in which it is said that the doctor rendered no services and the charges were exorbitant, and the case was proceeded no further with – I mean, I am aware of these cases but it does not mean that every complaint against a professional man is justified.

I just throw that out, Sir, at least the Bar Council I know is very active, the Disciplinary Committee, in hearing charges against lawyers who are alleged to have overcharged. Perhaps the hon. member will use his influence in the Medical Association to see if they too will set up a Council to adjudicate cases where doctors are alleged to have overcharged for the services rendered. I know the Disciplinary Committee of the Bar meets all the time and it has complaints against I believe every single lawyer in this island. Some years ago the Registrar told me there was not a single lawyer, barrister or solicitor, not one against whom allegations in writing did not exist in the Chief Justice's files. Every single one of us who is a lawyer has had a charge made at some time; very few of us have ever been convicted, so to speak, or in very few cases, and certainly no lawyer off hand that I can think of in politics has ever had a charge justified. That is a different matter, but people do make these charges all the time. All the solicitors, the most upright appearing solicitors, have the charges and they sometimes do get a little pressure and have to return fees, but these cases, Sir, it is one of the hazards of the profession. Having set up the machinery, you find that it is used. No doubt if the hon. member sets up the Medical Council machinery he will find it just as used.

The hon. member for St. Michael South spoke of the workload of Magistrates. Undoubtedly, this Act will have the effect of increasing the work-load on Magistrates; however, I tend to think that the Magistrates are far from overworked. What may be necessary is better physical accommodation, I think the hon. member for St. Michael North West really made his point and that of course will come when the new Hall of Justice releases some space for the expansion of the courts. As I told the hon. member, what perhaps may really be needed is for the country Magistrates to do a rota as supplementary Civil Magistrates in town to relieve the pressure on the Civil Courts, and will need quarters to be able to do that. I do not believe, in fact, that the Magistrates' Bench on any given day ever has the full quota of seven Magistrates, I think that a Magistrate is on leave or on secondment and quite often a vacancy is left. I don't think even all the vacancies are filled now, but of course I am not the substantive Minister any more.

The remaining points made by hon. members will be taken full account of, Sir, not only administratively but in considering new legislation for the future. I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 3.00 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: 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.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Question Time be now taken until 3.30 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: If there are no objections the motion is carried. The hon. member for St. Michael South, his question No. 15.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker,

To ask the Minister of Education and Culture: 1. How many students of secondary school age, namely eleven years old and over, are currently attending the government all-age primary or composite schools? 2. How many such students were attending those schools at the end of the 1975/76 and 1977/78 school years? 3. How many students of secondary school age are currently enrolled in the private approved schools? 4. Would the Minister state the number of classrooms, the roll, the optimum number of students in relation to the classrooms, and the incidence of overcrowding, if any, at each of the government secondary schools, older and newer?

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the Reply to Parliamentary Question No. 15 is as follows:

1. There are 3,468 students of secondary school age, eleven years old and over, who are currently attending the government all-age Primary and Composite Schools.

2. Students attending government all-age Primary and and Composite Schools at the end of 1975–76 and 1977–78 were as follows:

1975–76	–	3,793
1977–78	–	3,657

3. There are 5,315 students of secondary school age who are currently enrolled in the private approved schools.

4. There are 606 classrooms in the Government Secondary Schools with an optimum total roll of 18,241 pupils. There are 19,780 students attending the 20 Government Schools so that there is, overall, a shortage of 1,539 places of which 1,200 will be removed when the new school at Trents is opened and the remainder when extensions now underway are completed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for St. Michael North Central whom I do not now see in his place.

Mr. WEEKES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. member for St. Michael North Central, I am informing you, Sir, that owing to very serious circumstances beyond his control he is unable to be here today. Consequently I can only suggest to you, if it meets your approval, that the question be deferred.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the hon. member has been so instructed I do not think the request can be granted.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind if these things get laid and circulated without knowing the circumstances in which the question is based in a particular form. Just for the record I would like to point out that the answer given to this question is the same as an answer given to me to a Question that was on the Order Paper for two years during the Session 1966–71 and then the same question was No. 1 of the 1971–76 Parliament. I have used the same form of words that was used on that occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER: This brings us to the end of Question Time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS RESUMED

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that Government Business be now resumed and that Order No. 2 be the Order of the day.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: Government Business is the instant Order of the day; Order No. 2.

On the motion of Hon. H. B. St. JOHN, seconded by Hon. L. S. CRAIG the House went into Committee, Mr. SIMMONS in the Chair.

Clause 1 was called and passed.

Clause 2 was called.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer once again to column 2 of section 4, page 11. I am very concerned whether this Honourable House in this day and age, even if there was provision for the imprisonment of someone for a term of fourteen years for the killing or maiming of cattle, should not take the opportunity now to express our position on this matter; and I would certainly try to urge members on the other side, to give some consideration to an amendment that that fourteen years be reduced to five years without prejudice to any further changes in this particular Act. I understand that the Government is likely to undertake an overall review but I think it would be a mistake by us while considering this matter now to allow it to go through in this way and I myself think that fourteen years in the context of Barbados, whatever the historical aspects of it as outlined by the hon. member for St. Thomas, must be considered grossly excessive in the context of penalties in Barbados.

I would also take this opportunity to point out that I am not one of those people who believe that the

severity of penalties in itself will lead to a decrease in the particular crime for which the penalty is initiated. However, I do not wish to get into that area of criminology at this time for that is a highly debatable area. But I feel that we have an obligation to show some indication that we regard this particular matter as being archaic and the amounts of the fines and the terms of imprisonment excessive. I have listened very carefully to the legal arguments of the other side – I speak purely from a social point of view – and feel that the Government should give consideration to at least this particular area of the Bill.

3.15 p.m.

I have listened to the legal arguments; but certainly I do not agree with the position taken by the Leader of the House that because we have problems in the agricultural area that penalties of this order would necessarily act as a deterrent; because the problems there are historic – part indeed of the cultural tradition of this country, and will be changed eventually only in the context of the social and economic development of this society where people would be so much better off and would have so much money available to them that they would not waste their time trying to steal someone's cow or vegetables or something like that. That is going to be the final answer in the long run apart from the fact that there will always be a few recidivist criminals in this society.

I would implore the Government on this single occasion to give some consideration to what has been said on this side on this particular matter. I think that it is wrong that in 1979 we should have such a statute that can send a man to jail for 14 years for killing a cow. This represents the maximum penalty, and I appreciate that. I know that it will lie within the discretion of the magistrate; but I feel that it is an insult to the democratic process and to my feeling of humanity.

I do not feel that that kind of penalty should be on the Statute Book of Barbados; and when amendments are being made I think that this one should be dealt with right now; because I feel that it is the most offensive of the whole series that they sent here. I think that it is a question of humanity, and in my view it will and must reflect on the thinking of this Hon. House in relation to penalties imposed by this legislation; and I will ask that some consideration be given to a reduction of the penalty from 14 years to 5 years.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central and I must often wonder how cheap the arguments can be in here Monday after Monday or Tuesday after Tuesday. I sat here and heard the legal side of it. I heard the plea from the other side. As I understand it, this piece of legislation was on the Statute Book for over 110 years.

I have always heard the saying spare not the rod and spoil the child; and after all of these years, long before the time when there was such an increase in criminal behaviour in Barbados it was thought that there should be a penalty of 14 years for such a felony, what is the complaint today? I think that the argument from the other side should be that to help deter the crime rate there should be greater penalties; but we are not inhuman. We have allowed it to remain on the Statute Book as it is.

As I understand it the Judge or Magistrate has it within his discretion. He can convict, remand and discharge, or give a man one month, two months, three months, four months, five months or six months. There is the maximum penalty of 14 years. I cannot understand why the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is emphasising a cow. The emphasis is on cow. I think that what he should be trying to do is jail a fly.

This is something so simple. The maximum penalty in Barbados over 100 years was 14 years. All that they have done is to make certain amendments. I will say this now. I remember many many years ago there was a spate of acid throwing in this country, and a spate of bounce and drawing – the boys in the USA today call it mugging – and the Police found it very difficult to track down those people. When they were tracked down and brought before the Chief Justice of Barbados, I remember that they were given some maximum penalties and the cat-of-nine tails. I am not advocating that; but what I would say is that acid throwing and bounce and drawing went out of practise for many, many years.

I want the hon. member to ask himself this question. When a young man leaves school and buys a quarter of an acre of land and plants it, for instance, some Rastas that we have heard mentioned today raid it. All day and all night he is working. He has his vegetables to sell and then one morning when he wakes up to harvest his crop and finds that someone is coming to steal them, that man is met with gun fire. There are cases in this country. I remember reading of someone in St. Philip who came out one night to chase people off his farm and he was met with fire.

What is the hon. member going to ask me to do, remove something which has been on the Statute Book for 110 years from 14 years, when the crime rate 110 years ago was not as high as it is today? I think that we should be looking at the social problem as the hon. member said; but how would you solve these social problems when the air is polluted at night with cheap silly politics?

I cannot agree with the hon. member on the other side that you should reduce the penalty from 14 years to 5 years in the light that it is left to the discretion of the magistrate. I believe that my colleagues on the other side may be in a position to determine if at any time in the history of Barbados a man was ever given 14 years for stealing a cow, a pig, a goat or vegetables. If the hon. member can bring information to that effect, I will have to support his argument; but as long as it is within the discretion of the magistrate I think his argument falls down. It is only cheap politics that he is once again playing.
3.25 p.m.

Hon. C. L. BOLDEN: Mr. Chairman, I think that in dealing with penalty clauses in a Bill one should first recognise that those persons whose duty it is to administer the law used their common sense in relation to the crime, the state of crime at the given time, and the person or persons who have been convicted for committing such a crime. I do not believe that by reducing the figure from 14 to 5 years will in any way affect the results of the penalty which should be administered. It is full well known in the law that when those who have to make charges consider that the penalties are too low, they adopt a system which practising barristers refer to as throwing the book at the accused by charging the person with a series of charges. Then at the time of conviction they usually ask the magistrate or the trial judge to sentence in such a way to bring about a penalty so that the public would understand the gravity of the crime.

Now the hon. member is obviously playing to the Press and the Gallery so that tomorrow's newspapers will show that the hon. member for St. Michael South Central pleaded to reduce a penalty clause from 14 to 5 years and talked about humanity etc. I believe the hon. member should think carefully about the history and development of law in this country and remember that we have adopted many of our laws from the United Kingdom. Any one of us who has studied law will tell the hon. member that in the early days in Britain it was an offence to steal anything exceeding the value of a shilling. Stealing anything over the value of a shilling was a felony and the penalty for a felony was either that you be beheaded or be deported. The judges who had to administer the law used to induce prosecutors to reduce the value of the goods to under a shilling, and often of those who were convicted some were deported to Australia and New Zealand. If you came out of a certain social strata you went to the best of the places, and I do not think that judges in Barbados or magistrates can be regarded as having less human feelings than judges in other parts of the world.

I well remember that about three years ago in St. Philip a man grabbed hold of a cow that had strayed upon his land and killed it. He was charged at District "C", he went to the Assizes, and I believe that despite the fact that the same Bill was on the Statute Book for well over 100 years, despite the fact that the police claimed that the man did it with vengeance in his mind, the Judge sentenced that man to eighteen months imprisonment, not 14 years, but the law said that the maximum penalty for the offence was 14 years. I do not believe that anywhere in the history of the courts in Barbados you can find anybody being sentenced to 14 years for such an offence; so reducing it from 14 to five years and the Judge giving you 18 months is the same thing as far as I am concerned as if it had been written down in the book for 25 years.

Mr. Chairman, look at manslaughter. In the Law Books the penalty for manslaughter is life imprisonment. There is no difference today in the law between manslaughter where a man takes a knife or a gun and takes the life of another human being or if he drives a motorcar in such a way that he kills any other human being, but the Judge will give you one to two years imprisonment. The maximum I believe within the last ten years has been seven years imprisonment for manslaughter. You do not hear life imprisonment. Why doesn't he get up and ask that you remove the term life imprisonment from the Law Books because it is 1979 and put 7 or 10 years? You see, Mr. Chairman, what I do not understand is cheap politics. When the Democratic Labour Party was in power and they brought in the Medical Practitioners' Bill, they had just brought in a Legal Practitioners' Bill in which they said a lawyer must be liable for his deeds up to three years, but then they wanted to make the doctors liable for their deeds for only one year. Now today the same hon. member who was a member of the Democratic Labour Party as he says from back in the Seventies did not advise them on that. So this question of playing to the gallery and to the public by asking to remove the 14 year term and put in five years is not going to affect the law one way or the other. It is left to the discretion of the trial magistrate or trial judge to determine the gravity of the crime, and therefore to sentence accordingly.

There are laws on the Statute Book dealing with people who catch fires to sugar cane, something of economic value to the community. Every political party including the Democratic Labour Party and now the Barbados Labour Party has called for stiffer sentences in respect of fires to sugar cane, and what do we get? I have never seen anybody given the maximum sentence yet. If you go through the Statute Book from beginning to end I doubt in my fourteen years of practising at the Bar I have ever known of anybody given the maximum sentence. The newspapers have the habit of reporting that somebody has got 33 years imprisonment because it looks good and it sells the newspapers, but to us practising lawyers when you look at it somebody has

been given five years to run concurrently with a seven year sentence to run concurrently with a two year sentence. I had a client that had 27 counts in an indictment and when my friends outside were betting me that he could not come out of gaol for 20 years, I heard two years to run concurrently with probation, but if you multiply 27 by 2 you would get 54 years; but the man served two years on probation. So what is all the fuss about 14 years? Legal history will show you that the figure is placed there because in the view of penologist you must put something to stop people, because when they read it they would say, if I do so and so I will get fourteen years, and they will back off; but what else does it do? As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, if you remove it from 14 to 5 years, everybody would come in and ask to remove something from this right down the line.

I have never known as I said before any judge giving a convicted person the maximum sentence in that light. I know because I had to do with the previous matter in which I recall dealing with the death of cattle and I think the man got 18 months, and I do not see there is any need to interfere with it as it stands. The Democratic Labour Party Government had a chance to alter all the laws in this country when they were in power, and far from altering the laws they sat down and did absolutely nothing when the practising lawyers complained about it, and I do not think that the hon. member is in a position to complain about altering something which was altered during the period when he was a member of the Democratic Labour Party and should have brought his influence to bear upon those in authority at the time to have amended it to state what he thought would be reasonable.

3.35 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the plea made by my colleague, the member for St. Michael South Central and I would like to urge upon the Government that they defer consideration of this particular matter and give it more mature consideration. I think there is a good case for deliberating upon this particular matter some more and for the Government to come up with a more enlightened approach on this measure that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, I am not advocating this from any political point of view. I do not know why we should allude to the fact that this is a political matter. There are certain aspects of the legislation or public policies in this country in which this House ought not to be divided in this particular matter. I do not think that there is any political capital to be gained by saying that the Democratic Labour Party was in power and they had the opportunity to change the Law and did not change it and therefore when the member for St. Michael South Central speaks or any member from this side speaks that it is politically motivated and you are not doing it.

I think the arguments that have been advanced have been very weak in logic. We have an explanation and I can understand the historical explanation that has been given about penalties not exceeding 14 years and about the Irish in their struggle for independence from the British and this has been on the Statute Book since 1868. I can understand that type of historical explanation but I do not think it is very relevant to the particular point we are raising today.

This is a Parliament of 1976 – 1981 and all of us should consider very seriously that as legislators in this particular Parliament, we lay down our burdens and we would be able to say, and history would be able to say of us, that we were a reforming Parliament. Not one that is draconian and one that seeks to expand and perpetuate on the Statute Book legislation going back to 1868 or before which is excessive in terms of the penalties imposed. We should be aiming each one of us to ensure that the legislation in which we participate would be such legislation as would be considered enlightened.

I think it is a very weak argument to advance especially coming from those who have been trained in legal history to advocate that because it was not done before and it was on the Statute Books that there is all the more reason why it should continue. There were many excessive penalties on the Statute Books of Britain in the 19th Century and I am not schooled in legal history as some of my colleagues in this Chamber on that side are. I did not have the benefit of that training and I know very well that there was a reforming period in the 19th Century when every effort was made by the Utilitarians, people like Bentham and John Stoake Mills and, Mr. Chairman, I am certain you can give me some other names as well, and they tried to remode and succeeded to a large extent the Utilitarian Movement of the 19th Century to remove excessive penalties from the Statute Books in keeping with the social development and advancement of the social concept of England at that particular time.

A whole series of legal reforms were carried out as a result of the intervention and the exposition by people like Jeremy Bentham and John Stoake-Mills and so on and I believe that the Prime Minister is well aware of this and that is why he indicated that there were some forces in the arguments coming from this side. He recognised and that is why he indicated that there would be some reform coming later on. He did not dismiss the argument from over here as any cheap political argument. He recognised the course of the arguments. *(Asides).* I cannot identify off-hand but I would have to do a little research to tell you some of the excessive and draconian penalties which was on the Statute Books of Britain in the 19th

Century which were reformed out of existence, including matters like stealing a sheep, maiming and some of the other offences which were referred to in here.

We have got to look at this and I would appeal to members opposite in the same terms that I started. We must take an enlightened view of the legislation that comes before us and I certainly would not wish to be associated with any legislation which for one moment can be considered as antiquarian or against the tide of social and legal developments in an enlightened and progressive country. I would not want to be associated with it once it is drawn to my attention and I do not think any hon. member in this Chamber would want to be so associated. My colleague, the member for St. Michael South Central, has given some instances of these 14 years and we have had an explanation why it is so.

It is recognised, in spite of any arguments, that the Magistrates is a jurisdiction. It is recognised that this is not what any enlightened Chamber would want to see inscribed on the Statute Books. I do not think that any great harm will come to the Republic. I do not think that any great harm will come to the monarchy of Barbados. I do not think that any great harm will come to the monarchy, if I can paraphrase a famous phrase. If further consideration to this particular matter were postponed and the Government returned with a more enlightened piece of legislation on this particular matter, even pending further work of law reform that is suppose to take place, I would like to urge members that this position is not advanced out of any point of view of scoring any political points. It is not advanced from any position of adversary politics but out of a genuine desire to ensure that as a legislature, we take an enlightened position on matters that come before us.
3.45 p.m.

I believe the problem that those whom the member for Christ Church South Central have termed those in the productive sector, that their problem is when they have planted their crops and others come and reap, the problem is that they want greater protection. I believe that that protection can only come in part from legal penalties; I believe if other measures were introduced in order to step up the capability of the law enforcement agencies in this country to guard their property in a more effective, I believe that that might be a contribution towards the problem, but I do not think that any postponement of this particular matter for a few weeks could cause any great harm in this country, and I beg to move, Mr. Chairman, that further consideration of this matter be postponed.

Dr. HAYNES: I beg to second that.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I have given great consideration to the points advanced by the other side and when I look at the legislation that we are dealing with I think hon. members are labouring under a slight misappreciation of the purport of the amendment. In truth and in fact the amendment modifies the existing law to the extent that whereas today any unlawful and malicious wounding of cattle incurs the penalty of 14 years, in the future a distinction is made between the damage done if the damage is under $500, under the existing amendment the penalty can only be a year's imprisonment. If on the other hand, it is above the $500, not only does the existing law remain but also it must be tried by a Judge and jury in the Supreme Court, so that the force of the amendment is to modify the existing provision by making a distinction in the monetary value of the damage and permitting a Magistrate to try it, and secondly, varying the period of imprisonment from 14 years to 1 year. Section 28(b) makes that very clear, so that there is a considerable modification of the so-called severity of the existing law.

Now when we look at the other provision of the law, section 8, it is only a repeat of the existing law, may I draw hon. members' attention to this, that the Malicious Injury to Property Act is part of a whole series of specific Statutes dealing with offences relating to property. If we amend on the floor of this House today the provisions dealing with offences above $500 we would be interfering with a whole scheme of legislation which is in existence in a piecemeal fashion. We have said on this side that we would draw to the Attorney General's Office and the Law Reform Division of the Attorney General's Office the views of hon. members that in respect of paragraph 8 of this offence the penalties in the opinion of hon. members are too harsh and request them in their review of penalties, which is an on-going exercise in which I understand considerable progress has been made, and to ask them to modify it, but we cannot modify it in one Act without modifying it in the other Acts. And to illustrate this I will draw to the hon. members' attention that under the Larceny Act, section 9, any person who steals any bull, cow, ox, heifer, calf, horse, mare, gelding, colt, filly, ram, ewe, sheep or lamb, goat or kid, hog or pig shall be guilty of a felony, and being convicted thereof shall be liable to imprisonment for 14 years. It is very clear that there were a series of offences in a number of Acts in which there was a common penalty.

Now we go further. Any person who kills any animal with intent to steal the carcass shall be liable to be convicted as if he had killed the animal with intent to steal, and again the penalty there is the same as section 9, and we go ahead and look right through the whole of the Larceny Act dealing with these offences. If we go to breaking and entrance it is 14 years, and in the Malicious Injury to Property Act the scheme of the main offence once you were tried before a Judge and jury the maxi-

mum penalty would be 14 years. If we go and pick up this now and amend section 28 here other than in the fashion in which we are amending it, which is to mitigate the position, because we are now separating the category of offence of unlawfully and maliciously killing and maiming between the value of the animal that has been maimed or killed, and if it is above $500 the general provision applies, if it is under $500 the Magistrate can try it and the maximum fine is one year's imprisonment.

Similarly, we have done in relation to the Larceny Act. We have segregated the provisions and said once it is a monetary value a Magistrate can try it, and we have mitigated the penalties considerably, but that is legislating right across the board. That is instituting a new scheme with a new criterion, namely a monetary limit, involved and a whole scheme of punishment. Well, we cannot deal with the rest of section 28 without disturbing the whole context of the legislation. That is why we cannot today accept this, and what we can do is to draw it to the attention of the Attorney General's Office that all the penalties in relation to offences to the property which are triable by a Judge and jury hon. members feel that 14 years is too long a period. That is what we can undertake to do, but to move that today then we would be disturbing the whole scheme of legislation, when in truth and in fact what we are doing now is improving and reducing the penalties from the existing law.

Today if you unlawfully and maliciously brand or maim any cattle in Barbados you are liable to 14 years, whether the cattle is a little calf costing below $500. What we say now if the value is $500 the Magistrate can try it and the maximum would be a year, so we have considerably improved the position.

Accordingly, Sir, those are the reasons why we cannot accept the suggestions, and what we can undertake to do is to communicate the feeling of hon. members to the Attorney General and ask him when he is doing the review of the penalties in relation to the Judge and jury in relation to the High Court, then we can do that. Those are the reasons.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the Leader of this Hon. House has sought to bring a different dimension to this debate, because I was thoroughly disappointed where in a matter that must exercise the mind of every hon. member, the whole question of the social aspects of justice, the economic aspects of justice, and the dispensation of justice, a matter which we have sought to approach from this side from a strictly humanitarian position without the benefit of legal expertise on this side today, that because I brought this matter to the attention of this Hon. House that you hear these remarks of partisan approach and this kind of thing and playing to the Gallery.
3.55 p.m.

The validity of the point I have made stands and will always stand and anyone with any knowledge of the law or knowledge of the question of punishment in relation to crime must recognize the fundamental validity of the stand I have taken and the gross illogic of the arguments put forward by the hon. member for St. Joseph. If that was followed to its logical conclusion you could only say that Parliament need not put any ceiling in terms of penalties for any crime and leave the entire matter to the discretion of the officers of the courts. I will accept the assurance of the hon. Leader of this House that he has taken full cognizance of the totality of our representations here today, on the clear understanding that we have not taken this stand on a party political basis but because of our concern about the question of penalties, the question of crime, the question of the social and economic development in relation to those various aspects of our society. I accept his assurance in good faith and look forward to seeing comprehensive legislation come before this House, and that when that legislation comes we will see a more humanitarian approach not only to this matter but also to another matter of great concern to me.

I want to make it absolutely clear that I have always been totally against such things as capital punishment. I do not believe in murdering people legally or otherwise, so my position I am taking here now is a fundamental feeling that I have in relation to crime and punishment and I do not wish this to be misunderstood in any way. But there are certain persons on the other side who cannot understand that there are certain things that cannot fall within the partisan political arena. The barrier is not merely one of politics. I do not want to be insulted in this Honourable Chamber, but I think that all of us who have given some thought or who are capable of giving some thought to matters not only within our field but matters affecting the society, and capable of giving expressions of these thoughts often detect, despite the heated debate on both sides, a fundamental understanding of what is being said; but in some persons I have discovered that that understanding was never there and will never be there, so I shall ignore them and not respond to them.

So that is my position. I will accept the assurance of the Hon. Leader of the House and from my experience I believe I am reasonably assured that he will proceed along the lines he has indicated.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman,.....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I will allow the hon. member for St. Michael North West to speak, but before I get to that,

am I getting some indication from the Opposition that the motion which was put for further consideration of this matter to be deferred will be withdrawn? The mover of the motion is not in his place but I take it that that will be so. In light of the assurances given by the Hon. Leader of the House I will hear the hon. member for St. Michael North West.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of some importance and I think we have got to keep level heads. This side of the Chamber, in my view, understands the thought the hon. member is making, because the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House have given undertakings to review the matter and to draw it to the attention of the property authority when the far reaching legislation on reform is being considered. I myself have some sympathy with the upper limit of fourteen years as being against the trend of modern penological thought, but I want to draw one salient point to the attention of this Chamber, and that is no one should think that this is a mandatory sentence. I think that that may have been part of the confusion with the original argument and perhaps members of the public may have been led to think so. The sentence is in the nature of a discretionary sentence, leaving it to the discretion of the court to impose one day, two weeks, one year, any time up to fourteen years; and I would wish that that point be not lost on the public that it is not a mandatory sentence. What we are talking about is a maximum of fourteen years but in the discretion of the court and I am voting for this Bill on the pledges and assurances given by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the House.

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

Clause 3 was called.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 stand part, with the following amendments, section 22 paragraph (b).....

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The amendment has been circulated, so you can move the Clause as amended.

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that Clause 3 as amended stand part.

The question that Clause 3, as amended, stand part was put and resolved in the affirmative without division.

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

4.05 p.m.

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

Mr. SPEAKER: The Chairman, has reported to me the passing of one Bill in Committee.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT CHECKER HALL

Order No. 3 was called – A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Sutherland, Checker Hall, St. Lucy for the purpose of land improvement.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that either of these matters should be controversial. There are primarily for the purpose of road improvement. This resolution was given notice of on the 19th of this month, and I am informed that the necessary documents have been circulated. It is to acquire a portion of land at Sutherland, Checker Hall, St. Lucy, from an Isabel Greene. There is some 6,900 square feet or thereabouts.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

Hon. L. B. BRATHWAITE: Mr. Speaker, I am seconding this Resolution; but I just want to make a point in connection with the acquisition of this portion of land and the need for such acquisition. During my period in the Ministry of Communications and Works I had to deal with this matter; this matter was hanging fire for some three years because of the indifference of the people who were involved with this land; and these people were suffering terribly in the area as far as road repairs were concerned.

I think that the time has come when the Government will have to become more forceful in bringing these matters to a head. The person involved was very reluctant to come to any compromise because her neighbours would benefit from the purchase of the land for the improvement of the area; and although the land would be improved, which is Mrs. Green's land, she made it extremely difficult for the Government to negotiate because of the differences which existed between herself and the persons who would have benefited from this road work. I hope that machinery will soon be set in train by the Ministry of Housing and Lands to bring about a quick and speedy settlement of these matters.

As a matter of fact it was brought home very clearly to us that all the Government has got to do is to give notice of its intention to acquire, and the machinery can be immediately set in train in order to have the road works done in areas that involve difficulties of this kind. I just want to sound that note and bring the public's attention to the fact that at times when these

acquisitions are involved and there is no quick action, it is not because the Government has failed to bring about the required action on these matters, but because the people involved are invariably tardy in bringing these matters to a conclusion.

People have suffered very much as a result of this delay and these long drawn out negotiations with the parties involved. I hope that now the Government has brought this matter to the House that speedy and immediate action will be taken in order to put the services in train and to give those persons suffering for many years a proper road on which to get in and out, and a proper place to live.

I beg to second the motion.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Mr. Speaker, I want to draw it to the attention of this Hon. Chamber that the same state of affairs exists in the constituency which I represent as regards the policy of land acquisition. Some time in 1976, before the General Elections, the former administration acquired compulsorily certain parcels of land at Free Hill. The then Minister of Housing, Mr. Philip Greaves, said that it was for the purpose of housing development. I have spoken on this already, and I want to draw it to the attention of the appropriate Minister again.

Mr. SPEAKER: This deals with road improvement.

Mr. ALLEYNE: Yes, but I am dealing with the general policy of land acquisition; because what happens is that some of that land that was acquired for housing development is now being rented back to the original owners. I think that something is wrong there. If land is acquired for a public purpose and then not used, it ought to be handed back to the original owners. In fact, my constituents are now paying rent in respect of lands which were acquired from them under the Land Acquisition Act. I hear statements to the effect that they were paid, but some of those persons have not in fact received compensation for their land. I think that when one is dealing with acquisition under this Act, I have a duty to raise that particular point.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I take the hon. member's point, but I must draw to his attention that I think that the Act does make it clear. There is nothing to stop the Government from acquiring a portion of land, and then if it has no use for the land, they have the right to rent it back to the person. As I understand the law – maybe the legal luminaries will correct me on this – they should first offer back the land to the person it concerns as a priority. If there is any discrepancy, the hon. member can drop me a note and I would look into the matter for him if it is causing his constituents any inconvenience.

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

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND AT HAYNESVILLE, ST. JAMES

Order No. 4 was called – A Resolution to approve the compulsory acquisition of land at Haynesville, St. James for the purpose of housing development.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, this takes a different form in that it is for the purpose of housing development.
4.15 p.m.

This is to carry out the policy of the Ministry of Housing by way of a land bank at Haynesville in the parish of Saint James. I think there are 105 units which we hope to put at Haynesville. As a matter of fact, I think the bulldozers should be there by the morning of 1st April to start construction to make sure that I keep very close to my promise and the manifesto's promise to the country to build the required amount of houses which we have set out in the manifesto. So this is not for road improvement, but for the purpose of erecting houses to house the nation's people.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

SUSPENSION OF SITTING

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, I understand that all the matters except one have been completed and that certain conversations are going on on that for information and that a few more minutes will be needed.

I therefore beg to move that this sitting be now suspended until 4.45 p.m.

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

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, this sitting of the House as I understand it was suspended until today specifically to deal with this item as the major item, and for the Leader of the House to come in here now and tell us that everything is not in order is totally unsatisfactory. I do not think that we on this side will agree to any suspension of the House.

Hon. L. S. CRAIG: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. member for St. Michael South Central would not pay some attention to what is going on in

parliament. The Sitting was never suspended to deal with any particular matter. I moved the Suspension for the purpose of dealing with matters on the Order Paper, and at this point we set out to move the suspension which the Leader of the House has the right to do for any one purpose. The purpose is to have something regularised, so if the hon. member for St. Michael South Central is out for the kill, he has enough time to cool off himself and go and get another injection and settle down. I do not know what he is talking about the Sitting being suspended for a particular item?

The question was put and resolved in the affirmative without division and Mr. SPEAKER suspended the Sitting accordingly.

On resumption:

Mr. SPEAKER: This Sitting is now resumed.

THE CIVIL ESTABLISHMENT (TEACHERS) ORDER, 1979

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple matter, a Civil Establishment Order relating to the revision of salaries in the teaching grades of the Public Service. This is a Resolution to approve it. The Order was laid on Friday. The Resolution, I believe, has been circulated.

This matter has been in some sort of negotiation since November or December, 1977, and it illustrates one of the difficulties that has beset successive government in dealing with salaries revisions, because we find ourselves having to consider a salaries revision not just in terms of what general percentage increase in salaries may be appropriate in the light of the Government's ability to pay, the rate of inflation as measured by increases in the retail price index and the general conditions of the country, but also we find ourselves having at the same time to consider claims from particular employees and groups of employees in the Public Service for re-classification or revision, regrading, review whatever you like of the individual jobs. Right at the start I should like to say that it is a great pity that you cannot establish as a firm principle that salaries revision is one thing and regrading and re-classification is another, because in the current exercises concerned with salaries revision, in the end every single group eventually came to accept the Government's and the Barbados Workers' Union and the NUPW's proposals which are embodied in the formula that has come to be known as 20–10. Neither the teachers nor the police nor anyone else has objected to the concept that the cost of living increase is less than 20% over a period of time – I have forgotten the exact amount, but it may have been 14% – the government's ability to pay was very limited at a particular time. Everybody has accepted that and accepted the basic pay formula, but as hon. members will know as far as the police and the teachers were concerned, not only consideration of pay were brought into the revision exercise but also considerations of regrading and classification. This is no new feature either.

In 1976 there was a complicated regrading exercise that spread many parts of the Civil Service in 1969 and there have been others. There are, it is safe to say, always some regrading questions going on. There are not always salary revision questions going on, but at the time when the salaries revisions come up the regradings seem to assume a lot more importance, and in the case of the Barbados Union of Teachers, these regradings ultimately assume the major importance. The Barbados Union of Teachers is not a very old Union; it has sprung out of the NUPW but in its few years of life it does have this record: it has never agreed with the Government on a stated salary settlement. The BUT and the Government have never come to an agreement, not any Government; so this is nothing new. The Barbados Workers' Union, the doyen of trade unions in the Caribbean and the leading Union of Barbados overcomes the irresponsibilities even of some of its officers and the mature wisdom of Mr. Frank Walcott generally prepares in the interest of all Barbadians. It is true that the Barbados Workers' Union will submit salary claims for percentage increases greater than perhaps than any Union in the United States has ever submitted or even the very difficult British Unions so renowned for their difficulties which to the best of my knowledge have never put forward a claim for a 50% salary increase.

4.50 p.m.

In the end, the Barbados Workers' Union and the Government can get down to business, settle down and deal with the salaries. I believe that over the years the Barbados Workers' Union has come to accept that the Government will do the best it can when it comes to public workers. The National Union of Public Workers have shown some signs of intransigence in the past, Sir. The domestic quarrels sometimes are more significant than the quarrels in the distance but the Police and the Teachers over a period of years have found it very difficult to come to agreements with the Government. I am informed that the Police Association have only twice, and I am going back many years, Sir, come to complete agreement with the Government. I think this occasion now will make three.

The Barbados Union of Teachers remain entrapped. Unfortunately, this seems to be something that we are seeing with Teachers in the Eastern Caribbean or rather Teacher Unions in many Caribbean Islands. It is alleged that some of them have Marxist influence. Certainly you do not have to go so far, but certainly, Sir, you have seen them in difficulties with the Governments of Antigua, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and indeed even Dominica and the Government of Barbados. Many of these Teachers met at Cave Hill. I really do not know, Sir, but there it is.

I am not having any quarrel because the people who teach our children deserve some consideration and they have been getting consideration over the years. The terms of service for Graduates in Barbados are by no means bad. Graduates enter the teaching service in many cases at a higher level than they enter other grades of the Civil Service. They may be teaching Elementary subjects in the Primary Schools but they are still paid Graduate pay. They enter the Service and they are not teaching any subjects in which they graduated. A history Graduate may very well be teaching Elementary Arithmetic but he is paid as a History Graduate. Here you get other Teachers trained or untrained teaching the same Arithmetic in the same school for must less money and I will come to that point later.

The Graduate skills were introduced at a time, or I should say, the incentives were introduced at a time, when there were only three University Graduates teaching in the Primary and Comprehensive Schools. There are now in the Primary and the Comprehensive Schools together about 260 so the incentives needed to attract three or more people are now still being given when you have 260 or more than 10% of the actual working teaching force in the Primary, Nursery Schools, the Primary all aged and in the newer Secondary Schools.

Now there have been some teaching in the special 14 – 16 Schools which have been instituted to bring 14–years old back to school. Now next to the Graduates you have what is undoubtedly the background of the Teaching Service, the Qualified Teachers. These are people who have been through the Course at Erdiston and they have become qualified and they go on a different scale of pay from the Untrained Teachers, people who have just entered with Certificates and in the fullness of time will go to Erdiston or perhaps become graduates and there is of course a movement between all of these three main classes of Teachers.

The Untrained Teachers hope to be trained or become Graduates. Trained Teachers hope to be Graduates also. That is, Qualified Teachers, so you have as situation of class. There are in fact just under 3,000 Teachers in all the Government Schools in Barbados, roughly 2,983. Out of these you have the prodigious number of 404 on study leave at any one time. I do not think that any country in the world, and the Chief Education Officer told me when he revealed these figures quite recently at some Conference in Jamaica, they were hardly believable, but there cannot be any country in the World which is training or educating at the University so many Teachers in relation to its entire Teaching Force. Now I am not against that, Sir, but it does mean that we are paying a very large number of Teachers who are not teaching and therefore the total amount of money that is available for the salaries of the Teachers that are teaching is necessarily diminished or qualified, or what ever is a suitable expression, by this large reserve force and group in training.

On top of that, Sir, we also years ago conceded in the principle of paying the Temporary Teachers for vacation as well as full-time which is a condition of service which I do not believe that they enjoy for example, in Great Britain and we are only now moving towards the wealthier American States where you pay a man by the year and he has to teach whenever you call him. They have that type of Contract. That adds another 25% to the bill of the Temporary Teachers and all of this attenuation, Sir, means that the actual Teaching Force is sharing its potential rewards with a large force not teaching and in other countries certainly not being paid while on reserve.

I just say all of this, Sir, because there seem to be some talk abroad that the Teaching Service of Barbados is badly underpaid or that you are dealing with a lot of people who are being exploited by the Government. Point One – it would not be this Government that is doing the exploiting. Point Two – this Government is not going to give itself a pat on the back because all of these are things which we have come and found. We have come and found a condition of service for Teachers, the good with the bad, but very generous training provisions for Teachers. Very generous for Temporary Teachers on the one hand for the good and on the other hand perhaps the fact that graduates enjoyed exceptional privileges compared to Qualified Teachers and even to Erdistonians. It should not be thought that Graduates are un-trained because they get their training at Cave Hill and you find a man who is a trained Teacher and becomes a Graduate that he gets two sets of training, as I understand it.

We are faced with this situation. The Government finds itself negotiating with the Teachers. Sir, I have known a few cases where with negotiations with which I had anything to do with where there were more sympathy and less response to the sympathy than the Teachers. The Teachers started out, Sir, and I think they asked for 40% increases which may have been very much more modest than those of some other Unions but after they had got over all the ideological and political talk I must say, Sir, that the hon. member for St. Lucy, Mr. Leroy Trotman, Mr. Levere Richards and Mr. Frank Walcott together in all the years of negotiating with the Government of which the Government records afford any evidence have not talked as much politics and economics as Mr. John Cumberbatch at two meetings last year in June and July.

5.00 p.m.

The British Navigation Act was even analysed in a document. I would really like to read some of it. There will not be significant increase in productivity until the Barbadian economy has increased investment in new areas of economic enterprise. All of this was before any case was put forward for the teachers to get money.

Dr. HAYNES: On a point of order. I wonder if the hon. member would make that a document of the House, since he is reading from it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Such a decision can only come from the Chair.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: This is a Government file, if the hon. member tells me I cannot read from it I can only describe that.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Please ingore that.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Anyway, Sir, let me summarise the document. The first page of the document analyses the navigational acts and an import economy generally, the second page of the document speaks about price increases. Mr. Cumberbatch has even treated me to two full foolscap pages on productivity and microscopic industrial daylight saving – he has given me a little needle there about daylight saving – the Government must increase its level of investment in non-traditional areas of enterprise, we will have to face balance of payments for a long time, he put forward a case which is very much opposite to the case put forward by Mr. Cameron Tudor in the pages of the Nation. He said you must reduce the amount of consumer imports available to people, and he did not only put it forward in a document, he quarrelled twice with the Chief Establishments Officer about it, why couldn't he get some answer on reducing traditional consumer imports. Then on the fifth page something was put forward saying that the Union will submit a memorandum on security of tenure for teachers, and then at the end there are nine lines which contain the Union's proposals, and the first overlap of the qualified teacher and the graduate teacher scales based on the ratio of the primary Head Teacher's salary to that of a university graduate at the maximum, and further an incentive gap between the highest point of the untrained beginner's scale and the qualified teacher's scale.

They are the four points which the Union put forward. First, an overlap of the qualified teacher and the graduate teacher scale; two, greater overlap of the senior teacher scale with the graduate teacher scale; three, the equation of the minimum of the primary Head Teacher's salary to that of a university graduate. I could as well say that that was not raised nor was it acceptable to the Government. I am not going to refer to that again here, Sir, but it was not raised by the Union during the negotiations and it is not acceptable to the Government. And the last is an incentive gap between the highest point of the untrained beginner's scale and the qualified teacher's scale.

Now, the only one of those points which was actually put forward in the negotiations is point one, which is the qualified teacher and the graduate teacher. That is the only one. I really do not want to go over anything that hon. members may have seen or heard somewhere else, I do not want to take you through the course of the negotiations. The first meeting was a joint meeting of the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Government. Mr. Cumberbatch at this meeting refused to talk salaries until he received answers to his economic proposals, the Government's Chief Establishments Officer could not deal with it. The second meeting was held, the same thing. By this time, however, the Secondary School Teachers' Union was coming to an agreement. Further meetings now with the BUT and more economics and the difficulties came to be centered in what was called the five point overlap. Nothing else was discussed except the scale of salaries and the five point overlap. Nothing else was discussed all last year.

On and on it went. The five point overlap which is a complex and difficult concept as far as I can see for many people, including perhaps some hon. members, journalists and others, what had existed prior to 1969, so that a qualified teacher at the maximum got less than the graduate teacher at the minimum. In 1969 what was called a one point overlap was instituted, the scale of the qualified teacher was extended by one point and there was an overlap. He could at his maximum get the same salary as a graduate entering the Service. The Union have the impression that the whole scale was lifted; that is not so. The bottom point of the qualified teacher's scale was reclassified, there was no lifting, a point was added on at the top, the people in the middle remained the same, the bottom point had a redesignation, I believe it was called. The hon. member for St. Michael South will no doubt have a complete and accurate recall of this. I hope when he gets up to speak he gives an accurate recall.

Now, the Union went on without any more turbulence than was normal for many years – they were represented by the NUPW in those days – and they shared in the salary increases in the years between 1969 and 1976, but in the meanwhile the Barbados Union of Teachers had been formed and turbulence came in then. By 1976 there was more turbulence with all the Unions and the Government of the day could not get together with the Unions at that time, so there was negotiation, but unfortunately we will not have the benefit of a complete and accurate recall from a former Minister on this occasion, but I do not really believe Mr. Smith would be able to help us even if he were here, but I believe we would get more assistance from the hon. member for St. Michael South. But as I am told, and I am only repeating what I am told,

almost as an afterthought another point was added to the scale of the qualified teacher which was extended upwards by one point so that it overlapped by two points.

The Union all this time has been talking about a five point overlap, and this five point overlap of which they already had two is what has been an issue between the Government and the BUT. Well, Sir, in the course of negotiations you do not play out your whole hand at once, you play card by card. A further point was offered by the Government and rejected, even before we got to offer, the Union agreed to a 20:10 salary increase as long as the overlap issue is settled. That was in January of this year, so we made some progress. We came to and fro, Sir, but that was not enough for the Union. We then offered a second point, and I am going to say something that I did not say on television, the Union perhaps has not been sufficiently informed, the Government is not hostile to the whole five point overlap.
5.10 p.m.

The Government is not hostile to the whole five point overlap. The Government has not rejected the concept of the five point overlap, but at the fifth point you get a difficulty because you will then bring the qualified teacher at the fifth point up to the salary level of a senior teacher and the senior teacher has supervisory duties over the ordinary qualified teachers; and it has been proved – although there are other anomalies in the teaching service – very difficult in this situation to have somebody in a supervisory position earning the same as the people he supervises. I am told, for example, that the former Senator Deighton Griffith for many years had a very strong grievance that he was a headteacher and found himself suffering from the graduate incentive scheme whereby there were graduates on his staff earning more than he; and that anomaly may still exist in some cases today, but it is not to be carried any further; we do not want to extend to dozens of teachers an anomaly that exists in only a few cases at the present time and is being phased out otherwise. So it was impossible for the Government to contemplate the fifth point without revising not only the scales of the senior teachers – which Government is willing to negotiate – but without revising the headteachers salaries. All these things the Government is not unwilling to do. I myself have said that when you open the schedule of personal emoluments and see where the Headmaster of Harrison College is and where the Headmaster of Ellerslie School is, when you look on one hand at Harrison College and the position it enjoys in the esteem of our society and on the other hand at Ellerslie with the number of children the Head Headmaster has to teach, the size of the facilities he has to maintain and the staff he has to supervise; when you look at the new Trents School which will have better equipment and facilities than Harrison College – although this might still not make parents want to send their children there – it will be a massive piece of Government investment and I myself think that the responsibilities of those who are to be in charge of it are not properly recognized as regards salaries – all of this the Government is willing to look at. But the Barbados Union of Teachers has never given the Government the opportunity to look at these things because they have concentrated on the overlap between the graduate teacher and the qualified teacher, and they have fought for the one thing it is impossible to give without disturbing the entire teaching service, not to speak of the relativities in the rest of the service. I know that my colleagues in the Ministry of Education – and I am told the hon. member for St. Michael South – will tell you that the teachers have a special case put for them irrespective of the relativity in the public service; even to that the Government is prepared to lend a sympathetic ear, but it cannot be done within the context of a long drawn-out dispute over salaries, which every other body representing public servants has accepted. I cannot betray the agreement reached with the Barbados Workers Union or with the National Union of Public Workers by giving way to the first puff of wind coming from another direction. The Government must have a uniform attitude towards the people in its employ. The regrading exercise is one thing, but on the salaries revision the Government has to take a certain stand and I think that in the fullness of time the Barbados Union of Teachers will recognize this.

So now we find ourselves in a situation where the Government has gone as far as it can go and the union remains intransigent. The union's intransigence was not the only piece of evidence available to the Government that a settlement was unlikely to be reached. The union has never come to final agreement with the Government and there are not lacking reports of conversations from Mr. Cumberbatch and Mr. Mayers that they had no intention of reaching agreement with Government; but when the evidence piles up and at the end you see what happens on a particular day, you begin to wonder whether you were right to discount those reports that the Union was intent on embarrassing the Government; not the teachers – the Union – because I think it has come as a great shock to the teachers to learn that Mr. Cumberbatch never put a case for the teachers at the bottom of the teaching service; never once was this raised in terms of re-classification or regrading; that the re-classification exercise far from improving their position was to create an incentive gap which meant leaving them where they were and moving the others.

Anyhow, on 1st February when we had got as far as agreeing to the 20–10 and when we had got as far as agreeing that we could resume negotiations on the overlap, the goodly gentlemen representing the Union asked for a recess during the negotiations and they came back and for the first time put a case for adjustment of the scale of the untrained teacher. Now, as I have said

somewhere else, this came as a bomb-shell. When we realized that the BUT was carrying out the well-known tactic of the poker player who is losing his money and as soon as he sees things looking a bit more rosy seeks to raise the stakes, we had to consider our position. That is always a sign of intransigence, and bad faith and a sign that you are dealing with people who prefer confrontation to settlement. And we had to read the signs as such. We persisted, because we made the offer of the overlap subsequent to that. As long ago as August last year the Cabinet had met and agreed that the overlap could be given consideration, but the offers were not made until the framework within which it could be considered was settled and this was not settled until January. Immediately on settling the framework – and the Union even offered to postpone settlement of the overlap in January – immediately after settling the framework we held this meeting on the 1st February of this year and we were greeted with the union seeking to raise the stakes, and as I have said putting a case other than the original case.

5.20 p.m.

Immediately on settling the framework – and the union even offered to postpone settlement of the overlap – in January before any negotiations. We held this meeting on the 1st February this year, and we were greeted with the union seeking to raise the stakes, as I have said, and putting a case other than the original case. The letter accepting the salaries subject to the overlap was on the 18th January. They offered to meet as early as the 23rd, but the meeting was actually fixed for 1st February. This gave us some alarm, but we decided to behave as if the matter remained in good faith and to proceed to discuss further the actual points of overlap.

So when on the 11th February, we read in the newspapers that the teachers planned industrial action on the 12th February, it was suggested to me that I should intervene. I said no. Carry it as far as it can go. Offer the people the overlap as far as we can go. I did not at this stage intervene. The union asked that the notes of the meeting be altered. Around this time we got a letter from a group of persons who signed themselves as "Disgruntled Teachers." That was on the 15th February. The letter stated that they were forced to write to me through sheer desperation. They said: "It has reached a point where we feel that it is time for you to intervene on behalf of the untrained teachers and those not belonging to the Barbados Union of Teachers so that we can get our money. It does not make sense waiting any more because the BUT has willingly agreed to accept the proposals offered by the Government, and we are prepared to accept what has been offered by the Government also".

This group of teachers wrote to the BUT and also said that they sent a letter to the Advocate. I do not believe that it was published in the Advocate if it was in fact sent. So the Government was under this kind of pressure. A group of teachers writing us and asking us to deal with the matter. As I said, they were untrained teachers, and the BUT was doing nothing for them. We still went on, and we tried very hard to come to a conclusion with the union; but at the end of the month things still looked very bad indeed.

We spoke to the union again. We made a final offer which, as I say, was as far as we could go. I do not hide. We really could not go further than four points. We had the sick out. We also had the union for the first time, on 12th March, writing to us and speaking of lifting the scale, something never mentioned before in the negotiations. The first time that the words "lifting the scale" appeared in this file is on the 12th March when we met and offered the final point; because on previous occasions the overlap was granted by extending the scale, not lifting it.

There are strong reasons for extending a scale too, Sir, and having a long scale in certain instances. On the 12th March, we heard for the first time about lifting the scale and the untrained teachers. At that point the Chief Establishments Officer made his reply. The Union, I believe started to operate the sick outs and so on; and the Government came reluctantly to the conclusion that the BUT wishes a confrontation. It does not wish an agreement; and we could not keep persons such as untrained teachers waiting any longer for their money.

I have no intention of presiding over a situation where a salary dispute passes the financial year. In other words where in the second financial year you are still paying salaries of the previous year. I have never heard of this in Barbados before, and I have no wish to be the first Minister of Finance to be paying salaries in one year that were due in a previous year. I have no wish whatsoever of paying salaries more than a year in arrears. Hon. members are fully aware of the Financial Rules and the Financial Administration and Audit Act; and they will take note on that on this occasion I have waited until the end of the Financial Year. The Civil Establishment Order is being put up at the end of the Financial Year. Time has to be guillotined at a particular point. You can go only so far. You cannot be pushed beyond a certain point.

As I have said, I have the letter on file. I do not think that we should make this a document of the House. If the hon. member, or whichever hon. member is spokesman for Education wishes – it has notes. It has my handwriting as well as the Chief Establishments Officer's annotations on it. I do not think that I can actually show him the file, but certainly the letter itself. I can have a copy made of it and the spokesman on Education can see it if he wishes.

In the interests of these people on whose behalf no real negotiations have ever been put forward – the case

of untrained teachers was brought into discussion; but no specific claim has been made. It was only that there must be an adjustment, but no specific claim has been made; and indeed what specific claims there are to be made in such circumstances? I have spoken on what has happened. In these circumstances I made the Order. Before I just touch briefly on the Government's future plans in the matter, I would say that the process of collective bargaining can go only up to a certain point; because obviously if one side has no intention of bargaining and makes demands that are literally and fundamentally unacceptable, there will not be an agreement.

Collective bargaining means something very different in countries where you can bearly use the phrase in labour relations, countries that have industrials arbitration. The member for St. Lucy will be able to give us a good deal of assistance on this, I have no doubt. I refer to countries where when the collective bargaining process breaks down you find yourself in an industrial court – countries like Trinidad where unions can be fined for withholding labour and where employers also can be fined for shutting out and so on and so on.
5.30 p.m.

We do not have that machinery of ultimate solution, and long may the day be postponed if not forever that we come to a need for such machinery. I hope that we will always have such responsibility in employer/employee bargaining in this country that there will be no industrial courts here, no punishing of Unions for refusing to accept arbitrations or compulsory agreements, and indeed no punishing for employers. This question does not arise so often because we must get it clear in our minds that total intransigence on the part of the representatives of the workers has to be dealt with some way. You do not just sit down and leave it alone, especially when as in this case there are persons who are not affected by the negotiations. The headteachers are not affected by anything that the BUT has put forward in this exercise. Their names may be there, but the BUT has never raised a point at all. The senior teachers of the BUT have never raised the point. The Government is more interested in the senior teachers than the BUT. The Government has more interest in the headteachers than the BUT, and indeed the Government even has more interest in the untrained teachers because, Mr. Speaker, they told me I should reserve this for the review exercise, but I can reveal to the House that the Government has viewed very sympathetically the question of raising the level at which a teacher will enter the teaching service, cutting off one of the salary scales at the bottom so that somebody going into the teaching service for the first time will get a higher salary than at present even than the 20% increase at the bottom, and that those who are at the bottom will be given an increment. We are ready for a reclassification at that level, something which indeed the BUT has not specifically asked for in any of these negotiations.

Faced with all this we cannot allow professional intransigence to disturb the even tenor of the teaching service of this Island. I have been very disappointed by seeing one or two letters from members of the public saying how the Government settled with the Police, why don't they settle with the teachers. The Government did not just settle with the police; the police settled with the Government. There was settlement on both sides. Agreement was reached and agreement was not reached by just giving everything that is asked for. I cannot believe that the public thinks that the way to settle a labour dispute especially with Government employees is merely to say "all right, take it boys!" If the public hears, for example, that such and such a settlement means so much in taxation out of everybody's pocket when the week comes, the public perhaps will understand that money does not grow on trees; that when you are dealing with 3,000 people, to give 3,000 teachers $1,000 a year more is to cost the country $3 million which has to be raised from taxation; to give them $1,200 a year more cost the country $3½ million and if they want an average of $2,000 a year more it cost the country $6 million. Now under these circumstances the Government cannot say "have whatever you want boys!" It cannot work that way. We are put here to represent the interest of the taxpayers as well as all the employees of the Government, and where you get a group of employees who have proved with that Government and this Government as recalcitrant as the present leadership of the Barbados Union of Teachers, you have to take stern decisions, and stern decisions have been taken in this particular matter.

I have no idea what motivates the gentleman concerned; I have no idea what ideological excitement may exist in the breast of the present leadership of the BUT; all that I know is that there is a whole set of teachers in Barbados who have been waiting twelve months for a raise of pay, whose conditions of service are not affected by anything that the BUT is putting forward and they deserve their raise of pay.

Now this Civil Establishment Order is made not only without prejudice to a continuing dialogue between the teachers' representatives and the Government, but in fact while such a dialogue is in existence at the present time in respect of teachers represented by the secondary school teachers' union. That union was able to reach agreement and it has put forward a case for regrading. The Chief Establishments Officer will very shortly, for all I know the letter may be almost ready at the moment, be writing to the Barbados Union of Teachers to set out what steps have been taken so far and to indicate the Government's readiness to continue their dialogue on regrading. Regrading exercises do not have to be carried out, as I said at the start, coincidental with salaries revisions. The union recognised this when it asked for the salary revision to go back to the 1st April, 1978; it requested that the overlap also go back too then, but it

was prepared to accept regradings other than that as from the 1st February, 1979. Implicit in that which we have in writing from the union .....no, I do not think that is in writing; I think these are the notes of a meeting which the Union has agreed, but I do not think that is in a letter. Implicit in that is that the union recognises that there are two issues; one is revision of salary and a second is a regrading exercise. Sir, the Establishments Division would prefer me to call it a review exercise, but I am more realistic and I call it a regrading exercise and a re-classification exercise because I know that they will be some regrading as a result of it. I am satisfied that there will be some element of regrading. But the two things are different and they must now be pursued differently. The union said that they wanted 20 + 10, the overlap settled and a regrading. I am giving them 20 + 10, the overlap settled as far as we can, because the fifth point of the overlap has to be part of the regrading; it cannot be part of this settlement. You cannot take the fifth point as part of the overlap plus revision. You have to wait until the regrading. That is the fundamental rationale of this Order before the House and the Resolution which seek to approve it.

In the future we will go into all these matters from untrained teachers to senior teachers to headmaster as I said on television. I have chosen the categories carefully and deliberately. We will go into all that. Let us hope, let us pray to the Dear Lord above in Heaven that he spares Mr. Cumberbatch for long enough to let us finish the exercise before the next salary revision. There will be a continuous state of negotiations. I have no doubt with, the BUT, but I hope that given the rest of this year we can settle regrading with them and then we can jump in with all the unions for next year's salaries revision. I see the Union is very sternly sticking on 35% for the bus drivers. I have just got some good news in that regard. Sensible decent unionism. The Transport Board is making some progress in its negotiations with the Barbados Workers' Union, and I am very glad indeed to hear it. But, Sir, the Government is having to take the initiative in achieving progress with the Barbados Union of Teachers.

Sir, there is politics in everything, and I have no doubt that while in their hearts hon. members opposite will have the same opinion of the difficulties of negotiating with the Barbados Union of Teachers, the fact is that nothing you tell them is confidential; they leave the room and go on the telephone and ring the press and give the press a progress report and then come back in to the conference room. On one occasion I am told that was actually done. Another of the difficulties is that the nearer you get to agreement the more they find something else to throw into the ring.

5.40 p.m.

On one occasion I am told that was actually done. That is one of the difficulties. Another of the difficulties is that the nearer you get to the Agreement the more they find something else to throw into the ring. One of the difficulties is that you seem to be dealing with some very unstable persons at the top of the Union.

I go no further, Sir, I believe that the Minister of Education will tell you certain things. He has to deal with complaints against these people as Union Representative, as a Teacher and as people in the course of the Ministry of Education dealings with them. We have done our best. We have done our absolute best but no more than when we deal with Mr. Cumberbatch and Mr. Mayers are we able to deal with them as we can deal with Mr. Wharton and the hon. member for St. Lucy than they are able to deal with the children they teach as they can deal with the Government. We seem to stand today as they stand with the children at Parkinson School and Princess Margaret and I hope we treat them a little more kindly and do not seek to lead them into so many ways that it is alleged to happen in other places where they do some leading. Anyway, Sir, I do not wish to push the order too hard. I think all hon. members are fully aware of the issues.

There is one other point I wish to make and that is the point of arbitration. Now the Union wrote asking if we would arbitrate. The Barbados Union of Teachers wrote to the Government and the letter has not yet been published. The Government does not publish letters. It wrote to the Government and said that it is willing to explore with the Government the desirability and possibility of accepting mediation or arbitration by a third party and then they said the opposite otherwise. I would really like them to get the money first and then we can arbitrate what is outstanding after. They must get last year's salaries out of last year's Vote as far as I am concerned and that point I have made clear.

Now I have not seen it published anywhere, but Mr. Glenroy Straughn rang the Ministry and offered his services as an arbitrator and the Barbados Youth Council could write and offer its services in arbitration as well and the Government now knows all of this. We had to read in the newspapers that a letter was coming. We got the letter sometime after by a Messenger but we had to read it in the Newspaper. Apparently not only the newspapers, but Mr. Straughn and the Barbados Youth Council both seem to be fully aware of the contents of the letter even before the Government. The letter from the Youth Council said that the Union had intimated that it is not opposed to accepting the Barbados Youth Council as mediator in this matter. You see the orchestration that we have to put up with?

Instead of worrying about the Teachers' pay, the Union is worrying about its relationship with Mr. Straughn and Mr. Straughn's Party. Mr. Straughn is a

Marxist as opposed to some of the more militant groups that we have around. I have forgotten what his Party is called. That is a Party that the hon. member for St. Michael North Central abandoned in mid-stream on the battle grounds of the Lower Green some years ago. I always remember that. There was also a ban of George Norville's Book of 1884. Now the hon. member for St. Michael North Central would be able to give us chapter and verse on the present political beliefs of Mr. Glenroy Straughn and why he abandoned them. In particular I am asking hon. members to support the Resolution, support the Government's decision on this occasion and the Government's intention to proceed with the regrading exercise with all due dispatch, certainly with all the dispatch that the Union will allow in the matter.

There is only one thing I want to say, Sir. Again, we are very much attached to collective bargaining but we are not going to allow the Union to try to hold down the Teachers from getting further increases out of spite because of this Order. That has to be understood. If the Union wants to say it is not going to take further part in the negotiations, the Union can say so but the Government will make proposals relevant to upgrading those areas of the Teaching Service that may still be substandard in terms of cash and conditions of service. We intend to give a better deal to the Teachers. It is only that we cannot allow these childish, this irresponsible foolishness to go on any longer inciting the members of the public.

One final word, Sir. There are even two or three letters in the newspapers by persons not known to any member of the Government, not known to anybody employed in the Ministry of Education. I have absolutely no idea who these people are but I must say that they put the Government's case so well that the Ministry of Education would be very glad indeed to contact these people one of these days. There is a Mr. Corbin at the *Advocate*. It seems to me that his ideas perhaps could very well be useful to the Ministry of Education in due course. Hon. members are abundant with amusement in this matter but hon. members perhaps if they allow themselves to settle down they would see that it is even more remarkable that somebody with absolutely no connection with the Government or Government circles that we know of could write such a letter than if somebody were connected with Government circles. I can only thank the signer of this letter. There was an earlier letter which did not seem to be by the same person but I do not know who it is. One C. B. S., Sir.

Hon. Members must realise that on this occasion the element of orchestration is totally and entirely absent and these letters are more gratifying to the Minister of Education and to me because of the mystery of their origin. Certainly the letter from Dudley Corbin seem to summarise the facts very admirably and indeed at a lesser length than your humble servant has been able to do on some occasions.

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

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

5.50 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is a most important matter that we are dealing with. It relates to the teachers and the teaching service of this country, and there is no doubt at all that it is one of fundamental importance to this country, because as is generally known, our educational system is a complex – teachers, parents, students, buildings, material and equipment – and in that amalgam the teachers are a most vital and a most important part. It is therefore absolutely necessary that all efforts should be taken to ensure that there should be no disruption in the teaching service, or at least if disruption comes that as early a settlement as possible should take place, a settlement that is fair all around.

I have listened very carefully to the Prime Minister as he introduced this particular Resolution based on the Civil Establishment (Teachers) (Amendment) Order, and I must confess that he tried – I would have to describe it as a virtuoso performance – in introducing this measure. He has tried all methods, I think if I had to characterise it I would say that he has tried to put over a case with all sweet reasonableness. He is more sinned against than sinning, the Government has done everything right in this particular matter, and it is the leadership of the Union, the intransigence, the recalcitrance of the Barbados Workers' Union – not the Barbados Workers' Union, Mr. Speaker, the Barbados Union of Teachers, the Barbados Workers' Union even got the praise today - and he has tried to put it in all reasonableness.

I would say that it is a speech in which he has tried to avoid all political rancour, and quite pleasing on this occasion I would say he has not gone and blamed the Democratic Labour Party administration for whatever problems he may be having at this particular moment, he and his Government. I believe that is perhaps as it should be, because in this particular case the Government has dealt with this particular matter, it is largely a matter that arose under the present administration, and they have an opportunity now as the Great Combination to show how they deal with industrial disputes as far as the teaching profession is concerned. All I can say is that in this particular case they have found themselves in very deep waters, because when we hear the Prime Minister appealing for support from hon. members, including members of the Opposition, on this matter, and it sounds very reasonable, one would tend to forget that this is not the first occasion on which a situation of dispute between Unions and Government has arisen and that a settlement has had to be reached by the Government.

In 1976 as Leader of the Opposition the member for St. Thomas, now the Prime Minister of this country, when faced with a situation in which the then Prime Minister came to this Hon. Chamber, indicated that an impasse has been reached in industrial relations and the then Prime Minister indicated that he had held some 18, 20 or 22 meetings – I do not recall the exact number – and that at that stage a settlement had to be imposed, the then Leader of the Opposition indicated that that was not the way to deal with a situation, the then Government should go back to the bargaining table and continue the processes of collective bargaining. He went further and moved that the Civil Establishment Order should be suspended in order that further negotiations should continue. That was then, and the member for St. Thomas was leading the Opposition. On this occasion when there is an impasse between the Government and the Barbados Union of Teachers I do not hear that they are not going to legislate the settlement, indeed legislation is brought down to deal with the matter, contrary to the principles advanced by the Opposition then in 1976. Now I think that is a kind of turnabout and a turnaround which certainly needs further explanation lest there be charges of cynicism in Government circles.
6.00 p.m.

You adopt one position in 1976 and in 1979 you are adopting a different position now that you are in Government, and I believe this is a charge which the Government will have to answer. In 1976 the then Prime Minister indicated that there had been about eighteen or twenty meetings which he had held. I was trying to keep count as to the number of meetings held between the Government and the negotiating team of the Barbados Union of Teachers. No number has been given. I believe I got as far as six meetings, but I may be wrong on that score and I would be glad if the Government sources could give the information on this. In 1976 the then Prime Minister said he had held eighteen or twenty meetings and I would like the present Prime Minister to indicate how many meetings he had with the Barbados Union of Teachers and whether he should not follow the advice he gave in 1976 from the Opposition benches that we should go back to the bargaining table.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of elucidation, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member obviously has not understood my speech. We are returning to the bargaining table.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Yes, but I am arguing that you should never have left it because you had not exhausted those processes of collective bargaining, and I recall – you know that I know your words very well – that you said in 1976 as reported on page 6727 of the House of Assembly debate, Second Session 1971-76 Tuesday, 22nd June, 1976.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: If the hon. member will give way. Is the hon. member then doing what he was advising us not to do, look back at the past? He is always telling us not to look at the past, to look at what is happening now.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That may be a good debating point and I would certainly take the point if my position was being put accurately. What I have said is that if something is wrong you cannot take two wrongs and make a right. But in that reference I gave you said: "We believe that the sacrifice which the public officers are being asked to make is too great; the way in which they have been asked to make it is also too great." This particular issue relates to one of substance and one of style or manner in which this issue is being treated.

I would like to say from the start that we on this side do not approach this as any partisan political issue; we look at this from the point of view of the good of the country. We believe that it is absolutely necessary to ensure that the educational system of this country continues without any undue disturbance to the even tenor of that particular system. This does not mean, however, that we must not point out any glaring inconsistencies.

Now the Prime Minister is quite right in indicating that in 1969 – overlap is perhaps the correct term for it – but in 1969 the top of the scale for the qualified teacher became the starting point for the graduate teacher. Up to that time there was a gap between the top of the scale for qualified teachers and the base scale for graduate teachers. And I would like to make this point in that connection, that is, the whole question of overlap as the Prime Minister indicated really never became the major issue until around 1976-77. And there are reasons for this. I do not believe that there is much point in saying that this was a matter hanging fire from 1969, because at the time and thereafter – until 1974 – the Barbados Union of Teachers was a part of the National Union of Public Workers and its case was part of the larger case of the public service in this country as put forward by the National Union of Public Workers. For reasons known to themselves, and I believe in the interest of their own professional development and standing, the Barbados Union of Teachers established itself as an independent union around 1974 and thereafter what the Prime Minister has called turbulence has been introduced. Whether he feels it is turbulence is a matter of judgment. What I would say is that certain positions were put forward and I think that in union negotiations we have to take note of such positions. I do not know what problems have been caused between the BUT and the Government. These suggestions about Marxism and other ideologies – I wish he would stick to the issues involved without trying in any way to attach labels to the leadership of the BUT with direct suggestions and hints to

try to turn around the public support and sympathy which the BUT has tended to find in the case it has put forward. And the fact that this wide measure of support in the community has been forthcoming might be the reason why the Government should look at its own case. If the Government has this strong case, perhaps it means that the Government has not been putting its case. If the Government had in fact been putting its side of the case and that case was a good case, may be there would not have been that wide public sympathy. But the fact that there is this wide sympathy means that in this country there is the strong feeling that the Barbados Union of Teachers has a good case to present. And why should they not have such a good case? The Government has admitted that it is in sympathy with the overlap four points or even five points – the case being put forward by the Union. But the only reason why that demand is not being granted now is because of some disturbance, some postponed effect it may have on other scales within the teaching service and in a broader perspective the other scales in the public service.
6.10 p.m.

Why should the Government seek to give so many lashes to the leadership of the Barbados Union of Teachers? They are being blamed for talking economics in the presentation of their case. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that salaries revisions take place within the context of economics, within the context of the economy of a country. The Government itself in dealing with cases for salary revisions speaks in terms of the cost of living; the movement in the retail price index; it speaks in terms of the ability of the Government to pay. It speaks in terms of comparable salaries in other sectors of the public service and in the private sector. It speaks in terms of increased production; and we very well remember the hon. member for St. Thomas in 1976. *(Aside)* I do not know if the President of the Barbados Union of Teachers is a Historian and he wants to talk about the Navigation Act.....

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member will continue to address the Chair. I will see that he is not heckled.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Thank you very much, Sir. You have to speak in terms of economics. I do not think that he should be attacked for doing that, especially when the very Government came down and spoke in terms of a wage restraint which has ramifications as far as the total economy is concerned; and.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, what I complained of was not that they spoke of economics, but that for two meetings they spoke of nothing else. You must talk about economics and salaries, and not economics alone. At two meetings they refused to discuss salaries.

Mr. SANDIFORD: That is a point of elucidation. I have never been the leader of a union. You will correct me if I am wrong, but the member for St. Thomas has never been the Leader of a union. I believe, I am not certain that there was something called the Sugar and General Workers Union – some brief eruption on the scene. I do not recall that he was an officer in that union.

I have never been the leader of a union, but it is far from me to say how a case should be put forward and conducted. What I am saying is that they were asking for five points and an overlap between the graduate scale and qualified teachers scale. They have reached four points already with some suggestion that the Government might be sympathetic with the fifth point except over the implications in the other scales. If that is so then I think that the Barbados Union of Teachers may have done reasonably well in putting forward their case. So let us push that particular criticism out of the way, that the union has been talking only economics. I believe that is right for any union, including the Barbados Union of Teachers to speak about the economic situation in which their negotiations should take place, and especially within the context of a major policy of wage restraint being put forward by the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Prime Minister must tell us how many teachers are going to benefit from this particular offer that he has made. How many teachers would fall into the category of those who will benefit from this four points overlap in Government's terms, as they say, they have most generously granted. I believe that he should tell us if this represents the majority of persons in the qualified scale or whether it is only limited to a few; and he should tell us why in the interest of reaching a settlement he could not agree to lifting the whole teachers scale up a number of points in order to benefit those teachers.

Previous Governments have worked in order to improve the levels of pay in the Teaching Service, in order to improve their working conditions and in order to increase promotional opportunities. That is a task that is never finished. Governments have to work at this in the light of the prevailing economic and other circumstances; and I would like the Government to indicate why at this particular time in the interest of arriving at a settlement, why they could not lift the whole scale for the qualified teacher, not only at the top, but increasing it at the bottom as well.

I believe that in this case the Teaching Profession as well as – I am making a plea not only for the Teaching Profession, but the Nursing Profession as well – that those two categories of workers should be treated as special cases when these matters arise. I have been speaking so far in terms of the substance of the

case; but there is an even more fundamental matter relating to style, and I think that I should advert to that – the way in which this Resolution was introduced into this Hon. Chamber last Friday gives one to be deeply concerned; because after the House has dealt exhaustively with the Estimates for five days continuously, normally there is a break taken for about two weeks unless there is pressing business. On this occasion the sitting was suspended.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Order was received in this Hon. House by the Chair. The sitting was suspended on a motion accepted by the Chair. There will be no debate on this.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not reflecting upon your acceptance of the Order.
6.20 p.m.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Not of the Speaker, Mr. Speaker. The point I am making is this: that the first wind that the Opposition and the country got of this matter was on Friday night that legislation would be introduced in order to settle this particular matter.

Certain remarks were ordered to be expunged by the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very strange that after putting forward a very strong case for collective bargaining in the past, and after arguing that 20 or 22 meetings were not enough, that the same people, the same members who argued for more meetings should come now and terminate negotiations, and the first time that the Barbados Union of Teachers knew that the legislation would be introduced to deal with that problem was when they heard it on the radio like anybody else. The first time they knew it was when they heard on the radio that a Resolution and the Civil Establishment (Teachers) Order had been made and that the Resolution would be introduced into the Chamber. I find this very strange especially when you are accusing the Union of negotiating in public and you come in public without giving them the courtesy of knowing what was going on, without giving them the courtesy of telling them what was going on, and in this area of open Government you come and do it to the Union.

As I understand it the Prime Minister is indicating – I hope I am quoting him correctly – that as far as arbitration and mediation should be concerned he is not interested or rather he is willing to go to mediation or arbitration, but other persons seem to know more about it than the Government. I believe he mentioned the Barbados Youth Council and Mr. Glenroy Straughn. The Union advanced as their latest position that they are willing to go to mediation; why couldn't the Government respond to that particular position? Instead of responding to it, their response seems to be a Civil Establishment Order and a Resolution.

Now, Sir, we on this side believe that this particular case is one in which negotiations should continue. We do not believe that the Union should have been treated in these negotiations in the way they have been treated. I do not believe that in a case where the Union has responsibility for its membership that it is any part of the Prime Minister of a country to come and make a settlement which he claims is in the interest of the Union. I believe it is for the Union to decide that they want negotiations to end, that their case has been exhausted. I believe it is for the Union to indicate that or for the membership of the Union through a duly constituted meeting, if they believe that the leadership of the Union is not handling its case properly; I believe that is a matter for the Union and not a matter for the Prime Minister and Minister responsible for Establishments. I think that intervention at this particular point on the ground that have been advanced is unjustifiable. It is unjustifiable as far as the argument that he has no intention of being the first Prime Minister or Minister of Finance to pay out money in relation to a previous salaries revision in a different financial year is concerned. I think that is a great non-point. There is nothing at all relating to any financial rule; we can use these particular terms: maybe others may be swayed by the appeal which is known as appeal to authority, but it has really no substance. There is nothing to prevent a Government in one year from paying arrears of salaries relating to a previous year. It is done all the time in relation to purchases, goods and services for one year and from time to time paid for in succeeding years; so the argument that there is some big principle of public finance that if one year ends and another year begins and a settled negotiation is not completed that this is some grave offence of public financing and the Financial Administration and Audit Act is really a non-point, and I think in this case the Minister of Finance seems to be scratching around for reasons to advance for his particular case.

I do not know what more we can say on this particular matter. I think the Prime Minister finds himself on the horns of dilemma. He took a particular position in 1976 in Opposition and now finds himself contrary to those principles as Leader of Government taking the position which he opposed in 1976. Should we move that the Order be suspended? I do not know if we should do that. This is the actual step which was taken by the Leader of the Opposition in 1976.
6.30 p.m.

I am not going to vote. That is exactly what I am not going to do. I am not going to do that because I will let it be known and clearly known that it is the Government and the Government alone which has imposed this

particular settlement on the Teaching profession and you must carry full responsibility in the light of your previous statements which have been heaped upon the leadership of the Barbados Union of Teachers. All of them will be upon your heads. You will have to answer to the Teachers for the way in which you have treated them on this particular occasion. We are going to have no part in this. We are going to speak on it and make it absolutely clear that we do not believe that the Union has been properly treated in this particular case and we will leave the matter at that particular point.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, this matter is a very serious one for this country as a whole. The Teachers of this country over the years have had a rough deal in terms of remuneration until the Democratic Labour Party came to power and can be generally said that over those years there has been a substantial improvement in the lot of the Teaching profession in this country. The hon. member for St. Thomas has outlined in many ways and he averted to training programmes, the number of persons in training and so on and what he found when he came into office, the kind of progressive attitude which was taken in relation to the Teaching profession in Barbados by the previous administration.

Now you find a situation where a settlement is being imposed by legislation contrary to the express beliefs of the Barbados Labour Party in the pre-election period. No longer do we hear no such settlements should be made without the total exhaustion of the avenues of negotiations. No longer do we hear anything about arbitration. What we hear today is a very serious slanting of the case that was put up by the Barbados Union of Teachers. I am here well qualified with the information and I want to say this that the Hon. Prime Minister could not be in a position to put the case even for his Government's satisfaction since he did not even take the trouble to meet with the Barbados Union of Teachers on a single occasion. My information is.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. That is not true, Sir. I cannot call it a lie. What can I call it? It is not true anyhow.

Dr. HAYNES: I think the Hon. Prime Minister will tell us how often he met with the representatives of the Barbados Union of Teachers. We want to hear how often they met.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central has made a statement that the Prime Minister has never met. The Prime Minister said it is untrue.

Dr. HAYNES: I will say if it is untrue that I would withdraw it. I will ask the Prime Minister to inform this Honourable House on how many occasions did he meet with them in a negotiating situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have heard several accusations made against the Barbados Union of Teachers. These accusations I resent very bitterly because they represent perhaps the most under-privileged group among the Teaching profession in this country and at the same time they carry perhaps the greatest responsibility in respect of the Teaching Service in Barbados in relation to those in the Primary Schools, etc. in this country and at a stage at which education is very important.

I have heard them being accused of bad faith in the negotiations. I have heard them, Mr. Speaker, being accused of introducing economic rather than dealing with the question of the straightforward salary negotiations. Now this matter has to be seen in its correct perspective because it was put out last night on CBC and slanted in that way to the Nation of this country and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that these negotiations started at the time when the Government had a very strict policy of wage restraint and at that time they were talking of no increase and then subsequently a 5% increase and at the start of the negotiations it was put to the Barbados Union of Teachers that the economic situation was such that the Government could not consider their payments.

Now Unions take two positions in this situation. There are many Unions who would say that we represent the employee and we are unconcerned with your economic position and that is always the standard position that Unions take in any negotiation. The Barbados Union of Teachers took a very responsible position of trying to ascertain what was the true economic position and what plans the Government had and what kind of time framework the Government would have or predict in terms of getting out of the economic situation that they were in. Now I think that this was a very responsible position by the Barbados Union of Teachers but that act of responsibility, Mr. Speaker, is now being turned around and being suggestive that instead of representing the Teachers that they got involved in economic matters rather than getting down to the nitty-gritty of putting up a proper case for the people whom they represent.

I would say that in my view anyone who puts forward that kind of view for the country can only be trying to undermine the leadership of the Barbados Union of Teachers because they suspect that they might have political views that might be different from their own and I think it is very important that we on this side cannot stand idly by and see workers' organisations undermined in this manner and I am very concerned that that kind of position should have been taken when in fact the Barbados Union of Teachers could have taken a completely different line altogether.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the whole question of arbitration. There is no doubt that the Barbados Union of Teachers were prepared to have the matter go to arbitration but that matter was never dealt with, and it was never taken up by the Government of this country. On this whole question of legislation when you listen very carefully to what the Government has offered and what the Government claims were the payments of the Unions and what they would have finally settled for, I can see no reason why we should be considering legislation today and in my view is an act of bullying.
6.40 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER: Now the hon. member will withdraw that remark forthwith. Any debate that is taking place today the Chair has accepted a motion, and if there is bullying the Chair would have to be bullying. I want to warn the hon. member, he is merely skirting the border of Standing Order 28(1).

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the remark, but I also would like to state in no uncertain terms that the difference as far as I can see was so slight that it did not seem to me that it was necessary for an intervention of this nature.

Mr. SPEAKER: I warned the hon. member about Standing Order 28(1).

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other aspects of this matter I want to refer to. The hon. member for St. Thomas has said that no representations were made in respect of untrained teachers. It is my information that this was not the case, that representations were made that the start of the scale should be at the fifth point, that is, that the first four points should be abolished and that the point of entry should be at the fifth point, and that there should be a lengthening of that particular scale for the untrained teacher by a further four points.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Could the hon. member repeat that? I did not understand it, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER: I too would like to hear.

Dr. HAYNES: What I said was that the hon. member for St. Thomas did indicate in his speech that at no time, if I remember correctly, were there any representations made on behalf of the untrained teacher. What I am saying is that my information is that the Barbados Union of Teachers had made representations to the effect that the beginning of the scale for the untrained teacher should be now what would be the fifth point in the scale, and that that scale would be correspondingly increased by a further four points. That is my understanding of the situation.

On the question of the Erdiston trained teacher.....

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: On a point of order. You cannot just make a statement which contradicts what the Minister has said without giving specification. I would like to answer it, I would like to search the file, but he has just made a statement which contradicts what I have said. Can he give a date on which the Barbados Union of Teachers put it forward or a document in which it was set out?

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, to continue, in respect of the Erdiston trained teacher.....*(Asides).*

Mr. SPEAKER: I would not like the Government members to interrupt the hon. member who is addressing the Chair. If he has no date, he has no date.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, in respect of the trained teacher and the whole question of the overlap, the hon. member for St. Thomas has indicated that on previous occasions I think there were two points of overlap in the scale. They are now offering four points. What I would like the hon. member for St. Thomas, the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister, to tell this House, how many people would benefit from that offer of four points. Now, it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those people who would benefit or who stand to benefit because of the length of the scale for the Erdiston trained teachers, would be people who by and large would have been trained at Erdiston for some 14 years or more, and that many of those people would have been promoted into other positions. For example, principally as senior teachers, special grade or other areas of training, but with the few remaining people who would be likely to benefit from it would be those people who have not been promoted, and I would like to know how many people, whether there are 5, 10, 20, 100 or 200, would be benefiting from this so-called big deal of granting an overlap of four points or so. This is very important, because the significance of this can be very great in the community. You can say that you have been very magnanimous and you have granted these four points in the overlap, but in point of fact you ask yourself how many people would benefit from it, and my contention is.....

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that is a point which has been very ably articulated by the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Dr. HAYNES: Mr. Speaker, the point is that I am elaborating on that because the member for St. Michael South did not demonstrate the movement of personnel at that time into other areas of the teaching service, and it is that additional point that I wish to make, and it is

my understanding that many of those people would have to become specialist teachers or go on to other areas in the teaching service enjoying higher salaries, and therefore a very small amount of people would be affected by this tremendous generosity of the present administration.

Now, indeed there is a question of propriety, and it is my judgment that if the Hon. Prime Minister could find time to meet people from the Employers' Confederation whenever they want to see him, if he can find time to meet with other important social groups in this society, then he should find more time to pay more attention to the problems of the Barbados Union of Teachers, because in my view when matters occur in this country that affect the vast majority of working people and the people from working class homes, you do not find that kind of sympathy emanating from certain sectors in this country, and I take a very strong view on this. On Friday night I was able to leave this Hon. House and go to my home and make a telephone call and discover what was going to be the content of the Prime Minister's broadcast and called back my colleagues in this House and told them what it was about. It is a question of propriety and it is a question which this House cannot ignore.

The Barbados Union of Teachers was treated with scant disrespect, and on top of that they have come here today and accused them of bad faith, talking about Marxist affiliations and all this nonsense inside here, when they are trying to put forward a case for the poorest paid teachers in this country that have laid the foundations in the past and for the future to lay the foundation for development in this country.
6.50 p.m.

There is absolutely no need for this kind of situation. A little more attention to the problem could have solved the problem, and I want to go on record that I give my firm support to the Barbados Union of Teachers in their struggle for the persons whom they represent, and I am not concerned about any inefficiencies or the fact that they may not from time to time follow established trade union protocol according to the hon. member for St. Thomas. There is a policy where they discuss their business openly and any union is entitled to do that. They do not believe in confidential negotiations with their employers; that is their policy. Government says it believes in open Government and I cannot see what objections they can have if the Barbados Union of Teachers keep the public informed as far as the progress of their negotiations is concerned. This cannot be a serious point at all. And to crown it all, to try to suggest that the main reason for coming to the House now is to have this matter settled before the end of the financial year is total foolishness; it has nothing to do with the matter; it is an attempt to break the back and spirit of the Barbados Union of Teachers. And this nonsense has got to stop.

As far as I am concerned the Barbados Union of Teachers in their social programme, in their teaching programme and in their organization have brought a lot of awareness to bear on their members as to the social problems of this country, on the ultimate objectives and reorientation of the youth in their behavioural aspects and on their attitudes towards economic development in this country. And you can call it marxism or communism or whatever you like, the fact is they are trying to instill in their membership a completely different approach to human relationships in this society, and that will always be branded with all sorts of terms. And I want to make it clear once again before I sit down that I give my support to the Barbados Union of Teachers. I noted the weakness of the way in which the Prime Minister put forward his case in a most apologetic manner. He said he did not know what was going on and he knew that he was on very weak ground.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Mr. Speaker, we cannot go on with this. I never said I was not familiar with the case or that I knew I was on very weak ground.

Mr. SPEAKER: I thought the hon. member was expressing his own view of what you said.

Dr. HAYNES: That is my judgment Sir, from his attitude and from the weak way in which he put forward the case, because if I know the hon. member for St. Thomas well if he had any kind of case today, the decibels in here would have risen to the point where they would hurt our ear drums. But that was not the case; quite the contrary – meek, humble, hurt, sad, worn-out, betrayed by people who did not have the interest of the masses of people whom they represent at heart. That was not the position. His position would have been a different one altogether and he knows that he has no case; and we in the Opposition cannot accept the arguments put forward because we cannot allow this kind of inroad into the trade union structure of this country, not in the interest of this side or that side, and I can only ask him to do what he asked the former Prime Minister to do, that is, to postpone further consideration of this matter, get back to the bargaining table and try to come up with something that is satisfactory to the union of teachers and the teachers whom they represent.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, the contribution just made by the last hon. member is marked by such total ignorance and irresponsibility that I cannot understand how he could have expressed it with so much volubility and flair. He obviously does not understand anything of which is involved in this dispute. The hon. member gets up and talks about the poor people of this country and about humanity and the working class and so on. That is his theme all the time, as though the people of Barbados do not remember his antecedents, and he suddenly finds himself on a band wagon about poor

people, old people and under privileged people etc., and he is beating this week after week.

But to get back to the issue at hand. In 1976 the then Democratic Labour Party legislated salaries for all public workers. There was no agreement with the Barbados Workers Union, no agreement with the National Union of Public Workers, no agreement with the Barbados Teachers Union, with the Police Association, or with the Barbados Union of Teachers. And the then Prime Minister came into Parliament and legislated salaries for all five units. The situation in this case is that this Government negotiated and reached agreement with four of the five unions and finally decided when they could not reach agreement on certain matters with the Barbados Union of Teachers to bring an order so that the teachers could get their twelve months back pay and get the increase in salary which the Teachers Union had agreed to, the 10–20%; and the Government is bringing the order because the teachers want their money.

But the difference between this Government and the Democratic Labour Party Government is that when the Democratic Labour Party Government legislated the salaries in 1976 that was the end of the matter; there was a note of finality. What the Barbados Labour Party is doing is bringing an Order for the 10–20% which the Union has agreed to plus a four-points overlap which we have made, and at the same time saying to the union "This is not the end of it; we will continue negotiations over the outstanding matters of regrading in the teaching service." So we have not closed the door; we have not left the bargaining table. We will legislate for what we have agreed to up to now and will continue discussions on what is outstanding.

I heard the hon. member for St. Michael South who was the Minister of Education in this country for seven or eight years talk a whole lot this afternoon from one end of the scale to the other, and I took a look at the debate he was reading from. But when the then Prime Minister and Minister of Finance came in here and legislated salaries for teachers, the hon. member did not have the courage to get up and say a single word in defence of the teachers. I go further: The then Minister of Education who had just taken over from him got in here when the Prime Minister legislated the salaries in 1976 and never said a word. This Minister of Education would get up in here and will say what he thinks about teachers and the teaching service.
7.00 p.m.

The Minister of Education would get up and talk. This Minister of Education would get up and say how he feels about the teachers and the Teaching Service. That is what the hon. member did not have the courage to do. I have said repeatedly that there is an enduring hostility between the Barbados Union of Teachers and the Ministry of Education. It all came from the relationship they have ever since the hon. member for St. Michael South was Minister of Education.

When I went into the Ministry of Education I called them in and talked to them; and they told me that the hon. member was aloof and uncommunicated and they could not talk to him. In addition to this he was timid because he was afraid of the Minister of Finance at the time; but now they have a different Minister of Education. Nobody can scare me. I have told the Barbados Union of Teachers from the time I came into the Ministry that the lines of communication were opened between them and me, and I was prepared to fight their cause inside and outside of Government. I have told the BUT that if they have any problem, bring it to me and I am prepared to fight my colleagues for you.

I want it to go on record that I have told members of my Cabinet and the Prime Minister that I believe the teachers have got a good case, that the principle of overlap is a good principle; and I am prepared to fight it for them; but the BUT would not talk to me. I want all teachers who are members of the union to realise that I am willing to put their case for them in Government; but the Barbados Union of Teachers have got two leaders – John Cumberbatch and Stanley Mayers whom I know better than most people because I have been to school with them, and know them very well from way back. They seem to think that if they gain anything for the teachers of this country through the Ministry of Education that it is no gain. They must gain it through themselves.

Let me get the record straight on this. My colleagues and this country had better believe that I feel that the teachers of Barbados must have a better deal; and as long as I am Minister of Education I will be fighting for a better deal for them. I have already made it quite clear to my colleagues that headteachers in Barbados are not well paid, that trained teachers are not well paid in Barbados. I do not hide. I would have wanted the hon. member for St. Michael South as Minister of Education for a number of years to have got up in here in 1976 and told his Prime Minister how he felt about teachers and the Teaching Service.

I want the teachers who are members of the BUT to put pressure on their leadership to come and talk with the Minister. I say categorically that the whole review exercise that the Prime Minister has been speaking about is geared to make the conditions of service of teachers better than they are at the moment; and indeed it is a peculiar form of cant where people getting up and saying – not in here, not in here. I would not accuse the hon. member of cant. It is cant to hear people get up and say that the Government has been unfair in its negotiations with the teachers by bringing in an Order by legislation, and therefore it is treating them with contempt.

This Government is determined to continue negotiations with the teachers with a regrading exercise. The Barbados Secondary Teachers Union has already submitted proposals for regrading in the Teaching Service; and the lines of communication are open and we have started with them; but it is imperative in Barbados that the two teachers unions come together so that there will not be any lack of handling in the decisions that are ultimately made. There are some people who are teachers in the older secondary schools and a few of them are members of the BUT; and there are some people teaching at the newer secondary schools who are members of the BSTU. It is very imperative, Mr. Speaker, that the two sides try to harmonise their views and meet the Government as a single force so that we can go through a revisionary exercise that can only redound to the benefit of teachers in Barbados.

I must refer to the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. He gets up week after and week and makes loud and vitriolic contributions in here. I do not know of any time that the BUT has sent up a proposal for salaries to Government in these negotiations for untrained teachers, for the untrained teacher to get five points up on one scale or the other. That is totally and palpably untrue; and if there was any honesty left in the leadership of the BUT, they would point out to the hon. member that his story is not true.

He goes on and makes the point that the BUT was making out a case for the lowest class of workers in the Teaching Service. Again, it is totally untrue. The whole thrust of the negotiations with the BUT was for the Erdiston trained teachers; and it is only at the end of the day that they began talk about untrained teachers who formed a substantial percentage of the number of teachers in Barbados. He said also, Mr. Speaker, that the difference between the Governments position at the time of bringing the Order, and the position of the BUT is so slight, that it does not seem necessary to legislate. It shows a total ignorance of what is involved in these negotiations; because the case substantially made by the BUT is whether we are willing to accept the 10 and 20, but not until you have done the regrading exercise; and the Government has maintained that there are two separate issues. Revision of salaries is one thing, and a review of salaries is something entirely different. The position of the Government is that when you have agreed to a revision of salaries, let us get on with a formal agreement and then move on to the second exercise of a review of salaries.

The BUT has said that they have been tricked on two occasions by the Democratic Labour Party Government. They have been tricked on two previous occasions. The Democratic Labour Party told them that they would do a review exercise for settling salaries, and then they would carry out a regrading exercise. So we are reaping the results of the bad faith of the people who came before us.

Let the whole public and the teachers understand that we are committed to a review of the whole Teaching Service immediately after this exercise is gone through. We have met with the BSTU and we would like to meet the BSTU and the BUT together if we are to work successfully and reasonably on a reclassification and the regrading exercise for the benefit of all the teachers in this country.

7.10 p.m.

Now I want to make a point that has caused me some great deal of concern over the past few weeks. I got in this Chamber last week during the Estimates debate and I said that I believe that the substantial amount of the teaching service in Barbados are dedicated, committed hardworking people, and that there was a small minority, and I spelt out the minority work they were doing, who were doing things that were inimical to the interest of the whole teaching service, and I went on to say that I would be ruthless in wiping out that small element.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is a breach of privilege, and I am not even raising it in that way, but the Nation newspaper – and I will stay on the Nation for a while – carried an article on the front page of its last Friday's edition in which it said that there was this dispute between the BUT and the Government, and went on to say that certain threats were being made against a teacher for sicking out, and then in the final paragraph in bold print they said that only last Wednesday, the Minister of Education said in the House he will wait for times to blow over and he will be ruthless in bringing back some integrity to the profession in Barbados.

I am submitting, Mr. Speaker, that that statement in bold print was taken entirely out of context, and I believe it was intended to cause harm put the way in which it was done, and let me just say that the hon. member for St. Michael South was the first person who brought it to my attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: Well it is at this point I think the Chair is in duty bound to accept that the hon. member is drawing to the attention of the Chair what amounts to a definite breach of privilege. I can do no other under the circumstances.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I was putting it in the records and therefore it is in your hands and the Committee of Privileges. It was brought to my attention by the hon. member for St. Michael South.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order less this House be inadvertently misled in as much as my name has been called. I should like to indicate that I asked the hon. member for St. George South whether he had seen the report in the newspaper. To that extent I drew it to his attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: Your point is well taken.

Hon. L. R. TULL: The hon. member drew it to my attention and in juxtaposition to that statement were threats to teachers in an industrial dispute. The hon. member drew it to my attention because he as a member of the Opposition realised it was unfair reporting.

Mr. SANDIFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order, as the hon. member for St. George South has indicated that I found the report to be unfair reporting. I never discussed any matter of unfair reporting with him; I merely drew the matter to his attention.

Mr. SPEAKER: I note the hon. member's point that he has already admitted that he drew the attention of the hon. member to the article in the newspaper. That is sufficient.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I am going to wind up in this debate because I believe enough has been said on both sides for everybody to get a proper perspective, but I just want to say again that in 1976 the Barbados Union of Teachers asked the then Government for an arbitration exercise and it was rejected out of hand. Everything has come full circle and hon. members on that side have got the nerve to get up this afternoon and make the type of contributions they have. Everything that was done in 1976 was to my mind more designed to destroy collective bargaining and the strength of the Unions than anything that has happened this year, because I must repeat that we in Government have not closed the door to negotiations. Our legislation is to give hardpressed teachers who are desperate for their money twelve months' back-pay that the Union has agreed to. We feel that it is about time they get their money, but we on this side are continuing to keep the negotiations open, and indeed over the next few months the fruit of these negotiations will be made known to everybody including the teachers in Barbados.

Let me just finally say, Mr. Speaker, I again am making it quite clear that the teachers have got to understand that the Minister of Education relies on them to carry out his policies, and unless I have the co-operation of the teachers and they have my co-operation, then what I am trying to do will be in vain. It is therefore imperative that all teachers in Barbados – I am not talking about any Union now, I cannot reason with any Union any more – will understand that this Minister of Education unlike his two immediate predecessors will stand up on his feet and defend their legitimate rights and ensure the integrity of the teaching service that the Nation talks about both for the pupils, the teachers and for the whole public of Barbados.

Mr. SPEAKER: In the matter of the alleged breach of privilege complaint by the Hon. Minister, one of the necessary ingredients is that a copy of the article in the case where it has been published should be handed in and made a document of this Honourable House to cover the complaint.

Hon. L. R. TULL: Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the offending article.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that your motion is that this matter be referred to the Privileges Committee. I do so order that it be referred to the Committee of Privileges of this Honourable House.

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: Really I can add very little to what my colleague.....

Mr. SPEAKER: What the hon. member for St. Michael South Central has said? Is that what the Prime Minister is saying?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: .....my colleague the hon. member for St. George South has said. But there are one or two small points arising out of the hon. member for St. Michael South Central. Evidently he does not believe anything unless it is shouted in his ear, but you cannot always shout like the hon. member, because sometimes I have something to say and therefore I cannot afford to have it lost by bellowing it as if I am shouting over the Sands of Dee calling the sheep home. There is something terribly wrong with this House where an hon. member can come in and put forward a lie, and I do not mean it is the hon. member's lie necessarily, put forward a lie invented by someone else for the purpose of giving currency to something which is false and which they are themselves ashamed of saying, but can find an hon. member who in his inexperience and his innocence of ways of public life then repeats it for them. We have a situation where somebody has told the hon. member a complete utter falsehood.....

Mr. SPEAKER: Which hon. member?

Rt. Hon. J. M. G. M. ADAMS: The hon. member for St. Michael South Central, about the Teachers' Union putting forward a case for untrained teachers and lengthening the scale by four points. I have in front of me a document from the BUT and I can only tell hon. members of the House it is the same length as the previous scale for untrained teachers, it stops before the trained teachers scale, it contains the same number of points and the same break points with the intervals. It is in no way different except in the amounts of money from the scale that went before. The hon. member did not even understand what he was saying about cutting it off at the fifth point and lengthening it by four points, and in that really lies the escape for the hon. member because he so little grasped what he was talking about that he put it forward in a nonsensical way. But you see,

Sir, what goes on in here, especially what is said by certain members on the other side, immediately attracts the press.
7.20 p.m.

He so little grasped what he was talking about that he put it forward in a nonsensical way. You see what goes on in here, especially what is said by members on the other side? I have noticed for the whole week the Press has been giving the Government some heartaches with reporting. Every single day in the *Advocate* last week there was something reported that a member of the Government said in the House with which you could take exception, but not the Opposition. Never the Opposition. The Opposition always get straight reporting. Without fail, tomorrow's Press is going to say that the member for St. Michael South Central alleged that contrary to what the Prime Minister was saying the Barbados Union of Teachers had put forward a case for the untrained Teachers.

The hon. member cannot give a date in which it was to be forwarded nor the document in which it was to be put forward or anything. The Government's files were examined. I have in writing signed and submitted by the Barbados Union of Teachers with a covering document something that contradicts his statement. The scale is absolutely the same but you can be sure that just as the Press will report that the Hon. Prime Minister interferes with appointments which is his constitutional duty and obligation to make and is making them, that without fail they are going to put forward wicked lies that somebody is going to put into his mouth.

I am sure the hon. member will never tell a lie, especially not in the House of Assembly. I am sure the hon. member would not do something like that. Without fail just because it has been said it has got to go into print and somebody is going to read it and believe it when it is not unpredicted. They will say it is only politicians contradicting each other and when you hear them complaining about the Press it is a reasonable point to complain about that the Press goes to no trouble to check the statement that it allows people to be reported as saying.

We have another one, Sir, without never having met with the Barbados Union of Teachers. I have met them. I was meeting the Employers' Confederation? I have never met them. I have met the Police and the Barbados Union of Teachers in different times and different ways. I have met the Workers' Unions often at different times and in different ways and the Port Workers but still these statements are made without regard to their truth perhaps just so that they should be reported and so that they can cause annoyance with those concerned and it really is very important. It is so easy to say that the members of Government are sensitive and are always picking on the Press but it is the Government who always has to suffer.

The speech by the hon. member for St. Michael North East, a travesty of what he said appeared over and over again and yet we would be told why are we so hard with the Press. Why do we give them this kind of trouble. Now I do not want to worry about that. The hon. members on the other side have not said anything. No hon. member has come and said outright why do you not give them the five points or you should do this or do that. All they have done is tried to steer a little chilly-shallying path between what the Government has done. We have taken firm action, Sir.

We have not left the bargaining table as the hon. member for St. George has said. We are continuing to bargain. We have not shut down. We have not said this is the end of the matter. We have legislated before the end of the financial year what we have so far. We will continue to bargain. The same people for whom the hon. member for St. George South has expressed sympathy would be the same people for whom I expressed sympathy at the start. I have not heard any words of sympathy coming from the hon. member for St. Michael South but it is understandable in view of his past history and his past association with the Teachers and the Teachers' cause. I really had to admire his speech today. A man who has a history of disagreements with the Teachers and keeping them at arms length is making a speech in which he has to say something for the Teachers. I honestly have to say that this hon. member has missed his calling. He should not be putting facts of history. He should be trying to argue like his colleague the hon. member for St. Michael South West.

A letter will go to the Barbados Union of Teachers and I sincerely hope that they will come and bargain and even if they do not the Teachers' position will still be. The hon. member may think it quite unimportant. He might think the ideological comments are quite unimportant in most of these, Sir. The hon. member perhaps should read the documents that was put out by the *American Press* about the Cuban Intelligence Agency and read that Teachers' Unions are regarded by certain Marxist sources as one with certain areas of penetration for subversive purposes in the Eastern Caribbean, if he wants to hear, if he thinks it is of no importance.

I am not going any further than that. I believe the hon. member for St. Michael South would not have taken that point. He was a member of a former Cabinet. The hon. member for St. Lucy I believe knows that too even though he is not a Cabinet member but he is a member of the ICFTU and is fully familiar with the areas where these factors are thought out right or wrong and I think in this case we have made deliberate efforts and I think it is bad for the Barbados Union of Teachers not to come to any agreement for the purpose of embarrassing the Government. We have turned the other cheek and we are going on with them in this matter.

Sir, there is one other Resolution of which I hope there will be no controversy which relates to the same matter. I am going to move that this be now passed but in advance I am going to ask hon. members to deal with the other one because it is for the qualified Teachers who are represented by the BNSTU and there is absolutely no dispute between us and them. We are giving them their increase. They are the ones who work in the older Secondary Schools. There may not be many of them, Sir, but they must get the same increases as their brothers and I sincerely hope that the same Resolution can be passed without trouble.

I beg to move that this Resolution do now pass.

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

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

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I explain that this Resolution is consequential to the last Resolution dealing with the Teachers who work in the Secondary Schools. They have different representations. 7.30 p.m.

RESOLUTION TO FIX THE EMOLUMENTS OF HEAD TEACHERS, DEPUTY HEAD TEACHERS AND THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. H. B. St. JOHN: Mr. Speaker, that concludes Government Business, and I beg to move that this House do now adjourn until Tuesday, 3rd April, at 12.00 noon.

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

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